

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

At at Title school like ours, Behavior Supports, Social Workers, and Counselors are imperative. We have the best BH&W team we've ever had this year, and it has made a HUGE difference. Please prioritize these positions. A regional model for social workers would be incredibly detrimental for our students. Staff and families outside of Title schools have no idea, so when they fill out a survey like this, you're going to see a large number of people not taking our reality into consideration. Please approach your analysis of the survey through an equity lens.

I understand that there is a high likelihood that the social work model will need to be adjusted in order to meet budget restraints for next year. In accordance with BSD's equity lens, I advocate for the current social workers who have been working in the district for a number of years be consulted and included in planning what a new model could look like. Also, in order to maintain as many services as possible, I recommend looking into consolidating the work of the substance use counselor role into the work of the school social workers. School social workers are qualified to provide SUS services and it would make sense to use that FTE at the secondary level to maintain SUS services or at least screeners and referrals.

Eliminate social worker altogether . We also don't need 2 dedicated teacher for pe/music in each school. We can also have dedicated school for special help children in one area to instead of putting teacher /help in every school . This will utilize the resource fully .

Counselors and social workers are very important at the elementary level.

Do principals still decide where teachers are placed within their schools? I feel like that would impact Proportional Staffing around Teachers.

I think behavioral specialists have been extremely important- my children haven't directly needed them. But when other children have become violent in the classroom against them, they have been helpful.

My elementary children when from class sizes of around 21 for years to 34 this year in the same school. That seems so wild. Not only are they not used to that, it throws how they've been learning out of wack. Suddenly it's more about keeping the class in control than learning. There's an empty classroom next to them where a teacher could be teaching.

If we are to live in a community that thrives, our schools should thrive. BSD is one of the best districts in the state- a desired location. Let us not let that slip from our grasp as we make these cuts. Keeping in mind safety first, and learning in small classroom settings second.

Thank you.

I think with the higher rates of anxiety and the increase issues our kids are facing with mental health we would be doing a great disservice in cutting counseling and social workers. As someone who works in the schools and is also a parent, I have seen first hand how stretched thin our support staff is.

We must maintain social workers in our schools status quo. The work they do everyday is vital to supporting our students and families. Reducing the number of students would negatively impact our students and impact classroom teachers. Teachers need to be able to focus on teaching and when we can't afford to take away vital support staff that our students need. Our technology support in our buildings are also vital, losing this role again has a huge impact on teachers.

Please look at other ways to cut money in the budget. It seems like closing some small schools is the right next move with decreased enrollment and will save in the budget.

Cutting mental health providers and supports with increases in school behaviors should not be plausible. Beaverton has the highest staff injury forms in the state. Schools should always feel safe to all students and by cutting those supports it would tremendously impact students safety, positive school experiences, and families access to basic needs therefore impacting further how students show up to school (hungry, tired, in the same clothes, etc).

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

I have many questions; in particular how this language around 'proportional' actually contributes to savings. For Example, in the case of Counselors, how would moving counselors to schools with 'higher concentration of student needs' result in savings? Also, what does that mean - the more students there are, the more counselors there are, or something else? In fact, it is not clear how most of these result in savings: will you simply be eliminating positions? We need MORE Behavioral Specialists, not fewer. What does 'centralized instructional technology support' even look like? Does this mean you would be eliminating technology positions and adding even more to the workload of teachers who are already overwhelmed by large student numbers, record high levels of student needs - what's the average number of 504s and IEPs in each classroom these days? While the concept of a single social worker being the contact point for families with students in multiple schools, how does your proposal result in nearly \$3MM in savings?

It is essential that each school has their own counselor in order to build relationships and trust between students and counselors.

Right now a lot of kids/families are afraid to come to school. As a classroom teacher, I also deal with many situations that affect attendance, and kids who aren't here can't learn....and both the counselors and the social workers do many of those home visits, coordinating resources, etc. Our social worker is very much in demand and I just don't see kids getting as much support in the future if they are spread over multiple buildings. I feel like the instructional coach and behavioral coach positions are less valuable in terms of getting kids to show up here at school...not that they aren't helpful positions, but nothing gets done if they don't come to school, and the people doing much of that attendance work are the social workers and counselors. They should be cut last.

As a school social worker, I have serious concerns about Social Workers being off-site and responsible for multiple schools. This regional model limits our ability to build consistent, trusting relationships with students and staff, which are foundational to effective social, emotional, and mental health support.

When social workers are spread across multiple schools, our role becomes narrowed to reactive resource coordination rather than comprehensive, relationship-based intervention, which is primary in the Social Work field. This underutilizes our professional training and reduces meaningful collaboration with educators and support staff.

I teach at the high school level. I see an increase of mental health issues every year. I worry that decreasing mental health supports such as social workers, counselors, and substance use support will increase behaviors in the classroom. This will decrease learning for all students.

Who was consulted to recommend the Regional Social Worker Model?

It would be detrimental to cut school based Social Workers, School Counselors and Many Behavior Specialist jobs. At a Title 1 school (and non- title Schools) these are instrumental positions in very impacted communities. Please find other areas to consider cutting.

Please do not cut social workers, they are the foundation to so many student's lives and are truly indispensable.

We are still seeing the emotional and psychological aftermath of the pandemic, compounded by the current Federal attacks and harrassment to our communities. Kids are suffering from tremendous anxiety. Please keep counselors and social workers as they are absolutely essential to support kids and families in this climate.

I would like to see the district prioritize equal access to the art education for all students of every age group. Music, theatre, and art teachers are the heart and soul of our schools where kids reach their full potential in safe spaces and communities. These classes are what make kids love to come to school, which will increase attendance rates. The same goes for social workers and counselors—they are the people who catch the kids who would fall through the cracks. Our counselors and social workers are essential to the function of our schools and our kids' daily access to life-saving intervention.

We need social workers at every school!

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

As a community member, I strongly believe that it is critical to maintain full-time social workers in every school to ensure student's good mental health and therefore safety of all beaverton school district students and staff.

School Counselors are pulled in many directions, supporting mental health, academics, and post-high school planning. We are in need of more mental health support in our schools for students to allow counselors to proactively do our work. To remove both social workers and counselors from sites, while also asking us to do more to support our families impacted by ICE, is shocking. With more clarity around social worker and counselor roles, there could be better support for students, rather than overlap of services.

With concern for ICE presence in our community, counselors are being asked to support students and families in new and uncertain ways without much support at sites or district level. It is extremely frustrating to continue to be asked to do more, without acknowledgement of the uncertainty that we as staff are also facing, without additional support of ASIST trained administrators, and without a team effort to support students, rather just delegating more to counselors. The role feels nearly impossible and will only get worse with these suggested changes.

I'm struggling with where to rank the Social Worker and substance use specialist cuts. I think there can be some redundancy in those roles, but they serve a unique function that the regular counselors don't have the capacity to fill. I worry that not having them in our building as a high school employee will lessen their value. As a regular fixture in the high school, student that need support and access to the specific services a social worker or SUS provides are able to build a relationship. If a student is simply referred out and the SW/SUS isn't in our building on a daily basis I worry that the student won't get the value from that relationship.

I believe social workers and counselors should be a high priority. These are stressful times we live in. ICE raids, school shootings, the aftermath of Covid—students are experiencing a high level of stress like never before. Social Workers and Counselors are valuable.

Truly it cannot be overstated how much our school social worker & our counselors do for our students and to support staff. In my time at Beaverton in the last three years we have already moved from 3 counselors & a social worker at our school to two counselors & a social worker. These people are OVERWORKED AND OVERBURDENED. Who is going to do their work if you take them from the school?

The idea that you would leave a school without a guaranteed counselor is insane. Who does a student go to when they are crying? Am I just supposed to say, "buck up kid, there's no where for you to take a break?" Have you been in a middle school? The amount of drama & hormones these kids need help sorting through - not to mention the actual trauma that many of them are coming with as well. We're just gonna say "good luck with that" on the days that a counselor is not at the school because we went to a proportional model and smaller schools lost an ESSENTIAL position. I cannot stress enough that this would be an INSANE decision.

Moving to a regional model for social workers would greatly and vastly reduce the amount of help that our students are receiving.

Also, I have been to the district building. You all could cut costs on amenities in there. The toilet paper, paper towels, etc. in that entire building are vastly superior to what I have ever seen in a school. I know this is a small amount of money relative to the budget size. But it sends a message when I work in a school where the gym will likely collapse in an earthquake but our district spent money first on rebuilding the district offices. It sends a message when you walk into that building and you can't even access the floor you need to go to with your swipe access. It sends a message when the toilet paper and the paper towels are high quality while regular schools are left with the standard low quality low absorbency paper towels.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Behavior specialists, counselors and social workers are essential at our school. Multiple students can have behavioral support needs at once. It takes the entire team to keep the school working and when they are out sick or at training, the school feels it. Centralizing these positions is a terrible idea. Students need strong relationships with them and consistency. Not to have things change all the time, they crave stability. As for instructional technology support I hope people filling out the survey understand what that means because I honestly doubt it they way you have worded it. I teach STEAM to students. We explore concepts and use tools like robots and circuits that they do not have time to do in their regular classrooms. I open doors and ideas and help them believe in themselves. I have students that have a hard time in their regular classroom find their passion in mine. Losing this program would take away something that makes our district special.

We are in the middle of a mental health crisis and student behaviors are increasingly disruptive to classroom instruction. Don't cut programs that support these students! Start with the top heavy admin.

Having full time behavior and academic supports in elementary schools are most important. This starts all students with the supports needed for a positive school experience which will set them up for success through 12th grade. Start them off right!

It is time for BSD to actually use the Equity Lens and make the necessary cuts that will impact the higher SES schools so that students at lower SES schools do not lose the staffing and services that they so desperately need. All budget concerns aside, it's so hypocritical to claim to use your Equity Lens when making decisions when year after year our under enrolled, high SES schools are receiving a disproportionate amount of dollars per students relative to our larger Title I schools. Do not be swayed by loud, angry white parents. This is not equity.

Additionally, our Title I school need their social workers in the building. Especially in light of the current situation with ICE, these kids need the support that the school based social workers and counselors provide.

It was not an option on the survey, but you could cut 1 instructional day and preserve almost all Social Worker positions and I wholeheartedly support this.

In today's current climate, I think that cutting any social-emotional-behavioral support to students is a terrible idea and not supporting the current needs of our young people. I understand making services more equitable to needier buildings, but I still think that our students and staff needs as much social-emotional-behavior support as possible.

Keep the cuts out of the actual classrooms, teachers are already having to deal with so many behavioral issues without support that is very disruptive to student learning.

Full-time social workers at each school, and at the very minimum, at each middle and high school, has proven to be literally life-saving for students. If the decision is to cut social workers, I encourage the decision-makers to ask themselves which BSD student's life is not worth saving, prior to reducing the social worker budget and reducing the access to social workers on-site. This is the immediate impact that reduction of social workers will have on the BSD community.

Social Workers belong in the schools They are TRAINED and Licensed in mental health, where as counselors are not. They have to know the students and families. It will do no good if the are Centralized. The students deserve this support

Our social workers are VITAL to keep in our buildings especially schools with lower SES.

If social works and counselors are cut it sends the message, and will be a reality, that mental health support is no longer a priority in BSD and classrooms will be affected with fewer resources to help students with their own resilience they need to be productive learners.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Maintaining the Behavior Health and Wellness Teams is essential. Social Emotional Learning must come first. No one is learning if their social emotional and mental health is compromised.

Society is a mess right now. Cutting mental health and community services would have irreversible damage to our students and families.

this is the absolute worst time to reduce mental health support for our students. This includes FLEX online with our climate/ICE presence.

I cannot fathom a day in which I would survive without the support of our BHW team. I have three HIGHLY impacted kiddos with major mental health needs and two with instructional needs 4 grade levels below and 25 kids. The teacher burnout impact of removing these specialists will be astronomical. Our students deserve better.

Do not cut teachers and cut people who do not teach. Social workers are great, but we have counselors who can do that work.

Pulling social workers and potentially counselors out of buildings doesn't reflect an understanding of student and school needs in the present day with the continual acute behavioral and emotional needs that arise throughout the day. Please talk with BHW teams to learn just how much support it takes to get everyone through an elementary school day.

Thank you for the clear options. With the current state of the country and mental health crisis, I would love to see these supports prioritized. Much of the community is under the impression that keeping class sizes low should be the ultimate priority. Research shows low class size does not have the positive benefit we would expect. Maybe some communication regarding the additional need for mental health and wellness supports would be helpful.

In my opinion as a 21 year teacher in this district it is extremely important that you do not effect the classrooms as much as possible!!! Kids are facing more challenges than ever and we need way more support in schools. High quality behavior specialists, counselors, social workers, specialists, and teachers are what we need. Please find a way to reduce the money in other areas. Something else that isn't an option on this survey is the amount of money this district spends on color posters, stickers, and things that say I believe I achieve....we don't need that! I am sure that is costing money too. PLEASE don't take away teachers and specialist and behavior support. I do think that there could be a restructuring to the instructional coaching, but the last thing we should be affecting is the classrooms and specials. Teachers need to have teaching partners to help and kids need to be separated into different classes. One classroom per grade level is not a good or sustainable idea. Please Beaverton find a way to not reduce what directly impacts the classroom. I bet there could be more reductions at the district office and flex so that actual classrooms are not affected.

Regional social workers have been done before. The district found that schools lacked high-level Tier 3 supports from those social workers and expanded the program to better serve our students with mental health needs. If you view the SW role as purely resource provisioning/family staffing, regional is a good idea. If you include the regular mental health support that is provided across the district, regional is a terrible idea. Going regional will increase mental health struggles of our students and reduce supports for students with suicidal ideation, self-harm, eating disorders, and generalized depression/anxiety.

The support staff-counselors, Behavioral specialist, academic coaches are vital to an elementary school. If you have to make a change to the student/teacher ratio, you are going to need to provide adults to help in the classrooms. You also cannot committed to student's mental health and take away all of the supports that truly help these students.

SEL is so important to maintain that cutting behavioral specialists and classroom teachers to create larger classes with less behavioral support would be a big hit

I teach in a highly impacted Title I school. I am already not able to get through the materials that I am supposed to teach. Do not take our tech and other specialists from us! Our behavior specialist, social worker and counselor are helping prevent students from ending up in Child Protective Service because of

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

familial and community stresses and also preventing white flight/other student loss (and we need those students here for both stability and role modeling). I am not as concerned about keeping instructional coaches because they, for the most part, do not work directly with the kids. I think that the decision to have at least 2 grade level classrooms per building should be a building-by-building decision. We have a dual language program at our school, which means our English-only group of 1st graders is sequestered into 1 group that should, because of the volatile personalities in there, be split up. We have already lost at least 2 families because of the extreme behaviors in that class (our staff is working hard to help the kids, it is not our fault), and there are several other families who are planning on leaving next year to other options in the community. These are multi-kid families. These are not the issues that maybe some other schools are having, but our school is becoming a pariah in the community. We have a new admin who is determined to change things around; don't pull the things that are keeping our more stable families from leaving: the tech teacher who JUST got a big robotics grant and is using it with all of our kids; behavior, counselor, and social workers who the community trusts in a time when families are being snatched off the street by ICE; a history (at least) of having decent-sized classes in a building where the classroom set up and furniture size does not let classes of 30+ function well. Look, I know we are in better financial shape than many districts, and I appreciate that. However, our wealthier families can move to Tigard-Tualatin and in their minds, get more for their tax dollars (I don't believe that, but that is what they are saying). Our growing families can move to Hillsboro and find better housing. There are few affordable houses or apartments for middle and working class families with school age children to move into here, so we have to take care of the families we have to keep them.

We cannot meaningfully address student mental health while proposing cuts to counselors and social workers. These professionals are essential to student safety, well-being, and academic success, and removing them would place additional strain on teachers and administrators who are not equipped to fill that role. This proposal moves the district in the wrong direction and would have lasting negative impacts on both staff and students.

Cutting classroom teacher positions should not be considered a solution to budget challenges either. Fewer teachers mean larger class sizes, less individual support for students, and a decline in instructional quality. Students deserve access to a stable learning environment and the high-quality education they are guaranteed. Balancing the budget at the expense of student support services and classroom instruction undermines the district's mission and risks far greater costs in the long term.

As a parent of a neurodivergent child the Behavioral and teaching staff would be the last place I would cut. Keeping those ratios of resource to student is essential for any family whose child is in this category and trying to be part of the mainstream.

If there were a way to outsource or partner with Law enforcement in addressing substance use so that the burden and cost of addressing this problem did not fall on our educators or school district I would rather see that than carve out dollars needed to be kept for actual instruction and support of teachers in classrooms or resourced to the school.

Streamlining the resources in technology for classrooms seems like a big savings, that would reserve other specialist resources at the schools.

I am sorry everyone is being asked to do more with less and appreciate the chance to give input, and hope that the people with more knowledge and insight on budget and education find the best compromises.

While it may appear straightforward to adjust staffing for counselors, social workers, and behavior specialists—often referred to as B, H, & W—in elementary schools, removing these roles would be unwise. The social and emotional needs of younger students are significant and often complex, regardless of school

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

size. Smaller schools can experience high levels of need, while larger schools may not face the same challenges. For this reason, maintaining equitable access to these positions across all schools is critical to effectively supporting students.

My rankings reflect a deep belief in taking accountability in protecting the direct, school-based supports that students rely on every day, particularly classroom teachers and the social, emotional, and behavioral services that help children feel safe and ready to learn. While I understand the need for thoughtful budgeting, I believe we should evaluate the district and centralized levels before reducing the consistent and on-site supports for students. Strong, daily relationships with trusted adults are foundational to learning, this is an essential investment in the long-term success of our students and schools.

As a staff member, parent, and community member, these cuts are extremely worrisome to me. I work at and my children go to a smaller elementary school and these cuts feel like they would impact our school tremendously. We may be small, but our need is high. Our staffing of counselors, behavior specialists, and teachers should not solely be based on numbers, but the need should be examined as well. My school struggles to meet all the needs of students now, with these resources, and it terrifies me to think of how we will support our students without these crucial members of our staff. Where are the cuts to the high schools? To the curriculum adoptions that then we don't even fully use and (and that Beaverton spends severe amounts of money to TOSA's to rewrite)? Where are the cuts to the district office and administrators. You can't keep taking things away from teachers and kids, and expect us to just go on as expected. These hurt us and make it more and more impossible to do our every day job and support kids.

We need more people that work with students and less middle/upper management people in offices. With mental health the way it is, counseling and social work cuts seem unwise, though I do like the idea of families having one social worker as opposed to more than one.

Oregon ranks 2nd in the nation for illicit drug use and last for access to treatment services. These services are even more scarce for adolescents. Services in the community continue to be cut and without access to Substance Use Specialists in the schools, many students will be without the resources they need to thrive mentally, emotionally, and academically during their school years. The ripple effect of these cuts will be felt across every facet of their education. I understand that cuts come with any budget shortfall, but the proposed cuts to the Substance Use Support team will effectively eliminate the program of support these students so desperately need. The extra-added pressure to provide this level of specialized support will fall to Social Workers and School Counselors, many of whom have only completed one drug and alcohol course during their education/training. With Social Workers and Counselor also facing cuts, adding additional work to the plates of those who remain, we run the risk of our students (who often times have the greatest need) slipping through the cracks and dropping out of school.

I believe school-based staff, including counselors, social workers, SSS, and substitute-use staff, should remain consistent at Title I and low-income schools. Of course, rank is a factor, and all staff with seniority and good standing should be offered positions first.

I do not understand the argument that social workers are better able to support families when split across multiple schools. While collaboration happens across systems, social work is fundamentally relationship-based. Those relationships take time, trust, and consistency.

I do agree that a portion of social workers at lower-need schools could be regionalized; however, even in those settings, the work remains relational and continuity still matters.

I understand that there will be cuts in all of these areas, and a prioritization could impact the depth of those cuts. The underlying issues that have the biggest impact on student learning are behavioral which requires the support of behavior specialists, social workers and substance use counselors. The number of kids

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

with behaviors is EXPLODING right now (and I know of several teachers who have resigned as a result of lack of support)! Past experience proves that when we reduce these services, needs spike and then we are back to hiring more support in future years. I'd rather see the district NOT require kids to fall apart even more before we bring back the services. This is why those positions for me are at the bottom of the list for me. At the very bottom is WEX. These are some of our most impacted students, and they need DAILY support in life skills and work experience. These students will struggle to bounce back from any cuts to their program.

I urge the district to maintain full-time music specialists in every elementary school and ensure that all students receive 90 minutes of music instruction in a six-day rotation. These roles are not “extras” or optional enrichment—they are essential to a well-rounded, equitable education and to the healthy development of our students.

Extensive research demonstrates that music education directly supports cognitive development, memory, attention, language growth, and executive functioning, with measurable academic benefits. Studies from the National Institutes of Health and developmental psychology show that musical training strengthens working memory, concentration, problem-solving skills, and auditory processing—all foundational for academic success. In addition, large-scale research reviews find that students in strong music programs demonstrate higher reading, math, and overall academic performance, attend school more consistently, and show improved engagement and motivation.

Music education also plays a documented role in social-emotional learning (SEL). Research shows that music participation increases students' sense of identity, belonging, and emotional regulation, while building perseverance, collaboration, and self-management—core SEL competencies. Studies further highlight the strong relationship between music, movement, and emotional development, showing that structured music experiences help students build behavioral and emotional capacities.

Full-time music specialists also play a critical role in school climate and student engagement. Evidence from arts education research shows that access to arts instruction—including music—is linked to increased attendance, stronger school connectedness, and higher engagement among students, particularly those with learning differences or a history of chronic absenteeism. Additional nationwide data confirm that the vast majority of U.S. public schools offer music as a core part of the instructional day, underscoring its recognized importance in a complete education.

Beyond instruction, full-time specialists strengthen school communities through collaboration with classroom teachers. Research on arts integration emphasizes that arts specialists contribute to teacher professional growth, interdisciplinary learning, and a more inclusive and supportive learning environment—benefits that cannot be replicated by part-time staffing or itinerant models. Once specialist positions are cut, rebuilding programs, expertise, and community trust is both difficult and costly.

If BSD is committed to educating the whole child and providing equitable, high-quality learning opportunities for all students, then preserving full-time Music and Elementary Specialist positions must be a clear budget priority.

I respectfully ask the Budget Team to center decisions on the long-term developmental, academic, and community needs of our students—not just immediate financial pressures. Our students deserve access to a complete education, and our schools are stronger, more inclusive, and more successful because of our elementary specialists.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

The idea of cutting social workers and counselors severely concerns me as a parent of a high school student and infant. We would not have the need for a lot of financial items such as substance use support if ALL students are able to access the behavioral support required in early education. Saying that the cuts to mental health support to focus on students with more "needs" seems so exclusionary for the silent sufferers. Children need daily education and social and

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

emotional support from these roles and most of them require a Master's level education and they are choosing to help students. On a personal note, I have had several of my teen's friends reach out to me for support when it comes to suicidal ideation, domestic violence, and drug use. I was able to connect them quickly to their school mental health team. It worries me what would have happened had those counselors been at a different school that day or not had the capacity when support was needed immediately. Please reconsider these cuts.

I understand the district's need to make difficult budget decisions, and I appreciate the effort to balance fiscal responsibility with maintaining high-quality education for all students. However, I encourage the district to closely monitor the impact of any staffing cuts on student outcomes, particularly in the areas of mental health support (social workers, counselors, behavioral specialists) and special subjects like music and physical education. These services are integral to student well-being and development, and any reductions here could have long-term negative effects.

If possible, I also suggest exploring additional revenue sources or partnerships to help bridge the funding gap, such as grants, community sponsorships, or partnerships with local businesses. This may alleviate some of the burden on students and ensure that critical services remain intact.

This is in no way going to help our children.

Nothing about the Beaverton school my daughter goes to will shape her future as a productive member of society. She's being let down here just like she was at the private school she went to. The report card is a joke. I have no way of seeing what work my daughter does in school from her teachers and the lack of homework isn't helping. Being told she's not getting her classroom work done two weeks before grading day for teachers is beyond reckless and points to staff that don't find my child's education nearly as important as they should. I have yet to see the principal do anything important (seems like a cushy job!) and instead of two to three front office employees, why not keep a full time counselor, social worker, and/or behavioral specialist. Especially at the elementary level.

As a district parent I am concerned about the resources available to the students who struggle. Programs like the substance use program at Beaverton H.S. provide services that are very scarce to students otherwise. In the big picture these programs save the community money.

Social workers, behavioral health, and counselors are very important these days with greater health disparities, many children experiencing trauma related to immigration enforcement. Housing and food insecurity also take a toll. Having these professionals allow classroom teachers more space to teach.

Decreasing wellness supports during a mental health and housing crisis would be catastrophic to student success. The ripple affects would severely impact the remaining wellness supports (primarily caseload counselors who would have to pick up the slack with conducting suicide assessments, resource brokering, housing navigation, McKinney-Vento support) and would result in teachers dedicating more time to behavior management in classrooms over teaching.

Schools NEED social work and counselors. If you reduce counselors students will not get what they need because they are the drivers of maintaining 504s and IEP. Of COURSE, cuts outside of the classroom at an administrative level should ALWAYS be cut first. Stop applying for awards and that'll cut admin cost. Stop buying electric buses as the mechanics themselves say they are NOT reliable and highly problematic. Cut the fancy district wide recognition and leave that to local schools.

I hope you actually receive this feedback as the long term planning committee comments were NEVER SEEN AND NEVER ACCOUNTED FOR. If the major budget decisions are going to be made by the person that holds that title, the title should become an elected position.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

While behavioral specialists and substance use support specialists might serve a low population of total students, it's important for the students who need it to have a consistent connection to their staff at their own school. The fail case for these services being inadequate is much more dire than some of the other services mentioned that may affect more kids overall.

I don't trust the district to do what's best for students and teachers, but instead what's best for its pocketbook. This language "By using a weighted staffing model, the district can ensure resources are directed where they are needed most, maintaining a strong safety net for all students" is focused on treating employees as expendable resources while extreme behaviors continue to not be addressed at higher levels and its put back on the classroom teachers. This language "This model ensures every student has access to social and emotional support while maximizing the reach of staff" is nonsense - how does having a social worker distanced from the school and community increase access? This language "These positions would be allocated based on the number of classroom teachers or sections in a school rather than one per site. This ensures that coaching support is distributed fairly and that teachers receive the help they need to maintain high academic standards" makes me wonder if anyone who isn't a coach has spent any time at a school site with coaches. These coaches get very little time to coach - instead, they are on lunch duty, hall duty, recess duty, or at meetings (all day district meetings that are top-down directives to carry back to teachers and grade-level teams, where they attend more meetings rather than actually spending time in classrooms). And now you want them to be split between schools? Seriously? Again, before engaging in these cuts, I'd encourage everyone in the DO plus the school board to spend multiple days in a school and observe the vital roles carried out by all these people and their roles in 3D rather than a line item on a budget. Connection takes time and needs vicinity, and coaches, behavioral specialists, counselors, and social workers need that to effectively do their jobs.

Releasing this proposal without showcasing the estimated savings of district office cuts is not okay.

Also moving to a regional social worker model is not more efficient. Social workers will not have the impact on schools as we do right now where we see students regularly and are able to build rapport/trust, which is often needed to provide services to students/families. School supports like our behavioral specialist, counselors, and substance use specialist also provide endless support for our students. It would be a shame to cut positions that help our most vulnerable communities. This is an equity issue.

Really frustrating that these changes are happening and being made without consultation, observance, or consideration of my program even from my own building admin. Also half of these are programs that support marginalized groups. Guess students only will be believed in and belong in this district if you are in a marginalized group. ALSO funny to push for so much Emotional and Behavioral health supports but then cut them as well.

How do you plan to make the regional social work model work? Why are social workers always first to be cut every single year, time after time. Has anyone from district office shadowed a social worker? Seen how they spend their day, seen how they build relationships IN schools to better connect with families? Does district office even know what social workers do? Has district office ever asked for data and casa note summaries from social workers that we have been gathering for several years to show our impact and what we do in this district? Am I screaming into the void? Does this survey even matter? Where is the evidence backing that there is an overlap in services? Do you know that social workers coordinate already and we communicate with other social workers in other buildings?

Are any cuts going to be made at the district office?

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

It would probably be more cost effective to stop having Resource Officers in schools and put whatever money the district spends on them towards support staff like behavioral specialists. Our kids aren't thriving because they're being treated like future employees rather than students and teachers aren't get the support they need.

Our students social and emotional needs are higher than ever and our school counselors make a huge impact in supporting students both academically and social/emotionally so that they can access their education. Our social workers are also a vital role in our communities, some schools do not need a full time social worker in the building, while others really do. Please consider this when making cuts. Ultimately, it is better to cut in places that do not directly pull staff away from school buildings. We are already understaffed in many ways, and our students deserve the best support and direct services we can provide them.

While it is appreciated that you are asking for input assuming you take it into consideration, I do think asking staff to rank which of us or our coworkers will lose our jobs and which of our vulnerable students will lose their supports is a dystopian model. The proposed model for social workers does not allow social workers to better serve students. It takes social workers out of schools, away from communities and relationships that have been built and sustained over years. Social workers do not overlap services as whenever there are student(s) at other schools, social workers communicate with one another when students are being served at multiple schools and ensure services are not being overlapped. Taking away VITAL student facing services like social workers, school behavioral specialists, substance use support, and counselors during this time in society with ICE and the lack of mental health supports is not a good choice to allowing students to access their education. We need mental health supports in school more than anything, not less. Cutting mental health supports while touting the "Believe YOU matter" initiative is hypocritical. In addition, putting numbers on every cut positions facing students while not putting numbers on the district office cuts, is not transparent when you put this survey out to the public. Especially putting the district cuts as last makes it feel like you're trying to control the narrative about what order things should be cut and that feels unfair. I hope the district seriously looks into the spending the district office does in terms of unnecessary programs, speakers, technology, etc.

I am not sure if Student Support Specialists are included in this grouping, but those positions should be eliminated. This is the fourth year of having them (my building has 2 FTE) and I do not know what they do. It seems like they have a lot of free time and serve very few students. They do serve lunch duty though. The SSS load should be the responsibility of the Admin, Counselors, and Student Managers.

Cuts should be made in consideration to direct impact on students (i.e. Are they in the classroom teaching students directly). How many students do each of these positions serve? Do they serve hundreds of students or do they serve 30?

At the high school level, losing a building social worker will definitely negatively impact students and their families. Right now if a student has any need, they can get it resolved within 24 hours though the building social worker and a hotline for assistance they have created. There is a club that maintains a school pantry and clothing closet though the social worker. There is no way a student would get the same kind of supports if one person is responsible for multiple schools at different levels. Please reconsider this option.

We have to get student behavior under control. People are pulling their kids out of public schools because they want their kids learning, not being exposed to inappropriate behavior, room clears, and behavioral students. I love public schools but this is what I'm hearing in the community over and over again. By not addressing behavior and having real consequences for students, the district has created this problem.

It is very difficult to make a decision without having complete information. When will you know how much you can reduce the expenses from central office? Also, have you looked at all other departments? I know that you have a very hefty MLD that is made up of people that are making almost a certified teacher

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

salary - yes, getting information to people in their native language is imperative/crucial but questions arise when you have staffing allocated to schools that have DL programs where the services if the liaisons is not as crucial as for example in school communities that don't rely heavily on those services.

I am curious as to how you've determined that there is an "overlap" of services between schools and social workers. It is evident that this area is the one that you are heavily focused on reducing given the predetermined economic impact that this will have on the future budget and it goes without saying that the work that is done by the school social workers is done "behind the curtains". Families and children are dealing with issues that are only addressed by social workers, for example: housing, food insecurity, immigration fears, mental health counseling, medical needs, behavior support, etc. and for you to say that the services between schools overlap is a far reach. SSW work 1:1 with students, support families, engage and advocate for the "equity" that you stand by - how will reducing their workforce improve quality of care and connection with those that are already many times the most vulnerable across the district?

I'm disappointed to see that the bulk of the cuts will deeply impact the sustainability of the job for teachers. They have advocated for the support from Social Workers, Counselors and Behavior Specialists. The impacted students in our children's schools are only increasing. To take these positions away is going to deeply impact the environment for students to be able to learn. I would expect to have this district take a hard look at administrators, their salaries and their rolls at District Office before impacting buildings.

Student support staff such as social workers and counselors are really key in the secondary schools are a VITAL part of allowing teachers to do their jobs in the classroom. If their positions are centralized, this would put more weight on teachers and school staff to deal with student problems.

Oregon faces severe substance use challenges and ranks low in access to youth treatment. For many students, school-based support is their only option. This year Mountainside H.S. voluntary student self-referrals increased by 74%, signaling trust and unmet need.

Substance use support improves attendance, reduces discipline, and preserves instructional time—core district priorities. Reducing services would increase long-term costs. Current data supports expanding, not reducing, this program.

I have three points for your consideration:

1. Each year, we are seeing more and more students with intensive behavior needs coming in. Many counselors, social workers, student success coaches, SPED teachers, principals, and specialists (like music and PE) have been essentially working as one-on-ones on top of their regular duties to keep those students and all of their peers at school safe. With the proposal to split nearly all of those staff between schools, I think we are going to be in dire straits when it comes to providing any kind of behavior support for students at our schools – that leaves only principals and SPED teachers on site full time to respond to every single behavior support call. That will be woefully inadequate for the ever-increasing student behavior needs we are seeing. We need to have support staff and specialists full time in the building at schools to help support kids, or we are going to have even bigger behavior problems ahead with a lot less staff on site to help manage that.

2. The district (and the state as a whole) has been really focusing on trying to increase attendance at school, and research has shown us over and over again that one of the main reasons students show up to school are for specials classes. Kids need to know math, reading, writing, science, and social studies – we all know that – but the classes that motivate them to show up for school are the ones that bring them the most joy: PE, music, library, technology. If you decrease

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

or eliminate those, you are going to have students that are even less motivated to show up for school, which will further negatively impact our attendance problems.

3. Which brings me to the elephant in the room... A less pleasant thought to consider: we have a lot of partially empty schools due to declining enrollment, and a lot of buildings that are getting progressively emptier each year. For example, they are opening the new Raleigh Hills school next year that is slated to hold 750 kids, but without closing any other schools, they are expected to only have 270ish kids next year. I think an unpleasant but obvious solution is that we might need to consider closing and consolidating some of the other local schools. The majority of the staff could be preserved and moved into the bigger building together, and it would save the district a lot of money on overhead without having to eliminate very many positions. I hate the idea of closing any schools as much as the next person, but I think we are starting to see the stretch of our resources between more and more partially empty schools, and I think it's only going to get worse with each passing year. I think it might be worthwhile to consider that it might be better to have fewer buildings that are fully staffed with support and specials staff for students than more buildings that have only partial resources for kids.

I know the idea of closing and consolidating schools is a very heated topic with a lot of big feelings; I love our little neighborhood schools as much as the next person, and my preference would obviously be to keep all of them open and fully staffed. However, I think kids deserve to have full time specials and support, and if that means that we have fewer buildings, then I think we need to consider that option. Closing or consolidating schools is going to be unpopular, disappointing, and heated for communities whether we do it this year or in five years, but I think it's worth it to consider ripping off figurative "band-aid" now. In the case of Raleigh Hills, I think it makes sense to do it now so that students and staff from all of the incoming schools have a chance to co-create a new community together when they all enter the building together for the first time. Families will be disappointed if their schools close, of course, but I think that will be relatively short-lived when they get to experience the joy of entering a brand new, beautiful building and being part of a wonderful new community together. The students from all of the entering schools can help write a new school song, pick a new mascot, and share the joy of creating all of those foundational pieces of community together as a team.

Thank you for taking the time to thoughtfully consider these ideas.

Increase discipline in the classrooms and options for schools to deal with kids with behavioral problems. If they don't behave/are disruptive/interfere with daily learning of others/cause safety concerns.... 3 strikes you're out. This should be regardless of if they are in a protected class or not. Actions need consequences, and under current structures this is no longer being enforced at school. Send them all to remedial school and concentrate your social workers, behavioral specialists, drug treatment counselors there. Enrollment is declining due to parents with means who care about their children's education pulling their children from public school or parents without means switching to homeschooling due to quality education and safety concerns. DO NOT increase class size. My 3rd grader has 30 kids in her class. Her teacher is wonderful but is hamstrung by behavioral problems in the class. Keep calling the parents and make them pick the child up. Only then will you see changes.

Pulling social workers and potentially counselors out of buildings doesn't reflect an understanding of student and school needs in the present day with the continual acute behavioral and emotional needs that arise throughout the day. Please talk with BHW teams to learn just how much support it takes to get everyone through an elementary school day.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Taken together, these proposals follow two consistent themes: reduce guaranteed, site-based staffing and replace it with proportional or centralized models. On paper, this looks “efficient.” In practice, it shifts schools from stable, relationship-based support systems to rotating, reactive services. The risk is not abstract. It shows up as slower response times, weaker relationships with students, higher caseloads, less prevention, and more crisis management. Schools do not experience need in neat, predictable averages. They experience it in bursts, clusters, and human stories.

What is being cut here is not just headcount. It is continuity, trust, and the ability to intervene early rather than late.

Regional Social Worker Model

Risk: Loss of continuity, weaker relationships, slower response in crises.

School social work is built on trust, presence, and familiarity with families, staff, and school culture. Moving to a regional model turns social workers into itinerant responders rather than embedded partners. The claim of “overlap” ignores a basic reality: families with multiple children often need coordinated, consistent support, not a rotating cast of professionals.

Harm to students and teachers:

Students in crisis do not benefit from seeing “whoever is available this week.” Teachers lose a consistent partner who understands their classroom dynamics and student history. Crises become harder to prevent and easier to miss. What looks like efficiency on a spreadsheet increases the odds of late interventions, escalations, and missed warning signs.

Better solution:

Keep school-based social workers as the default, but create a small regional surge team for overflow cases, multi-school families, and crisis spikes. Standardize referral protocols to reduce duplication instead of removing embedded staff. Use shared case management systems rather than shared bodies.

Why this works:

You preserve trust and early intervention while still reducing inefficiency and overlap.

Proportional Staffing: Elementary Classroom Teachers

Risk: Volatile staffing, multi-grade instability, larger or uneven class sizes.

Guaranteeing a minimum number of classrooms per grade creates predictability and instructional stability. Removing that floor means some schools will run with single sections in certain grades, making them fragile to enrollment shifts, absences, or behavioral clustering in one classroom.

Harm to students and teachers:

Students lose peer diversity and scheduling flexibility. Teachers lose collaborative partners at their grade level and absorb more variability in class composition and needs. Principals lose options when a cohort has higher behavioral or academic needs than average. “Proportional” sounds fair, but children are not distributed proportionally by need.

Better solution:

Set minimum grade-level floors (for example, no single-section grades K to 3 unless enrollment is extremely low), then apply proportional staffing above that floor. Use multi-year enrollment averaging instead of single-year snapshots to avoid staffing whiplash.

Why this works:

You keep instructional stability while still aligning staffing to real trends.

Proportional Staffing: Counselors

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Risk: Higher caseloads, less prevention, more crisis triage.

Counselors are already stretched thin. Removing the guarantee of one per school means some campuses will have only fractional access. Weighted models look good in theory, but they depend on perfect data and perfect timing. Need does not announce itself neatly in advance.

Harm to students and teachers:

Students wait longer to be seen. Small problems become big ones. Teachers become de facto counselors without training or time. Schools lose the ability to build proactive social-emotional systems and instead shift toward emergency response only.

Better solution:

Guarantee a baseline counselor presence at every school (even if fractional), then layer weighted staffing on top for high-need campuses. Also protect maximum caseload caps districtwide.

Why this works:

No school is left without access, and the highest-need schools still get more support.

#### Centralized Instructional Technology Support

Risk: Slower support, less classroom-specific problem solving, more downtime.

Instructional technology fails in classrooms, not at district offices. Centralizing support increases response time and reduces context. Specialists who know a building, its staff, and its systems solve problems faster and more effectively than a remote queue.

Harm to students and teachers:

Teachers lose instructional time to tech issues that linger. Students lose learning time. Staff become more reluctant to try new tools or methods because support is no longer nearby or immediate. Innovation becomes riskier when help is farther away.

Better solution:

Use a hub-and-spoke model: keep at least one building-based instructional tech lead per cluster of schools, supported by a small central team for standards, procurement, and escalation. Separate instructional coaching from hardware break-fix support.

Why this works:

Teachers get fast, contextual help without duplicating full teams everywhere.

#### Proportional Staffing: Elementary Specialists (Music and PE)

Risk: Erosion of equitable access to a well-rounded education.

When specialist staffing floats with enrollment, smaller schools lose program depth and scheduling flexibility. The practical outcome is often fewer minutes of instruction, more rotating staff, or combined classes that dilute quality.

Harm to students and teachers:

Students in smaller or higher-need schools get a thinner version of music and PE. Classroom teachers lose reliable planning time. Specialists lose stable schedules and relationships with students. “Proportionate” distribution does not guarantee equal experience.

Better solution:

Set minimum weekly minutes per student districtwide for music and PE, then staff to meet that standard. Allow shared specialists only where travel time and

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

scheduling still protect instructional quality and prep time for teachers.

Why this works:

You protect equity of experience, not just equity of headcount.

Centralized Substance Use Support

Risk: Delayed intervention and weaker school-based prevention.

Substance use issues require early detection, trust, and consistent presence. Centralizing this function turns it into a referral service rather than a prevention and early-intervention system.

Harm to students and teachers:

Students are less likely to seek help from someone they rarely see. Teachers lose a familiar expert to consult before problems escalate. By the time the centralized team is involved, the situation is often more serious, more disruptive, and more costly to address.

Better solution:

Maintain school-based prevention leads (counselor, social worker, or specialist) and build a central expert team for complex cases, training, and compliance.

Focus centralization on expertise and data, not first contact.

Why this works:

Early identification stays local; advanced intervention scales districtwide.

Proportional Staffing: Behavioral Specialists

Risk: Schools lose baseline capacity to handle behavioral needs day-to-day.

Behavioral challenges are not evenly distributed, nor are they predictable year to year. Removing guaranteed coverage means some schools will operate below the threshold needed for prevention and early support.

Harm to students and teachers:

Classrooms become more reactive. Teachers spend more time managing behavior and less time teaching. Students with emerging needs wait longer for help, increasing the likelihood of discipline, exclusion, or crisis interventions.

Better solution:

Guarantee minimum behavioral support coverage at every school, then use weighted staffing for additional FTEs. Invest in teacher training and tier-one interventions to reduce downstream demand.

Why this works:

You reduce total need over time instead of just rationing support.

Student Work Experience (WEX) Model

Risk: Reduced continuity and weaker real-world skill development.

Cutting from daily to every-other-day participation is not a neutral efficiency. Work experience programs rely on routine, immersion, and relationship-building with supervisors and coworkers.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Harm to students and teachers:

Students lose momentum, skill development, and credibility in work settings. Programs become harder to coordinate. The students who benefit most from structure and consistency are the ones who lose it first.

Better solution:

Keep daily participation for the highest-need students, but offer hybrid schedules for students who can succeed with fewer on-site days. Reduce costs through employer partnerships, transportation coordination, and cohort scheduling, not by cutting days.

Why this works:

You preserve impact where it matters most and right-size elsewhere.

Proportional Staffing: Instructional Coaches

Risk: Less embedded professional growth, more surface-level support.

Instructional coaching works because coaches are present, visible, and part of the school culture. When coaching becomes fractional or shared, it shifts from sustained improvement to occasional consultation.

Harm to students and teachers:

Teachers get less job-embedded support. New initiatives are harder to implement well. Instructional quality becomes more variable, especially in schools that already struggle with staffing or student needs.

Better solution:

Maintain school-embedded coaches in high-need or large schools, and use shared coaches only among small, stable campuses. Tie coach allocation to instructional priorities and change initiatives, not just headcount.

Why this works:

Coaching stays strategic, not just mathematical.

Middle School and Option School Scheduling Adjustments

Risk: Staffing driven by accounting logic rather than educational design.

Aligning staffing strictly to schedule math ignores why some models intentionally use different teaching loads. Those differences often exist to support students with higher needs, alternative programs, or specialized approaches.

Harm to students and teachers:

Programs may be forced to change their instructional model to fit budget logic rather than student need. Teachers absorb heavier or less sustainable workloads. Students in non-traditional or option settings often lose the flexibility those programs were designed to provide.

Better solution:

Create funding bands by instructional model (traditional, alternative, option, intervention-heavy) rather than a single uniform formula. Audit actual teaching loads, but allow intentional variance where the model justifies it.

Why this works:

You align funding to purpose, not just periods per day.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Credit Recovery Allocation

Risk: Shrinking a safety net based on past usage, not future need.

Just because a budget line was underused does not mean the need is gone. Credit recovery demand fluctuates with cohorts, disruptions, and external factors.

Better solution:

Keep a small protected reserve for credit recovery and set clear triggers for scaling it up or down based on real-time data. Reallocate only truly idle funds, not the safety net itself.

Why this works:

You avoid being unprepared when cohorts or conditions change.

Harm to students and teachers:

When the need spikes, capacity will not be there. Students closest to graduation but at risk of falling short are the ones who pay the price.

Proportional Staffing: FLEX Online School

Risk: Treating online education like a simple enrollment-based factory model.

Online programs often require different support ratios, more intervention, and more monitoring to keep students engaged and progressing. Pure proportional staffing risks underestimating that reality.

Harm to students and teachers:

Students who already struggle with engagement get less support. Teachers carry larger caseloads with more complex needs. Completion and success rates are likely to suffer.

Better solution:

Staff based on engagement intensity tiers, not just enrollment. High-risk or credit-recovery students get lower ratios; stable, on-track students get higher ratios. Use early-warning data to dynamically rebalance caseloads.

Why this works:

Support follows student risk, not just student count.

District Office Reductions

Risk: Hollowing out the systems that keep schools functioning.

There is a point where cutting central support stops being “efficiency” and starts being infrastructure failure. HR, IT, compliance, curriculum, and student services do not disappear when budgets shrink. Their workload shifts to principals and teachers.

Harm to students and teachers:

School leaders spend more time on administration and less on instruction and culture. Teachers inherit more non-teaching work. Errors, delays, and compliance risks increase, even if they are invisible at first.

Better solution:

Conduct a workload transfer audit before cutting. Prioritize eliminating duplicate systems, manual processes, and low-impact reporting. Invest in automation

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

and shared services before cutting people.

Why this works:

You reduce cost without quietly increasing school-level burnout and errors.

#### The Centralization Problem

Centralization consistently trades local knowledge and speed for theoretical efficiency. It assumes need is predictable, evenly distributed, and easily triaged from a distance. Schools do not work that way. They rely on relationships, presence, and early intervention. When support becomes regional or district-level, it becomes slower, thinner, and more reactive.

This budget is not just reducing services. It is changing the operating model of schools from stable, relationship-based support to a roaming, scarcity-based system that responds after problems grow instead of before.

#### Bottom Line

Each individual cut may look manageable in isolation. Together, they represent a structural shift away from prevention, stability, and equity toward rationing, triage, and central control. The savings are real. So are the risks. And the costs will show up not just in spreadsheets, but in classrooms, hallways, counseling offices, and the daily workload of teachers who are already being asked to do more with less.

For years, Oregon has ranked near the bottom of national K–12 performance indicators — including achievement, chronic absenteeism, graduation rates, and social-emotional well-being — on a range of measures such as NAEP scores, state assessments, and reporting from education research organizations.

Nationally, states with stronger outcomes tend to share several structural attributes:

- Consistent class sizes and teacher assignment stability
- Robust access to counselors, social workers, and behavioral support
- Embedded specialist staffing (arts, PE, technology integration)
- Early intervention systems that prevent need escalation

Many of the proposals under review move BSD away from these research-aligned predictors of quality and toward models that prioritize cost-allocation formulas over embedded professional capacity.

Instead of asking, “How do we make staffing more proportional or centralized?”

Ask, “Where do relationships, speed, and prevention matter most, and how do we protect those while removing duplication and low-value work?”

High-performing systems do not win by thinning out the front line. They win by:

- Keeping support close to students,
- Using data to target intensity,
- And cutting process waste before people.

Thank You for reading this

Lucas Mally

Social workers and counselors do some of the most vital and important work at our schools. They help us ensure that students are safe, healthy, regulated and have their physical and emotional needs met so that they can learn most effectively. Teachers and students would have so many different problems we would

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

find ourselves unable to solve without these roles. Spreading these important people even more thin than they already are by having them manage more than one building, is not only unfair but will assuredly mean that students receive less support than they need. At my school, this would mean an increase in behaviors and stress for students and teachers. These are trusted people in our building, by having them travel from building to building, they may not be well known and the students who need them the most may not trust them as they do now. This choice would be detrimental to the function of our schools and the health/well-being of our students.

Consider the impact of reducing mental health staff accessible within schools. Decreasing social work positions would significantly increase the workload of remaining staff and place additional strain on counselors. Reductions to both mental health and substance use support services would directly affect a critical area of student wellness—social and emotional well-being. Staff with formal training in mental health should be thoughtfully retained, as their roles are grounded in specialized preparation, a defined code of ethics, and professional standards that ensure consistency across the district. In contrast, additional teaching support roles (such as instructional coaches or SBS positions) are often utilized with considerable variation from building to building based on administrative discretion. Maintaining adequately staffed, trained mental health professionals helps ensure equitable, consistent support for students district-wide.

Parent of a disabled child who needs stability with counselors, teachers, etc.

Cuts to student-facing positions and student services should be cut last. For example, if scheduling changes and reallocating positions is possible, make those cuts before you cut something that directly benefits students such as credit recovery programs. Please try not to cut social workers before counselors, as they work directly with our students that have the highest needs.

To me, as a teacher and a parent of a middle schooler, elementary schooler, and preschooler all very bright but also with unique needs, and as a sister and auntie to individuals with moderate to severe autism, having more teachers per student ratio and behavioral and mental health support will always be more important than nicer buildings (unless there is mold or lead), technology (I actually think less is better and wish we would go back to pen and paper), and extra programs.

Asking educators and community members to rank which vital programs should be cut is an exceptionally cruel and unusual exercise in futility. It is indefensible to pit essential supports like social workers, who are frontline responders to increased ICE activity around schools, substance-use support staff, while the drug epidemic rages on, and critical partners like counselors/school support specialists against one another, while the rest of our democratic institutions crumble around us, when counselors and behavior specialists are indispensable in helping students develop the emotional regulation, conflict-resolution, and coping skills they need to navigate, and just simply survive, a world increasingly defined by instability and harmful behavior. All the while district office payroll remains disgustingly and shamefully bloated.

This is especially troubling when Oregon has a Rainy Day Fund that could be accessed, and when the legislature has the option to decouple our state budget from the federal chaos created by the BBB. This is not a values-based budgeting process, it's a deflection, and quite honestly, it's embarrassing that we are even asking this question of our community.

Please do not cut Behavioral Specialists. They are absolutely needed, especially in small schools. They often function in place of the administrator when the administrator is out of the building. They help students with restorative practices, and allow teachers to continue to focus on learning in the classroom. They are a huge necessity with big behaviors that are often present in schools.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

I strongly urge the district not to diminish, merge, or reduce the role of school social workers. Their work is distinct from that of school counselors, and there is very little overlap between the two roles.

School social workers provide critical support that goes far beyond academic counseling. They address family instability, mental health crises, housing insecurity, abuse and neglect concerns, and community-based needs that directly impact a student's ability to function and succeed in school. These responsibilities require specialized training and a scope of practice that counselors are not positioned to absorb.

In these extremely difficult and uncertain times, the presence of a dedicated social worker in every school is not a luxury—it is a necessity. Students and families are facing unprecedented levels of stress, trauma, and unmet needs, and school social workers are often the first line of support and advocacy.

Weakening this role would leave vulnerable students without essential services and would place an unrealistic burden on other staff. Instead, the district should be strengthening and protecting social work positions to ensure that every school has the resources it needs to support the whole child.

Thank you for your time and consideration, and for your commitment to the well-being of our students and school communities.

Asking educators and community members to rank which vital programs should be cut is an exceptionally cruel and unusual exercise in futility. It is indefensible to pit essential supports like social workers, who are frontline responders to increased ICE activity around schools, substance-use support staff, while the drug epidemic rages on, and critical partners like counselors/school support specialists against one another, while the rest of our democratic institutions crumble around us, when counselors and behavior specialists are indispensable in helping students develop the emotional regulation, conflict-resolution, and coping skills they need to navigate, and simply survive, a world increasingly defined by instability and harmful behavior. All the while district office payroll remains bloated.

This is especially troubling when Oregon has a Rainy Day Fund that could be accessed, and when the legislature has the option to decouple our state budget from the federal chaos created by the BBB. This is not a values-based budgeting process—it's a deflection, and quite honestly, it's embarrassing that we are even asking this question of our community.

1- The district should proportionally fund each school site. Where BSD claims to have the most diversity, the schools comprised of the most diverse populations are not equitably funded. Their per student operational funding is below the average, while, for example, the district receives 1.5/ELL funding, those funds are not actually spent at the intended schools. Rather it is siphoned off to maintain advantage at our most homogenous, high-SES elementary schools, which a small, vocal crowd of highly-educated people have coopted the term "community school" as justification for smaller than average class sizes and much higher than average per student operational spending. This perpetuates community inequities and quite literally means that the Whitest, most educated communities are benefiting from the backs of our BIPOC communities. Change is hard, and group threat theory is very real, but an equitable redistribution does not mean a loss for this group, it would mean that actually BSD is following through on its Mission & Vision. I urge the district to not be intimidated and bullied by this group. It comes down to the question of, is the district willing to do the hard work for ALL or for a select few who have the resources to be louder than the masses?

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

2- In study after study, it is shown that the most success happens when the whole person is tended to. This means, at a minimum, retaining and proportionally allocating services to students and families in the form of low-barrier or no-barrier school social workers, behavioral specialists, SUS specialists, food pantries, and so on. These are not expendable resources. They are vital components of student, building, and district success. When basic, non-academic needs are met, the rest falls into place. This will have a direct effect on attendance numbers, early-leaver/dropout rates, and graduation rates. How many times does Maslow's hierarchy need to be proven before the funding falls in line with it?

Our students continue to need full time behavioral supports from our behavior coach and counselors! Please do what you can to make sure each student continues to maintain this support. Our students need it now more than ever!

We can not reduce counselors and behavior specialist, behaviors are too elevated in elementary schools. If you cut back these positions it will affect everyone.

I believe proportional staffing at elementary is necessary, in regards to instructional coaches and SBS. It follows the model that ELD/LAS has been using for years. If a school is large they receive more support, whereas a smaller school receives lower FTE. It does not make sense that a school as large as Sato has a 1.0 IC as well as a school as small as West TV. Furthermore, centralizing social workers and proportional staffing of counselors is a good idea. I also believe that it is difficult to prioritize District Office reduction when you do not know the details. I believe that there are several district office admin positions (not executive) and district office classified positions that could be combined for large cost savings.

It really depends on the school, but from what I have seen and heard, it seems like the student behavior specialists or social work positions could be cut to part time or completely eliminated from a school. There are some schools that would be two full time social workers. I don't feel like our more well off schools even need a social worker (although they are nice to have). I feel like a lot of the TOSA positions could be drastically reduced.

Behaviors have become a worse problem, cutting behavior specialist and counselors would be detrimental to all.

I support the school district's decision to reduce the number of social workers, and I also believe that our school district has too many administrators.

Our students are overwhelmed with mental health issues. By further reducing social workers and counselors, students are less likely to attend school and find success. Our really students rely on our social worker and their wellness center to help them feel balanced and supported. Teachers are already overwhelmed with workload. If social worker positions are cut it will put it on them to provide even more student support. We can't expect academic success without minimal supports. A district level social worker will not be very effective as they won't be able to see many students or build and maintain all important relationships with students. Please find another cut, NOT SOCIAL WORKERS!

Is it possible to adjust the model for smaller schools where they would have a full time counselor but not a behavior specialist? This would ensure that there was always some level of support in each building.

Can small school principals take on additional roles that might eliminate the need for as many tosas - tag coordinator, literacy support...?

Could we eliminate a day or two off of the contract and have an equal cut for all staff?

Can we look at boundaries to have more schools at capacity and eliminate over crowding?

Is school consolidation an option for schools that would be highly impacted by the proposed cuts?

As the district faces budget challenges, I believe that prioritizing early education helps our students learn and grow. It's important to involve parents, teachers, and community members in discussions so that everyone's views are considered. I also encourage looking for other funding sources, like grants and partnerships, to lessen the impact of cuts on important services.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Maintaining sufficient staffing for counselors and social workers is important, especially with the rising mental health concerns among students. Finally, focusing on long-term solutions and inviting parents to support schools through volunteering and fundraising could help strengthen our community and improve students' educational experiences.

I strongly urge the district to reconsider the proposal to remove school social workers from individual buildings.

This shift would significantly undermine the effectiveness of social work services and negatively impact our most vulnerable students. School social workers are most effective when they are embedded members of the school community. Their daily presence allows them to build trusting relationships with students, families, and staff. Many of the critical supports social workers provide simply cannot occur without being physically present in schools..

Integrated social workers, substance use support and IT are fundamental to the functioning of a comprehensive high school. The social workers and substance use support specialists are able to create meaningful and lasting relationships with students because they see them every day. I have seen first hand how valuable these staff are to a school like AHS and we would be devastated to lose them. Furthermore, I having quick support for technology issues is what allows classrooms at large high schools to function smoothly. IT support is never short on work. I cannot imagine how our classrooms and teaching would grind to a halt some days if not for the quick and effective support of our amazing IT staff.

Please continue to advocate for more funding from the state level. We are cutting the services students need most. Please do not cut desperately needed mental health supports, specifically our social workers and counselors. We need reduced class sizes and more educators in each building as overcrowded classrooms are high stimulus and escalate many (otherwise manageable) student behaviors leading to decreased academic performance.

Seriously consider allocation based on the needs of the student and family population each school serves. We have established social workers, counselors, and behavior specialists who are desperately needed within certain schools. And the caseloads are too much for only 1 or split time at our highest needs schools. For example, McKinley elementary has a highly impacted community, and our support staff within the school on an every day basis, help make those connections for attendance and social emotional needs of the students to be met.

When looking at an equity lens, when the biggest cut is your social workers, who are working for the most in need in any school is the biggest line item being cut, that appears like you are not actually looking to ensure every student has access to what they need to be successful in the classroom. With the current climate of fear, cutting of SNAP, and rampant deportation- cutting student support services seem counter productive.

I am a nurse for the district and support three schools. I wish we were staffed similar to other specialists such as school counselors. At one of my schools there are 2 school counselors, while there is one of me spread over three schools. I hope school nursing can expand one day to allow each school to have a nurse or even one nurse supporting only 1-2 schools, similar to the proposed Social Worker allocation. Alternatively, I would propose maintaining the current staff levels for nurses and allocating each school a full time Health Assistant who can report to the nurse and be delegated common daily tasks such as insulin, asthma support, health room visits, daily meds, etc. This would improve overall daily functioning of the front office of each school and allow other matters to be addressed, such as absorbing the potential gap in social work and counseling needs.

There isn't enough staffing to support our students right now, let alone if we start cutting services. Our social workers are vital to our community. With every middle and high schooler having a chromebook it is essential that they be able to access support on site. I understand that cuts are never easy to make but people in school buildings should be the last to be cut since they directly provide support to students.

Proposed cuts to the mental health teams in schools alongside proportional staffing for classrooms, will lead to additional teacher burnout and reduce student success in the classroom. We need to ensure that our students and families are properly supported in order to provide the best environment for student

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

achievement. As a large elementary school staff member and with my own children attending a different large elementary school, I have seen what cuts to counseling and social work positions have done to schools first hand. A regional model for social workers will not provide the supports that our students and families need and will cause harm to those most impacted already.

The Youth Mental Health Crisis has DRASTICALLY increased in the last two decades. The percentage of high school students who experience persistent feelings of sadness or hopelessness in 2023 was 53% for females and 28% for males, compared to the 39% and 21% in 2013. The percentage of female and male high school students who seriously considered attempting suicide also is increasing and was at 27% for females and 14% for males in 2023, compared to 22% and 12% in 2013. There is a serious Child Behavioral Health Workforce shortage and Oregon is one of the most at risk states. 65.1-80.2% of children (aged 3-17) faced difficulties obtaining mental healthcare care in 2023. By decreasing mental health supports (counselors, social workers, AND substance use specialists), not only are you decreasing the supports students have at school, but you are also decreasing the support they get to find outside mental health resources. Students cannot focus in school when their mental health is decreasing. By decreasing these resources in schools for kids, there are going to be an increase of issues in the classroom (increased absences, missed assignments/tests, acting out, etc). I am terrified for the future of our kids and their families, but increasingly terrified for them if you decide to cut mental health supports in schools.

Student behavior is the top concern for parents, students, and staff alike. I do not support cutting those that help support students in this area when it is a growing concern of all stakeholders.

In a time when we have more students with more severe behavioral/emotional issues, cutting services that support students, families, and teachers is a terrible idea. When students are disregulated and teachers must stop class (or clear a room), ALL students suffer.

There is extensive data about how these sort of cuts will not only negatively impact grade level students but create an educational career impact(k-12) these proposed cuts will decrease community support for schools, attendance will be impacted, we will see behavior rise, higher teacher turn over and weaker bonds between students and schools, trust in schools and the district will be impacted and enrollment will continue to decrease, but at a faster rate. This is not at all in the direction of supporting our students, it is showing our district does not care. This will immediately impact them negatively and have lasting negative results.

Proportional cuts seem to be aimed at the smallest schools. While this may make sense numerically, these schools do not have a VP to share the urgent student behavior load, leaving quite a bit of work for the Behavior Specialist, especially when the principal is out of the building. In addition, were a small school to have cuts to their TOSAS (Behavior Specialist, Academic Specialist, Counselor, Social Worker) I believe, at least it would be so in the school where I work, there would not be enough staff to cover arrival, dismissal, lunch and recess duties. I believe that the Academic Coaches and Behavior Specialists are central to a school and should be cut last, especially as they basically run the school when the admin is out of the building and do so much of the coaching and support needed by classroom teachers and their students.

In my building, however, I do believe that fewer hours or days from the Counselor and Social Worker would still meet student needs.

Some of the proposed cuts are not on the ranking list above. For example, there was mention of cuts to SPED Paras but that is not one of the choices above.

Are some cuts not presented above because they are a given rather than a proposal?

I do think it is important to consider more than the numbers. For example, the specialized program in my elementary school, on average, uses support from our Behavior Specialist 1-2 hours a day. This person is the only one in the building outside of the specialized program with Safety Care training and is needed to support this program when students are highly dysregulated.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

One thing that I love having, but I do not think is needed in my building, is a full time para for ELD. She is great, but I do not think we have the need in numbers, and a para can only provide so much support with limited training and expertise. Best practices would say that the person with the most experience and expertise should work with our neediest kids, and we have a full time para pushing in to support ELD kids.

The same could be said for para support with our students in academic intervention - we are having para staff work with our neediest learners and with our neediest behavior students in regular ed classrooms. This does not seem like the best model, especially as quite a few of the para staff do not have the skills to successfully teach behaviors or academics. To their credit, they do not work during staff meetings or PD days, so there is limited opportunity to support them with training and education. Cut the para staff and have the academic specialists and behavior specialists and ELD specialists and classroom teachers do the work with these students instead.

At our small school, specialists have more than enough plan time. I do not think we need full time specialists in my building; however, will a .75 or .8 specialist position even fill? I am concerned that this cost saving measure may cause staffing issues. As mentioned above, if we were to cut para staff, specialist schedules could be arranged so that specialists in buildings with additional plan time could cover lunch and recess duties, again putting the most highly trained and effective staff with students over paras.

Please be careful about cutting certified support staff at the smallest schools. I wonder, if instead for example, it might make more sense to cut behavior specialists at the smallest elementary schools that are large enough to have a VP. The VP can share the load of the behavior specialist. Or, in schools with a full time ELD teacher, maybe a cut to the academic coach would make more sense than a cut to the academic coach at a school with a half time ELD teacher, especially since both of these staff members coach teachers in the teaching of literacy.

Finally, when working on job shares between two schools, please consider proximity as well as school schedules. In our building, we have a person who starts their day at a late start school and finishes their day at our school which is an early start school - this person does not work a whole day. How often is this happening across the district?

I think teachers would still get their required plan time if we cut the technology position. Again, a para is taking a whole class for a period of time and teaching them - this is not a best practice. I think elementary kids get enough tech time in their classrooms with 1-to1 devices, Dreambox and other tech teaching and learning tools, and the programs for teaching typing skills are on all devices and can be used in the regular classroom.

I have seen the data that our BHA&W team collects. The majority of student behavior issues (not including our specialized programs) are when students are with para staff at lunch, recess and technology. The staff who need the most coaching on working with students academically or behaviorally are the para staff. Let's consider restructuring.

This is crazy. How can you propose to cut valuable staff positions. We are living in a time where students need trauma informed care. Cutting social worker and counselors locations to fit a mold, is not the answer. Let's focus on district office reductions first. The people working daily with students are what make the schools safe.

I am a school psychologist in the district I mainly serve in special education. I am an active member of the Behavior Health and Wellness team. Centralizing social workers would greatly change the way our students access mental health support. The social workers are often responsible for maintaining and covering the Wellness Centers at secondary schools. This program is essential for supporting students and making school a safe place. If there are concerns about multiple social workers supporting the same family, we could change the model where the social worker for the older student is responsible for providing supports. Additionally, funds could be saved through reducing administration, TOSAs, and other specialty staff in the district office.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

It is crucial that each school have their own social worker. It is immensely difficult to be able to support multiple families at different schools. It would make it extremely challenging to know the needs of every family if the social workers had to be at multiple schools.

In the era of world shaping technology, where CS and stem education must be centralized and Oregon is already behind technology development... risking to not invest in today's youths and young minds puts barrier to access technology atleast in title 1 schools. Shocking to hear it from our school board. Even heavily low budgeted school have heavy technology focused curriculum and provide stipend for afterschool. Schools substance support could totally eliminated by zero tolerance to substance use policy which not only helps with the budget most importantly adds safety to teachers and staff reducing behavior and academic focus and saves peer from distraction. This should have been long ago. Schools are there to nurture mind and body and have system in place like ventoact or emergency crisis our students face now which is great. Some elementary have two pe and two music and not provide space for technology. General teacher struggle to complete core concepts with new curriculum adding technology to them is not fair and square to teachers nor to students. Having separate behavior school for students who disrupts the class will help other students grow and glow reducing need of site Elise behavior specialist and in need student access coach/ academic coach can support that. Centralized social services can connect neighborhood schools as some of them doesn't need much social needs based on demographics.

The cuts in staff and behavior supports are going to cause inequities to the most impacted students (ELD and SPED) and place additional stress on staff that is already stretched thin meeting needs with current resources.

The rise in student mental health and behavior difficulties has greatly impacted student learning. Cutting the roles that support those areas (behavior specialist, social worker, counselors) would be a tremendous disservice to student success. These individuals, along with our special education staff and administrator are routinely responding to student needs in the moment to help students become regulated and ready to learn. This is in addition to the preventative measures they all provide through groups, check-ins, behavior plans, counseling, special ed services, and family-school collaboration. We cannot lose the safety and well-being they provide.

We need more direct instruction and fewer coaches....focus on classroom based subjects. I know our hands are tied about the state requirements for a certain number of hours of PE or recess etc. Movement is good, but we don't need full time coaches to only teach SEL or oversee teams of people.

If you want to support all families equally, you don't want to cut Counselors or Social Workers. I do understand the temptation to want to go to regions, but it is hard enough for our staff to connect w families when they are at our school part time.

While the actual dollar amount spent on District Admin seems like a small part of the budget pie, we have levels and levels of upper and middle management. And now the whole HR department is only able to be accessed via help desk ticket. We have a staff access issue. So many group emails that go into dark holes, and less service rather than more. If a staff member or teacher is in a crisis, sending a help desk ticket cannot replace the need for quick, professional support.

And technology boondoggles have been numerous. The Raptor system has been a multimillion dollar mess. And this district is rolling out a whole new round of radios and reprogramming. I like that the district is paying for a redo of this, but the lack of oversight and planning has been clear from the beginning. Building safety and radios are important. Throwing good money after bad only makes the public less likely to fund the next levy.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Those of us on the front lines have no way to provide ideas or concerns except for these occasional surveys. When systemwide concerns arise, we are told to advocate for change through our admin team as the impacted departments have tried to ask for the same changes and only been told no. Our staff have a wealth of knowledge and suggestions. We have systems that work. But top down requirements are put on us, and forced through. For example, the giant boxes of “playful inquiry” related stuff. Most of the teachers didn’t even want it or need it. Just more money thrown away. And now they all have workbooks...no more actual books, just workbook learning.

Reducing BH&W staff may seem like it would have a less direct impact on students but losing both the proactive and responsive support of these people will mean an increase in classroom disruptions, more students with unmet social/emotional needs, and ultimately a workload burden on classroom teachers. Our budget crisis needs to be addressed by our state lawmakers rather than on the backs of our dedicated educators and ultimately on our students.

As a concept I support the idea of regional social workers and think that is a more efficient model that supports families but I do not believe that with the number of social workers proposed to be cut, the model would end up meeting the needs of our families. A more thoughtful approach would involve some reduction of FTE based on enrollment combined with a team of regional social workers so some cuts but not the number currently proposed.

Being a small school, our support staff takes on numerous other duties not just our job title. We do not have an assistant principal so some of the roles are helping with problem solving and discipline when our principal is out at meetings or overwhelmed. Our instructional coach has to take on the role of both instructional coach and intervention teacher in order to identify students that need more instruction or may have a learning disability. She also has to support her paraeducator staff with plans on how to support students in small groups. The paraeducators are not as skilled with supporting students with multiple needs that impact emotional, social, academic needs. These students need support in gaining these skills with the most experienced teacher like the instructional coach that is also a reading specialist., Orton Gillingham trained, LETRS trained, and trauma informed educator.

Our small school student population is impacted with kids with suicide ideation, homelessness, mental health issues (abuse and neglect), food scarcity. Without the support of our counselor, behavior support specialist, and instructional coach, we will not be able to meet the needs of our students and support our staff. This will lead to students not attending on a regular basis as we are able to make kids feel connected and safe at school to grow as learners. Our Behavior Health and Wellness team works hard to connect with teachers, families, and get the resources needed along with our social worker and nurse. Our counselor, behavior specialists and instructional coach are usually implementing the interventions along with the teacher, giving wellness room breaks, and even doing check in and check outs to give the student another adult to connect with.

Cutting staff would impact our school leadership club and Tiger TV that create school community and make students want to come to school daily. It would not allow our learning specialist to meet regularly with her most impacted learners in order to help with students' needs.

Our elementary specialist enrich our students with areas like music and physical education and allow time for teachers to plan and collaborate about their students.

It feels inequitable since elementary school is taking the biggest hit in this budget proposal. We know that the early years are the most important to students' success in the later years.

Family partnership will not be able to happen due to staff being cut and becoming part time or even spread thin at two schools.

This causes stress for all staff when discussion about unknown job cuts start happening in February. It makes caring for our staff and students difficult when these starts five months before a decision can be determined.

If staff don't find out their placements or cuts until June, how they be able to find the best position that suits us at the Job Fair.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

The district should use student and family survey data to guide investments in learning tools that truly support student success. While some vetted apps are effective, the growing number of digital platforms increases daily screen time beyond healthy limits. Prioritizing physical books / worksheets can reduce screen exposure while strengthening academic skills .

More importantly, student success depends on regulation and well-being. Investing in special education services, counselors, and behavior support staff delivers far greater impact than expanding instructional coach roles or relying solely on the MTSS model. When students are not regulated, academic growth cannot occur.

Clear and enforceable substance-use policies—similar to sick-child policies—protect student safety, reduce long-term costs, and hold families accountable. Schools must prioritize safety, well-being, and foundational learning. Strategic budgeting that reduces unnecessary screen-based tools and redirects funding to student support services is the most effective way to ensure long-term student success.

Most of these proposed changes disproportionately affect elementary schools, smaller school, and most importantly, our most vulnerable students. Social workers, counselors, and other elementary teachers are critical to developing students' minds, and pulling funding from these positions is short-sighted. In the long run, widening achievement gaps are more expensive to address later-- not to mention the human cost of removing this support.

Working in a small school in BSD, I feel that the cuts to small schools are going to be devastating. Because we are small, our staff take on numerous roles to meet the needs of our students. For example, our Student Behavior Support Specialist is working with newcomers to help them gain skills and feel okay about coming to school and picking up a student with attendance issues whose family is experiencing housing insecurity. In addition, our Counselor, Instructional Coach, and Student Support Behavior Specialist help with discipline when the principal is overwhelmed or out of the building. Despite our small enrollment, we have a significant population of need (including behavior, suicide ideation, homelessness, abuse and neglect, food insecurity, and mental health issues. It takes a village to give our students the time and support they need to be able to learn at school. Cutting our support staff would increase student behavior and decrease student support, affecting learning outcomes and feelings of belonging. It feels inequitable that elementary schools seem to be taking the biggest hit when we know early intervention has the best outcomes to set students up for success. I am wondering if early retirement incentives or other creative ideas have been considered to help lessen the cuts to small schools. Cutting staff would affect our school leadership program, availability of the Wellness Room, schoolwide initiatives (i.e. food drive), attendance, and our academic and behavioral interventions, which would greatly affect our students and families.

Classroom teachers cannot be responsible for everything on our own. We need support positions, we need specialists, we need counselors, and we need social workers. The more things you put on us, the more of us will leave the profession, the more our healthcare expenditures will rise due to stress, the more we will experience burn out the reduces the energy we can put into this job. Find other ways to save money.

This survey appears to disproportionately impact elementary schools. Early childhood and elementary education are the foundation of lifelong learning. These cuts would affect students both academically and emotionally. Even in smaller elementary schools, classroom teachers rely heavily on support staff such as counselors, academic coaches, and behavior specialists. Their support makes it possible to meet the academic and emotional needs of students. As a kindergarten teacher with 26 students, I see firsthand how large class sizes and increasing needs demand more resources. Cutting staff at this level would make these expectations unattainable.

Changes/ cuts should not be made to BH&W positions. These are vital to support student behavior needs so that teachers can teach and students can learn. While all of these proposed cuts are impactful I cannot imagine schools being successful with less support in that area.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

First of all, I do not appreciate seeing this in January. I am used to the chaos and stress that BSD puts us through in the Spring when it comes to the never-ending possibility of being on the chopping block, but having to be stressed about this when our jobs are already stressful is not very mindful of the district.

These proposed budget cuts seem to disproportionately impact elementary schools and schools with smaller numbers. As a member of one of those schools, this scares me greatly for my students. Even though we are a small elementary school, we have a great amount of need. My students need every single one of their support staff every single day in order to thrive, to help manage behaviors, to enjoy a feeling of belonging and to feel safe at school. Isn't that what BSD preaches? Don't kids from small elementary schools deserve just as much support from schools with higher numbers? This proposal does not make me think you are thinking equitably.

If you decide to send counselors or behavioral specialists to two schools, you will tank the efficiency and effectiveness with which we are able to do our jobs. Kids will suffer for these decisions and so will the rest of your staff. If you cut support staff, your Admins, teachers and your SPED teams will be even more overloaded with mental health issues behaviors than ever before and those people will find it even more difficult and dangerous to do their jobs. Dangerous situations for our students (abuse, use of drugs, neglect, etc) will go unnoticed just because of how bogged down everyone is in behavior with so one trained to noticed and no one to help and respond. Please think about the consequences of cutting valuable professionals who really help BSD students feel your motto - Belong. Believe. Achieve.

These proposed budget cuts appear to disproportionately impact elementary schools, which are the critical foundation of our entire education system. Early childhood and elementary education are where students develop essential academic skills, social-emotional growth, and a love of learning that carries them through middle school, high school, and beyond. Reducing resources at this level risks creating long-term gaps that become increasingly difficult, and costly, to address later. If we weaken support for our youngest learners now, we undermine students' future academic success, workforce readiness, and overall well-being. Protecting elementary education should be a top priority, not an area for the deepest cuts.

The proposed reductions seem to overwhelmingly impact elementary schools/students, especially smaller elementary schools. If all of these are moved forward, smaller elementary schools will be hugely impacted in a negative way. When you refer to a "weighted staffing model" or one based on caseload, I think it is vital that you are looking at how many kids these staff/teachers (counselors, behavior specialists, social workers, etc.) actually work with and the amount of time they spend supporting kids-- not just the number of students in the school. Student enrollment number is not an accurate representation of population needs and actual caseloads within a given school. Additionally, not having at least 2 teachers at each grade level in elementary would have a detrimental effect on teachers' ability to collaborate and offer quality, best-practice instruction to their students. No teacher should have to teach a grade on their own without professional support in a grade-level colleague. Finally, such large reductions in the departments of counseling, behavior, and social work does not seem to align with the district's "Believe You Matter" campaign to support well-being and mental health... I don't see how this is a positive or sustainable way to support our students and community; we cannot possibly offer the same level of supports and services with these cuts, let alone make improvements in these areas.

As an elementary resource room teacher, I want to emphasize that BH&W services are essential to my ability to effectively serve students with disabilities.

BH&W staff provide Tier 2 academic and behavioral interventions that prevent escalation and significantly reduce referrals to special education. At a time when the number of students receiving special education services is increasing, this preventative work is critical to maintaining appropriate service levels for

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

students with the highest needs.

BH&W staff also help fill existing operational gaps by supporting meetings, scheduling, and problem-solving when specialists such as school psychologists are not available full-time. This support allows special education teams to remain compliant while preserving instructional time for students.

Reducing BH&W staffing at the elementary level would shift additional responsibilities onto classroom and special education teachers who are already operating at full capacity. These positions represent capacity we cannot afford to lose. From a long-term perspective, cutting these roles increases the risk of staff burnout, service disruption, and legal and safety concerns—ultimately harming the students who rely most on consistent, on-site support.

I strongly urge the district to protect BH&W staffing in elementary schools as a necessary investment in student stability, instructional access, and equitable support.

We have many more special education students in our kindergarten and first grade classrooms without the support they need. It takes much longer to get kids through the SPED process and get placed into programs. It is much harder get kids the supports they need, and behaviors are bigger and more frequent than they used to be. If our behavioral specialists, counselors, social workers are cut/ work in two buildings- this is where you are taking the support from. So much of our support staff works with these young kids and their behaviors. If you have to cut these things, you need to think about how you are going to support these students.

I think you should cut the big company things you pay for like the Raptor App and Dreambox. I think you should send back the new furniture that you bought that no one likes. I think you should stop paying for instructional coaches to go to meetings to be coached on how to be coaches because they don't have any time to coach us, they are busy working with kids as they should be.

In order for this to be equitable, a school like mine that is highly impacted behaviorally and academically (McKinley) should not be losing any Behavior specialists, Counselors, Social Workers, Teachers. If anything we need more rather than fewer. I hope ACES and trauma in the school population is taken into consideration.

**We need social workers!**

Counselors, behavior specialists, and social workers are vital to the operation of our schools and would be a terrible loss if cut.

Cutting any teachers and support staff at the elementary level is the wrong decision in the current educational climate. It shifts the burden of student social and emotional wellness onto classroom teachers and pulls attention away from academics. Teachers are already overworked and burdened by the level of behaviors we manage daily, and removing these vital staff members creates an unsustainable workload that will directly impact student learning and safety.

Eliminating social workers closes access to critical outside-of-school resources, especially for Title 1 and impacted schools. Reducing social workers and counselors will worsen existing systemic barriers families already face and further marginalize our most vulnerable students. These cuts silence student voice, reduce supports, and increase the likelihood of crisis situations being handled without trained professionals.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

We also should not be eliminating specialist positions—including technology. Our world is rapidly advancing, and preparing students with essential technology skills is vital for their future success. Removing specialists reduces student access to high-quality instruction and takes away opportunities that should be a core benefit of public education.

If budget cuts are necessary, the district must look to the district office first. Classroom-based positions, specialists, and student support services provide a direct, measurable benefit to students every day. Cutting them is not sustainable, not equitable, and will cause long-term harm to schools and families.

Cutting any teachers and support staff in the elementary level is not advantageous in the current educational climate. This puts the burden of social wellness onto teachers, forcing them to focus more on emotional regulation and less on academics. Teachers are overworked and burdened with the amount behaviors that we encounter, and taking away these vital members of our school creates an unsustainable work load. Eliminating any social workers closes access to outside of school resources, especially for Title 1 and impacted schools. Decreasing the number of social workers and counselors in schools will further enforce systemic barriers that families are experiencing, particularly in this current political climate. Cutting social workers and counselors further marginalize these students. If budget cuts are required, we need to look more at the district office. While these roles are important to the function of our district, there are more opportunities to eliminate nonessential positions that do not directly effect classrooms.

Oversized classes impact students, teachers, support staff, and schools overall in an incredibly negative way. With behavior issues among young students on the rise it is not a good idea to cut teaching positions (especially behavior specialists) and make class sizes larger.

In addition, the current political climate means that many students and their families are actively in danger and in need of support that school-based social workers and counselors provide. When these positions are school-based a sense of trust is able to be established, which is absolutely necessary, especially now. Removing regular access to these positions puts a systemic barrier in place for students who need them most.

There are increased staffing needs for students with behavioral issues and our specialized programs that take a lot of time and support. Please keep student success as the priority when making budget cuts.

I think counselors, social workers, and classroom teachers are vital to the success of our school and the social, emotional, and academic support of our students. In my four years at BSD, I have been supported by counselors far more often than "student success coaches" or "teaching coaches." At my current school, the counselors, front office staff, and social workers have the most connection and effect on daily interactions with students. At the end, shouldn't we ask what is the best for our students and place our money, time, and effort in bettering the student experience. Thank you.

As someone in a small school I am very disappointed with all of the cuts coming at elementary schools. We have a small first grade class and thinking about a teacher EVERY year having to change their room and/grade seems like terrible practice. I think it is ridiculous that the district won't change the boundaries and would rather gaslight themselves into thinking that large elementary schools are better. We should be moving boundaries and sending some students that go to schools with 6 classes in a grade to a schools with 2. We need our teachers, counselors, specialists. There has to be something more we can do than this.

Social workers, counselors and classroom teachers are vital for positive student outcomes. Student success coaches are a waste of money.

We need to maintain reasonable class sizes and provide behavioral specialists. There are so many mental healths needs that teachers have no feasible way of supporting a large caseload. Behaviors are so impactful right now at the elementary level that cutting behavioral specialists would have terrible impacts.

Social workers, teachers and counselors impact students every single day. We need to invest in those people, not cut those positions. With the level of behaviors coming into schools, their support is essential.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Reductions of Social Workers and School Counselors should be avoided. The mental health needs within the district require professionals with specific training in mental health support and Social-Emotional Learning (SEL). Consistent access to School Counselors serves a great purpose in the regulation of our students and our Social Workers are required more than ever to help families access increasingly-needed and increasingly-limited community services. These professionals are also critical for the development of an effective SEL Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS).

If a role within the Behavioral Health & Wellness (BH&W) framework should be cut it should be the Student Behavior Specialists (SBS's). The SBS's generally do not have backgrounds in mental health training or training in behavioral assessment and intervention. I would prefer the elimination of the SBS's rather than reductions in Counselors or Social Workers.

mental health needs are increasing and needs to be addressed. Title one schools need support.

School staff that directly work with students are the most crucial to our school district. Cutting district office reductions and roles that only serve to direct staff to action should be highly considered, as opposed to cutting roles such as classroom teachers, social workers, student success coaches, and academic coaches. Removing YSO's and instead allocating that money towards social workers would also be the most intelligent decision to elevate and maintain students' health as a priority in our schools. The ability to collaborate as teachers with families, students, and community members to ensure our schools health and community is in our best interests.

Social workers and counselors NEED to be in buildings. This whole idea that some families that have children at multiple elementary, middle, and/or high school levels and would get double served should be the least of the district's worries. Social workers are the people that help provide the basic needs our students and families needs. Centralizing them removes them from the day to day relationship building role they have expertise in, that role that our students need.

How much is having police officers in our schools cost? Why is that not a consideration?

By reducing the amount of people who are available to fill duties and respond to behavior needs, you are directly impacting each classroom, student and teacher. The reality without those positions is that teachers will burn out quicker, there will be more behavior needs and therefore the system will be overwhelmed with need. Please do not cut counselors and behavior specialists! Our students and staff depend on them greatly to access their education.

As a BSD School Psychologist, it is crucial that we consider the priority of student behavior, mental health, and safety in our schools. Our Counselors, Behavioral Specialists, Social Workers, and Classroom Teachers are PIVOTAL in supporting these drastically changing needs. Children CANNOT learn if behavior of themselves or other students are getting in the way. Please consider how different schools are than just a few years ago and know how important these roles are to support children feeling safe and their ability to learn.

Lots of hard decisions ahead. Keeping students supported is my number one. I know there are schools that don't necessarily need a full time counselor, BSS, or social worker. But in my experience the title one schools do. I hope that principals can be involved in the conversation about what is needed at their schools to ensure students needs are still being met.

Removing social workers from schools will have massively negative consequences for families in need. Social workers often are important team members that have knowledge of community resources, mental health support for general education students, and help address their other needs outside of the school environment. Placing them on a regional based model will greatly decrease student access for supports from the school environment. In the secondary setting, students have often sought out our social worker on their own accord to advocate for household needs (food boxes, rent support, etc.). At a building level,

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

social workers help to provide those supports to students, participate in the STAT/SIRP processes, participate in re-entry meetings, conduct suicide screens, assist in running the wellness center, and help to provide other interventions for students. I'm not sure how they are supposed to continue with these supports in a regional model. It doesn't seem like an understanding of the major role social workers have in buildings was considered or understood before this proposal.

Working in a high school, I see firsthand every day how well-utilized our counselors, social workers, and substance abuse specialists are. They already have caseloads that are too large to effectively manage (especially high school counselors), and I can't imagine losing any of these vital mental health supports. When students are in crisis, emotionally or behaviorally dysregulated, or need a space outside of the classroom, these are the staff members students seek out and/or are directed to. Most days, students still can't access these roles in a timely manner because there aren't enough of them. Without them, I would anticipate much greater classroom disruption, burnt-out teachers, and students posing a danger to themselves and others. All of these cuts are difficult and will impact all other jobs, but I would be especially weary to cut these crucial positions.

Student Behavior Specialists, Substance Use Specialists, Counselors, and Social Workers are integral to student success and well being. Without their support students do not have the mental health, substance use, and behavior regulation support. This cannot fall solely on teachers who manage a whole classroom without impacting instructional time. We cannot build a multi-tiered system of supports when we are cutting the supports we offer in each building. By reducing these staffing allocations we are not able to have a robust Tier 2 Behavioral Health and Wellness team in each building. When we support social emotional learning, we support all students. ODE has put Transformative Social Emotional Learning standards in place; it is clear that SEL and behavioral health and wellness is well researched to lead to student achievement and increased engagement. Students have to be regulated and to feel safe to learn and access content. Reducing these positions limits our ability to meet these state standards and move SEL work forward. If we want to hold true to our promise of Belong, Believe, Achieve it is imperative we assess our values and fund positions that align with our desire for students to truly feel like they belong, learn the skills to believe in themselves and the school they attend, and achieve as a whole child- not just focusing on their academic aptitude.

Many of the potential cuts listed could impact the same demographic of student. For example, counselors work closely with social workers, behavioral specialists, substance use specialists, and instructional coaches. Students that need the additional supports the most are more highly impacted by these potential cuts than others. I would recommend consideration of larger class sizes as a starting place. Additionally, we have many staff intensive programs in our district including dual language and the co-teaching ELD model. Both great programs. However, in a budget reduction scenario, I think direct conversations need to be had about further expansion of these programs in what seems like years of potential cuts.

Finally, many of the options listed focus on proportional staffing, primarily impacting small elementary and/or middle schools. Hard decisions should be made sooner rather than later on school consolidation and boundary adjustments. Not easy conversations, I know, but these need to be had.  
Thank you.

Since we have come out of the pandemic BSD has dedicated a great deal of time and money towards B H and W teams- i would hate to see these changes be diminished by having to cut a lot of great people that truly help our most vulnerable students

As a parent, I strongly encourage the district to prioritize protecting direct student supports, including classroom teachers, counselors, behavioral specialists, and social workers. These positions have the most immediate impact on class size, student safety, and academic success.

While I understand the financial challenges the district is facing, reductions that increase class sizes or reduce access to mental-health and behavioral support services will have long-term academic and social consequences for students. I support prioritizing reductions in central administration, operational efficiencies,

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

and non-instructional program adjustments before reducing direct student services.

Maintaining stable staffing in classrooms and student support roles should remain the district's highest priority as budget decisions are finalized.

My students do not have much (if any) one-on-one contact with them but I know that counselors, behavioral support specialists, and social workers are critical to helping all students get a good education. I worry that with an exercise like this, parents will choose to cut things that they think their particular children don't need. I hope you consider that the majority isn't always thinking in terms of the common good.

Have we considered cutting more administration positions to save money and where those funds could also help fund more classified support and BH&W positions?

"This model ensures every student has access to social and emotional support while maximizing the reach of staff."

This does not ensure more or access to support. This would be removing supports. Those staff members who are supporting the social emotional well being of students have taken the brunt of the loss of funding over the years. Students don't need a regional model that removes supports. They need the supports at their schools who know them and have invested in them over the years. This applies to anyone on the behavior health and wellness teams.

The past five years has been an incredibly difficult time in education. We are just now beginning to see the relief and benefits of so much hard work from everyone in our school and I assume it is this way across the district. I am finally teaching most of my time instead of babysitting bad behaviors. I do not for one minute believe we are in good shape and ready to move forward without our school's social workers and other specialists. Please Please listen to what is working at schools like Aloha and Beaverton and Southridge.

Hi- I am writing to formally oppose the reduction of 19.5 school social workers. I work as a school social worker and I see directly how current events (Immigration Customs Enforcement) is causing chronic stress, unmet mental health needs, are currently impacting students. This is impacting their emotions, their ability to feel safe at school and ability to learn. Student mental health needs in Oregon is increasing not declining. Student needs such as: depression, trauma responses, and anxiety are becoming more frequent. (<https://www.koin.com/news/education/oregon-surge-crisis-youth-mental-health-rank-worst-state-us/>)

Reducing school social work services during a time when students of color are greatly being impacted by Immigration Customs Enforcement is sending the wrong message from an equity lens.

School social workers play a critical role when it comes to attendance, being pro social factors when it comes to suicide prevention, coordination with community mental health providers. Cutting school social work position will shift these needs to administrators, teachers, and community partners who are already have high caseloads.

I strongly urge the district to reconsider the proposal to reduce social workers and explore alternative budget solutions that do not disrupt student mental health and safety. Please continue supporting students with the above needs by supporting the mental health professionals who serve Beaverton School District students.

Given the continuing mental health and behavioral issues, especially at the ES and MS level, a reduction or centralizing of counselors or social workers is NOT a good idea for any of the students, staff, or community.

Reduce central office positions.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Limiting FTE of behavior specialists and counselors at smaller schools and taking away social workers suggests that the district believes student's social emotional health isn't as important as academics. Students cannot learn if their social emotional health is not supported. Make SEL a priority!!!!

The impact this could have on smaller schools within the district could be devastating for students and teachers. Taking away social workers, limiting FTE of counselors and behavior specialists would drastically limit the amount of people to respond to students needing social emotional support. Taking away these resources would put even more stress on teachers, who are already overworked and overwhelmed. Do not take limit counselors and behavior specialists FTE at smaller schools!!!!

I believe that low income schools should receive the most amount social emotional support! These budget cuts are making families prioritize academics over mental health which is a hard line that is not blurred both are important

Students are impacted when those staff who work directly with them are stretched thin without support. Cut the district/IT/extras before cutting teachers and counselors.

I don't know what some of these things are. What is the WEX Model? And what Specialists at the Elementary would be impacted? This survey was not equitable because there are not descriptions of what they actually entail. In my opinion maintaining any position that supports mental health/behaviors of our student is imperative. They can't learn if their emotional needs are not regulated.

It would be a disservice to the community we serve to cut Behavior Specialists, Counselors or Social Workers. We are constantly hearing about "unprecedented times". We need to have support with out students mental health at times like these. While I don't diminish the work that teachers and specialists do, I think it does make sense to allocate staff according to the size of school and consideration of a Title 1 status. I do want to know about other alternatives that we could also look at.

For example, the previous superintendent had a large COLA and raise each year. While I understand the importance of bringing in talent to lead the district, if we were to reduce that, as well as the salary of district level administration, It would help with the deficit we are in.

Additionally, could we consider fewer days in the school year. Currently, Beaverton Schools have more days of school than most districts across the state. As stated in the video provided by the district, we could save over 2 million dollars for each day of school. If we were able to have a mid-winter break like other schools do across the country, that would save approximately 10 million dollars. If we did something similar, and either started or ended the school year one week earlier, we could reduce an additional 10 million dollars. I think this is an important consideration to look at and present to our community. I tend to hear about the fear in our community in losing teachers or support staff. Perhaps we offer ways in which that doesn't have to happen to the same extent.

I'd be concerned that the centralized substance use support makes it harder to identify students who need help, but I may just not understand how that service works. If I was confident that it wouldn't change the likelihood of students accessing that service I'd move it higher on my list.

I rated elementary specialists last mainly because of PE - if there's confidence that students would still reach their PE minutes and would be taught by a teacher with licensed PE specialist I'd feel more confident in that change. I don't feel as strongly about music, I'm more concerned with students accessing opportunities for physical activity.

If counselors were reallocated but there was a guarantee that someone on staff would be trained at identifying urgent mental health needs and helping students access those services then I'd feel more comfortable with that cut.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Please do not assume that higher SES schools do not have high behavior needs. Please also consider that Instructional Coaches have very little impact on the classroom. Ours does not coach teachers, rather they look at data and organize the use of our para-educators.

Please prioritize keeping class sizes small and preserving paraprofessionals, and behavior supports. Smaller classes improve safety, academic outcomes, and equity—especially for students who struggle to stay safe and engaged. Please consider prioritizing paraprofessionals and teachers who work directly with students daily.

I volunteer at Barnes Elementary daily. The social worker makes sure families and students have access to food, medical and mental health services. She also works with kids on social interaction, regulation and attendance. In short, she is key to helping meet kids basic needs so that they can learn. It would most certainly be inequitable to cut such a critical role from Barnes.

It's disheartening that once again our mental health providers are listed at the top of the cuts. Anyone who suggests cutting access to counselors and social workers is unaware of the day-to-day experiences of our staff and students. Each year, more and more students are struggling with their mental health. To cut these positions would send a message to students, families, and our community that the Beaverton School District does not care about the wellbeing of our students. It would show that students who need mental health support do not belong in our schools, a contradiction to the district's mission statement. It's also frustrating that the district office cuts are only labeled as TBD. That demonstrates a lack of accountability. Before publishing this half-baked proposal, you should have taken time to consider this number and what could really be done to trim this portion of our district. Clearly you have put thought into how to cut mental health professionals, but have not taken time to look in the mirror at your own level of waste.

I believe that everyone in the US should be bilingual but is this the time to start adding more programs to the district when we do not have money to provide even the basics for all students? Plus, Finley and Bonny Slope is a high social economic area but they will be getting free busing to the new option school? This does not sound equitable, especially since Jacob Wismer is so close to those schools. I think working out a system where the social workers and counselor communicate better in who will take care of a whole family is better than actually cutting positions. The social worker and counselor in our building hardly ever take a break and mostly eat their lunch while working. We need these positions! Do we really need to keep adopting new instructional material? The teachers barely get proficient in one new adoption when a new one starts being introduced. Why are we changing curriculum so quickly? Did we not do the research to see what was the best the first time around? I have personally cleaned out a portable with over 30 boxes of unopened materials in the pass. That has to be a big money saver if we stopped that. Also, we do not need all extra TOSAs on the district level. If they have been out of a school for more than 3 years they have no clue to what is actually going on within the buildings.

I think maintaining current class sizes is important along with keeping the support staff there to support students like counselors and behavior specialists.

It is so unfortunate that we are needing to cut funding at a time when our students and families need more social worker support, more counselor support, smaller class sizes.

I think it is absolutely ridiculous to consider cutting support staff. That makes it seem like you do not understand the importance they have in our buildings. I consult with our counselor, SBS, SUS, and Social Worker on a daily. I would be calling them out to the building every day in which case their transportation costs and everything will need to be covered and that is a waste in itself. It makes it seem like these positions are optional. Have the people making these decisions or proposing this been in to our schools and talked with people that have these positions or talked to admin who could not do their jobs without them? Teachers and students will be negatively impacted if these positions are reduced. What they do matters and sometimes is even more important than getting credits. It is especially frustrating when there is a rainy day fund available or other options than cutting to this extent. Lets push for those things instead

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

of trying to overtax a system that is already at its limit. Also after cuts like this, it often takes years to get this level of support back into the buildings. Lets move forward as a district and not keep taking steps back. Students and teachers need support and to feel valued, reducing these positions is not helpful for anyone other than a budget sheet. Lets think better and be more creative in our solutions, our community deserves it.

1. I considering to keep and defend the whole community as priority , All minorities families are the easy target for the nationwide circumstances and have to be protected in order to have students as the main reason for any scholastic goals, vision and mission . Protection means a very supportive assistance of counselors, social workers, community liaisons. Those employees are very important for students and families, not the first on the grill.

2. Some departments have been grow as an White elephant (greasy) in the last 5 years, too many administrative and expensive cost jobs have been created ; influencers contractor are taking field worker position (civil server employee) . Maintenance dept is a real good example. How much money of the tax payer had been expend in millionaires projects that shows more waist than benefits? (Re keying all facilities is a lot extra money than a proposed cuts on counselors and social workers.

3.No one is happy with any cuts announces but if is necessary. We need to start were is really necessary not just were is easy .

Any position that does not work directly with students should be prioritized to be cut...such as academic coaches. They should be working with students, not teachers. The social workers are vital as well as the behavior specialists. Elementary students thrive by having specials and learning new skills in P.E., Music, STEAM and the library.

Please stop putting so much money into technology. We need behavioral and mental health help more than ever now. Less focus on the latest and "greatest" technology. More focus on play at the younger grade levels, social skills, coping skills, relationships, emotional and mental well-being, calming environments. Less time on screens.

We need more support not less especially at the middle level and especially with mental health services.

We may have declining enrollment but we have an increase in students with special needs and an increase in students and their families who struggle with getting access to necessary resources. We need smaller class sizes, increased behavioral health supports, and smaller neighborhood schools more than ever. You will do the students of BSD a huge disservice by reallocating teachers and cutting counselors, social workers, and resource specialists

As an employee I see a great deal of money spent on things that as a staff member I feel are unnecessary for example we recently had all the doors re keyed in our building, we all received brand new walkie talkies when our old ones worked better than the new ones. What our building can't afford to lose is the behavior staff persons. Behavior issues in elementary school are like nothing I have seen in 15 years of working for BSD. It feels unfair to larger more crowded schools to hear about small schools with class sizes of 15 vs ours of 28 or more.

As a parent, my top priority is protecting the daily learning experience for my child —strong core instruction, manageable class sizes, and a school day that is engaging and joyful. I support the district making necessary reductions, but I urge BSD to cut least student-facing/least utilized items first and preserve what kids feel every day. Please protect elementary classroom staffing, PE/music specialists, and library/literacy supports because these are the foundation of learning and the “free” enrichment that keeps kids excited about school. In addition, student well-being is inseparable from learning—please maintain strong counseling, behavioral, and social work supports so classrooms remain calm, safe, and ready for instruction. If regional/central models move forward, please include clear service standards (response times, consistent school relationships, and equitable staffing based on need) so families don't lose timely support. In short: reduce overhead and efficiencies first, and keep resources closest to students—especially in elementary—so every child's day remains academically strong, supportive, and fun.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

If we are truly going to make these decisions using our Equity Lens, we have to take into consideration the dramatic increase in recent years of students and families needing mental health and behavior supports. Our Social Workers, Behavior Specialists and Counselors should be an absolute LAST resort for cuts.

I am a School Counselor at FLEX. We serve a large majority of students who have high needs socially, physically and academically. The proportionate staffing allocation does not take into consideration the needs of our student population as a whole as compared to our in person elementary, middle and high schools.

Any reduction of social workers, counselors, instructional coaches (which should be supporting students too) and behavior specialists will have an enormous and negative impact, especially at the elementary school level.

I don't like many of these cuts. I am wondering if we could cut a few days of the school year as an option to preserve positions that help students with mental health and help families who are struggling. We are going to need more support in those areas in these difficult times (times will get more difficult), not less.

Choosing to change any staff to a "regional model" severely and negatively impacts our ability to make and maintain relationships with students. Overloading classroom teachers, specialists and counselors with too many students makes balancing learning and behavior management extremely difficult, and makes the students feel less supported and less valued. Interactions become impersonal and transactional. That is a terrible model for supporting these post-pandemic kids.

Teachers (classroom and specials) and support staff are an incredibly valuable asset especially in small schools. Keeping schools staffed and supported (by specialists and counselors) is essential. Small schools in the district are important to keep class sizes small in all schools and are a necessary community asset.

As a tax payer who has supported bonds in the past I hate to see that the district needs to cut services that students need. My own children have accessed many of these- particularly the social worker at their school. I would like for students to continue to have equitable access to all of the proposed cuts. When we made the move to a 1:1 district I was really excited that my students and other students had equitable access to technology. I would like for students to have continued access to technology as well as education about how to be a strong digital citizen- especially in light of the fast pace at which technology, and AI, are moving. Our teachers are overworked and understaffed. Having a point person at each school who can be nimble and responsive to changes seems vital as we prepare students for the 21st century workforce

Our kids need a BH&W team ON SITE, not somewhere else.

My first and most pressing thing that I wish to voice in this is my immeasurable disappointment that the first things that are being placed on the cutting block are all things that will have a direct negative impact on students. Credit recovery, WEX, substance abuse support, counselors? Every single one of these is something that, if cut to this degree, will end up negatively impacting kids to some degree. Some not very seriously, others to levels that could be very dangerous.

I also find it sad, though perhaps not surprising, that we have these wide cuts to things directly within the school buildings, yet district office reductions are given a TBD. The things being taken from the school (counselors, school psychologists, etc.) are all far more important to our student's success than keeping and maintaining 2 different school district buildings. The priorities on this just feel so out of whack. Counselors and these types of direct, staff-to-student interactions and positions should be the LAST things we look to cut.

District programs should also be looked at before these vitally important services. Things like hoxhunt, which offers no perceivable benefit to students, should be no-brainers to cut. I know we want to make sure curriculum adoptions happen, but if we know of an incoming budget crisis of this level, why are we so

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

quick to pay millions of dollars for a VERY unpopular curriculum , like Savvas, and its materials. That, alone, could save a large chunk of the \$10 million dollars. Character Strong, as well, is unpopular with staff and students and should, once again, provide an obvious place to cut money before taking counselors and services away from our students.

It remains shocking to me that people running the district are so quick to look at cuts in the buildings that they know will have far-reaching negative impacts on students before anything else. I know ours is a large district, but we are already in a time period where we know students, staff, and community at large is struggling with mental health and, by extension, substance issues. Yes, we should review how certain parts of our staffing and district our run, but not to the detriment of our students. If our priority is not on what is best for students, what in the world are we doing here? If it were my decision to make, I'd look at reductions in superintendent salaries, the number of administrators we have at the district level, and programs that we're currently spending too much on that we don't need. We don't need Savvas, we don't need character strong, we don't need 2 district buildings. We DO need counselors, behavior specialists, substance abuse supports, school psychologists, social workers, teachers, and manageable class sizes. Please look at what will actually help kids.

Reducing counselors and social workers will deeply impact student mental health and any work related to improving attendance will be destroyed.

Please get rid of administrative bloat. I attended a high school of 1,400 with just 5 counselors - and yet last year my kid's middle school of 800 students had 5 counselors and drug counselor. And stop spending over \$700 million on a high school renovation/rebuild. A lot of high schools operate without pools or tracks or athletic facilities. The main purpose of a school is to teach reading, writing, and math - and we're failing on that front to the point that curriculum and standards have been downgraded over the years. FIX THE FUNDAMENTALS FIRST: teachers and student instruction and resources. THEN you can worry about other budget items. Lastly, it is a JOKE that parents and teachers have to buy school supplies when there is so much waste and bloat in the \$18,000 per student per year being spent.

The LITT position at schools should be protected. These specialists provide necessary services that are specialized by school. Having only one district position would be a huge detriment to student learning. As our world becomes increasingly digital, students (and teachers) need support in learning about new technology and incorporating it effectively into lessons. The LITT at each school is necessary and cutting this position would result in a lose of student learning. The needs to be at least one dedicated counselor per school. Counselors work closely with students and with staff. More and more students are experiencing mental health issues and they need to have someone at the school that can work with them. Counselors are absolutely necessary and should not be cut. I understand that we need to make cuts somewhere, but please don't cut student services and support.

Please decrease class size. I would caution against cutting Behavior Specialists and Counselors at elementary schools. We are stretched thin as it is with insufficient staff to deal with student behaviors! I would also suggest that Title I schools need extra support staff.

Our students are having a hard time. Ensuring that we have adequate staff to manage the physical health and social/emotional/behavioral needs of our students is of utmost importance. Our behavioral specialists, counselors, nurses, instructional coaches, and social workers are doing critical work every day and our students cannot afford to lose them.

A smaller school serving a high-needs population cannot make staffing decisions based on enrollment numbers alone. The intensity and complexity of student needs must be the primary driver—especially when those needs fall outside the traditional comprehensive school model.

In schools serving students with extreme life circumstances—chronic trauma, housing instability, family disruption, involvement with child welfare or the

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

justice system, untreated mental health conditions—the work required to support each student is significantly more time- and resource-intensive. These students do not need less support because the school is smaller; they need more individualized, consistent, and relational support to remain engaged, regulated, and safe.

Mental health needs are a critical factor. Students who are coping with anxiety, depression, trauma responses, or behavioral dysregulation often require daily check-ins, crisis intervention, coordinated care with outside providers, and proactive emotional support. Without adequate counseling, social work, behavioral, and support staff, these needs fall to classroom teachers—who are neither resourced nor trained to serve as mental health providers on top of instructional demands. This leads to burnout, inconsistent support for students, and preventable crises.

Additionally, many of these students do not fit the comprehensive model of education, which assumes stable attendance, predictable behavior, and the ability to self-advocate. Students navigating extreme life circumstances often require:

Flexible scheduling and pacing

Case management and advocacy

Frequent adult intervention to stay engaged

Support navigating systems outside of school

De-escalation and regulation support to access learning

These supports cannot be delivered effectively by a minimal staff, regardless of school size. In fact, in a smaller setting, the absence of adequate support staff is felt more acutely because there are fewer people to absorb crises or share responsibility.

Basing staffing decisions solely on student numbers overlooks the reality that need is not evenly distributed. Ten students in crisis can require more staffing capacity than fifty students who are stable and well-supported. A staffing model that ignores this reality risks prioritizing efficiency over equity and undermines the school's ability to serve its intended population.

Ultimately, a larger support staff in a smaller, high-needs school is not an excess—it is a necessary infrastructure. It ensures student safety, mental health stability, access to learning, and staff sustainability. If the goal is to genuinely serve students who have been historically underserved or excluded by traditional models, staffing decisions must reflect the depth of need, not just the headcount.

This list does not feel like an adequate representation of ways the district can trim the budget to equitably serve our students. I wonder about programs such as pre-k. When our district just made huge strides to foster belonging, increased attendance and the rollout of the SAEBRS assessments - why would you then

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

cut the roles that would support those initiatives? Cutting down at SBS, School Counselors and School Social Workers would eliminate any potential to support this crucial work for students and in turn make these roles turn to a responsive role that can only aid in emergencies, if they have enough capacity to cover that. Having these roles split between buildings also creates gaps in relationships built between families, student and educator and decreases efficacy and student outcomes. I highly urge reconsideration of these options.

I am unclear why all of the options for cutting positions/programs besides District Office and FLEX has specific costs/cuts listed. If the goal is to keep cuts away from the classroom, why would we not list an estimate for District Office cuts? Does this include school building administrators? It's my understanding that within BSD, positions like SUS's and Social Workers are funded through the SIA which is a stable source of state funds. Since the clearly stated goal of the SIA funds is to support the physical, mental, and emotional health barriers through school-based services and nutrition, what else would we be funding through the SIA if positions like counselors, social workers and SUS's are being cut? It's an important moment in American history public organizations to engage if full transparency. I hope that BSD moves forward with this budgeting process in a way that builds trust within our community and centers their decisions on what students and families are currently needing to support their goals and well being.

Special Education should be the last to be cut. These students are the most vulnerable and need access to all specialists such as Work Experience, Behavior Specialists, Counselors Social Workers etc.

It seems like the cuts disproportionately impact elementary schools. If students don't gain a good grasp of fundamentals in the early years, that sets them back in secondary grades and in life. The cuts also seem to have a huge impact on mental health services. Students who struggle with emotional and behavioral challenges are less able to access the curriculum. Once again, these students will be disadvantaged in secondary grades and in life if we don't provide the necessary services in the early years. These changes do not meet the district's stated equity goals: they unfairly burden elementary schools, and they widen the access, opportunity and expectation gaps for students with emotional and behavioral challenges. Finally, there are no specific proposed cuts to district offices, merely a promise to look at such cuts. I imagine that administrative salaries are much higher than teacher salaries, and cutting a few staff at the district level could provide a savings that would prevent detrimental cuts at the elementary level and in mental health services.

(1) The priority for the school system is to provide great schools having solid academic programs. The top asset of a school system are qualified teachers helping students to learn and grow at school. Cut administrative positions before cutting any teaching positions. Our greatest generations were taught in one-room schoolhouses. The teachers and those who interact all day with kids are the most essential to the system. (2) Use money allotted to the technology budget before you cut things like arts, counselors, library, PE or music --especially for elementary school students. Specialist teachers are essential to a well-rounded academic program. We are not worried about our children learning tech; they will learn tech. We want our children to have attention from qualified adults. We want them to grow dynamic skills sets, to exercise their imagination, creativity, physical health and interactive skills, and to be healthy mind and body. (3) Similarly, sports in Beaverton are available to students in other ways than at school. Expensive sports programs are not essential to students when schools are facing dire budget situations. Families/the community will have to raise money for expensive sports programs in hard times. (4) Go to bat for Beaverton beyond our city. Find rainy-day funds. Find stability funds. Find the local corporate tax increases that would be significant to our schools but a drop in the bucket for multi-billion dollar corporations. Go to Salem, meet with representatives, and talk to wider circles about this crisis in education funding. Network to USE ALL available tax and finance mechanisms to gather funding from local and regional resources. (5) Never forget to follow American best practices research about teacher-to-student ratios. These are cardinal rules in student success. This research remains current. When ratios are off everything

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

suffers. (Note: having an aide in a room for ten minutes in the morning does not count as adhering to the ratio.) Prioritize classrooms held at optimal sizes. (6) If declining enrollment is causing BSD to lose funds then make broader, clear, known efforts to increase enrollment.

I understand the fiscal limitations and it's heartbreaking to see what supports our students might lose. In a world where mental health issues are skyrocketing, families are struggling just to provide for basics, and the needs of the "economically disadvantaged" as well as the needs of the "economically advantaged" are great, I feel compelled to advocate for social workers and counselors. We already have caseloads that are difficult to manage and restructuring the social worker model or cutting counselors cannot be the answer to our budget crisis.

School counselors and social workers are oftentimes the ones that students and staff turn to when families have a question or concern and they don't know where else to turn to. In a matter of minutes, our days go from teaching a classroom lesson on researching Best College Fit to talking with a student who is contemplating suicide. Our jobs pull us in many directions, which we love and most of us went into this profession seeking this job because of the variety. However, I would be remiss to not share that in the last ten years, I've seen a steady increase in workload due to societal factors. I could work a full, 40 hour week by focusing solely on supporting the academic needs of my students, let alone supporting the social/emotional needs and the conversations around postsecondary planning.

The voices of social workers and counselors are oftentimes missing because we are lumped into the same union as teachers, yet we are smaller in number than teachers which is why I'm pleading with you in a survey to not cut counselors and to not restructure the social work model.

I really hope the district does not cut funding to support staff such as para educators, specialist, counselors, ect because they are the backbone of the school. This directly relates to student learning, a positive teaching and learning environment and things of that nature.

Concerned about disability supports being affected by cuts to social workers, counselors, and behavioral support specialists. My daughter's school is already under supported since they pulled a social worker away from the school. My daughter has 504 supports.

I have mixed feelings about the social work model. In some schools, including my current one, social workers play a critical role in supporting student well-being. In other settings, however, my experience has been that social workers were largely absent from meaningful student support.

Counselors and social workers are ESSENTIAL

The proposal to have less than one dedicated social worker and counselor at any individual site is outrageous and shows a complete lack of awareness of the needs of our community. Likewise, framing these cuts as the best ways to reduce costs without providing any estimate of savings from central office cuts is shameful.

Maintaining student behavioral health and wellness support is essential and is directly tied to student outcomes. Interventions for attendance, behavior, and family support remove barriers that cause students to underperform academically. It is critical that all high schools maintain at least one social worker per school. Perhaps middle and elementary schools could look at a regional model, as their populations are smaller. High School Counselors play a critical and significant role in keeping students on track to graduate by supporting behavioral and learning needs regardless of demographic. An increase in High School Counselor caseloads for any demographic would be damaging to students.

As a BSD parent and voter who has paid property taxes in the district for over 15 years and has always voted in favor of BSD bonds and levies in the past, I am extremely disappointed to see BSD moving to a mega school model that does not serve students or staff. I would prefer to see cuts to things like contractors

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

like BRIC that write surveys/seek community input - it's incredibly frustrating that the district is sinking money into surveys and community input when they don't appear to follow the responses (and in some cases the responses aren't even able for district/board review - why are we continuing to pay for incompetence?). Since that is not an option on this survey, I have chosen to prioritize district office reductions. Please do not cut behavioral services, social workers, or counselors - our students and families need their help now more than ever and one counselor and one social worker per school is the bare minimum.

Cutting student supports is framed as a more efficient system. In practice as has previously been seen in the district, it leaves the most vulnerable students behind. Proposing to cut the most robust student supports in Social Workers and Counselors is incredibly shortsighted and shows just how much the district has no idea the day to day interactions that all Social Workers and Counselors have each day with students, staff, the community and families. It is incredibly disheartening to see this.

BSD needs to closely evaluate the budget for the Public Safety and make cuts accordingly for staff/programs etc What kind of oversight is there for their spending? They can buy new cars while teachers are buying supplies with their own money? How much money did they spend on Raptor and what is the evidence that program has actually made our schools safer? How much are we spending on our contract for police in schools with BPD and Washington County? Research is very clear that students and communities are safer when we have counselors and social workers in school and a robust teaching staff. Police do not make schools safer.

How much money are we spending on consulting with outside businesses? Where could we be leaning into the expertise we have in the district instead of outsourcing for consultants who provide limited support and follow through?

It is absolutely time to re-assess the way that Community School operates in this district. They serve a very small student body, and many of those students could be served at their home schools if we supported home schools with more robust Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs and interventions. Community School is overstaffed with a full time principal and assistant principal--theoretically they oversee other programs on the campus, but the reality is that those other programs on the Merlo Station Campus have other administrative support and function well with streamlined teams and have strong outcomes with students. At the very least the district should cut the AP position and reassess staffing there in other areas. Ideally, the district should continue to support Interim Home Instruction, Passages, CEYP, and CTE but close Community School, bring staff back to comprehensive schools, re-invest in MTSS structures in comprehensive schools, and use the space left on the Merlo Station campus to build satellite programs of our successful CTE pathways programs that have long waiting lists--offer a second Health Pathways, Mental Health Careers Pathway, and Educational pathway.

Dismantling the Substance Use Specialist team will make it nearly impossible to provide early interventions for students struggling with substance use. A centralized model is code for only a couple of staff who will try their best to coach over-worked building folks on how to support students without being able to provide direct support and interventions themselves. This team has played a critical role in reducing our district's suspension and expulsion numbers, and cutting that team will absolutely lead to higher rates of suspensions and expulsions for vulnerable students. Research shows that higher rates of exclusionary discipline have a negative impact on school culture and climate and reduce students' feelings of belonging across the board.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Our district should NOT cut counselors. Our counselors already have more students on their caseloads than most of their colleagues across the nation. They are critical staff for an MTSS model, which is what district management says we are working towards.

BSD needs to closely evaluate the budget for the Public Safety and make cuts accordingly for staff/programs etc What kind of oversight is there for their spending? They can buy new cars while teachers are buying supplies with their own money? How much money did they spend on Raptor and what is the evidence that program has actually made our schools safer? How much are we spending on our contract for police in schools with BPD and Washington County? Research is very clear that students and communities are safer when we have counselors and social workers in school and a robust teaching staff. Police do not make schools safer.

How much money are we spending on consulting with outside businesses? Where could we be leaning into the expertise we have in the district instead of outsourcing for consultants who provide limited support and follow through?

It is absolutely time to re-assess the way that Community School operates in this district. They serve a very small student body, and many of those students could be served at their home schools if we supported home schools with more robust Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs and interventions. Community School is overstaffed with a full time principal and assistant principal--theoretically they oversee other programs on the campus, but the reality is that those other programs on the Merlo Station Campus have other administrative support and function well with streamlined teams and have strong outcomes with students. At the very least the district should cut the AP position and reassess staffing there in other areas. Ideally, the district should continue to support Interim Home Instruction, Passages, CEYP, and CTE but close Community School, bring staff back to comprehensive schools, re-invest in MTSS structures in comprehensive schools, and use the space left on the Merlo Station campus to build satellite programs of our successful CTE pathways programs that have long waiting lists-- offer a second Health Pathways, Mental Health Careers Pathway, and Educational pathway.

Dismantling the Substance Use Specialist team will make it nearly impossible to provide early interventions for students struggling with substance use. A centralized model is code for only a couple of staff who will try their best to coach over-worked building folks on how to support students without being able to provide direct support and interventions themselves. This team has played a critical role in reducing our district's suspension and expulsion numbers, and cutting that team will absolutely lead to higher rates of suspensions and expulsions for vulnerable students. Research shows that higher rates of exclusionary discipline have a negative impact on school culture and climate and reduce students' feelings of belonging across the board.

Our district should NOT cut counselors. Our counselors already have more students on their caseloads than most of their colleagues across the nation. They are critical staff for an MTSS model, which is what district management says we are working towards.

Cutting social workers would have a ripple effect across all areas, and impact all students. BAD IDEA!

Cut one day of school and save enough money to keep social workers.

Cutting teachers from schools is incredibly disruptive to the comradery of the school. Staff and students need more access to mental health and behavioral services, not less. Removing counselors, social workers and behavioral support from schools is reckless and irresponsible.

## 2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS

February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026

Cutting BHW members will hamper the progress schools are making in the Tier 1, Tier 2, and MTSS process. In addition, cutting BHW members will place more stress on classroom teachers with less staff outside of the classroom to support them. However, I do agree that small schools should not have the same number of counselors, SBS coaches, and Instructional coaches as larger schools.

I would really like to see a rationale for cutting more student facing positions than central office administrators. I don't understand why the district says how important mental health is and then suggests cutting positions that we know support student mental health. I understand we are underfunded at the state level and we have declining enrollment, but we are serving a population of students with greater needs than ever before. Working parents like me are stretched thinner than ever before, please don't cut the people my kids depend on every day at school to feel safe, seen and heard.

How does cutting the substance use specialists, social workers, and counselors benefit students? In our district Believe You Matter campaign, you acknowledge the increased mental health concerns our students are facing. Cutting these supports does not help anyone. Centralizing these supports removes caring adults from the school buildings. There will be more behaviors in classes making it even harder for teachers. Everyone is already at capacity. Parents are going to be even more frustrated and pull their kids out of school, so we will lose even more revenue.

I think it's a bold move to put Social Workers at the top with the cost saved but not bother to explain the TBD of District Office Reductions.

Is there capacity to collaborate with other districts to provided services?

The work of a social worker is also not as effective if they don't have a relationship with the families, especially due to the nature of their work. Even if they were assigned three schools, some schools have 70+ families by themselves they are serving. Is the number of families each social worker helping going to be taken into consideration when making the 'geographical' areas?

Same goes for counseling, if you remove social workers and other supports the counseling program relies on those connections to help serve our students.

In our current time, these two are critical resources for the success and many of our students/families having their basic needs met. It would be disservice to the community, and student's futures to stretch these resources even more thin. Our staff also rely on these individuals and maintaining their own mental and physical well being.

The social workers, counselors, behavioral specialists and instructional coaches are so important in the daily support of our students that I fear reducing their presence would greatly impact their mental health and ability to learn due to that. The amount of support that these individuals provide daily at my location is constant.

I would be interested in hearing more about how the budget would be effected if we reduced or reconsidered providing the Pre-K programs.

Behavioral specialist's role can easily be done by other members of the BHW teams such as admin, social workers, and counselors but social workers and counselor roles cannot be duplicated by behavioral specialists. Social Workers have specialized training in mental health, supporting families, distributing resources to families, crisis assessments, suicide prevention, and safety planning that behavioral specialists do not have and cannot replicate. Counselors have specialized training in identifying individualized needs of students in classrooms and supporting teachers in meeting those needs. The loss of social workers, especially, will directly impact student's sense of belonging, their mental wellness, and safety at school and at home. In a single day a social worker will

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

complete a suicide assessment, provide a family with food to make it through the week, connect a family to a program to prevent homelessness, and build new community partners to meet the need of students and families in the building. If Social Workers are cut or moved to a regional model none of this work will be done. Our BHW team collects data and every year the Social Worker has the most referrals out of anyone on the BHW team.

After thirteen years teaching in the district at various grade levels, small class sizes, counseling support, social worker involvement, and special education services will always be my top priority. Time and time again, these priorities have proven to have the greatest, most direct impact on our students. Without these things, our students will suffer.

We need Mental Health Support in all schools across the district. #1 COUNSELORS #2 SOCIAL WORKERS #3 STUDENT BEHAVIOR SPECIALISTS

This is a scary time for families and students, full of uncertainty and more violence than weve known in our community in a very long time. We need school counselors, small class sizes and social workers more than ever now.

If you're looking for the additional 20 million, it's in the paychecks of department heads and the superintendent.

██████ had a 300,000 sign on bonus. The average salary of licensed staff is 88,098, not to mention classified pay which averages out even lower. So no, I don't believe that cost of cutting social workers, councilors, and teachers would stand more beneficial that reducing the salaries and cost of department heads and reducing FLEX.

I think social workers should be staying on as much as possible especially in the title 1 schools. Their workload is already a lot as it is and they do so much for families providing resources to help them stay a float in todays economy.

As much as we as staff understand the need to budget cut there are many staff members that are needed on the day to day function of the country's children's education. Social Workers and counselors are supporting various ways so that students are able to be mentally and socially function to learn and grow in their education. The mental exhaustion on what our students are dealing with is very high. Reducing these staff members, the impact will be high.

Our school social worker is immensely helpful. She is always so busy supporting families in our school. We greatly appreciate her!

Our school would absolutely fall apart without a Behavioral Specialist. We don't have an assistant principal, so our Behavioral Specialist essentially fills that role, but on a certified staff salary.

Let's clarify what social workers think will work when we make this regional plan.

I strongly oppose reductions to school-based staffing, specifically the Regional Social Worker Model, Counselors, and Behavioral Specialists. These roles are the backbone of equity in our schools. Moving social workers to a 'regional model' destroys the deep, site-specific trust necessary to support students facing poverty, systemic racism, and trauma.

Reductions in these areas disproportionately harm our most marginalized populations, who rely on stable, daily access to trusted adults for safety and social-emotional regulation. We cannot prioritize 'efficiency' over the well-being of students who are already underserved.

To bridge the \$25M deficit, the district should instead:

Cut from the Top: Reduce the Superintendent's salary—currently projected in the \$370k–\$420k range—and other executive compensation.

Audit Curriculum Spending. For example: eliminate high-cost third-party programs like 'The Great Body Shop' and utilize lower-cost resources.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

It is beyond unfortunate that at a time when our students and families need more social and emotional support, we are forced to cut social workers, counselors, teachers and teacher training and supports. None of these things on this list are unimportant so a portion of the BSD community. I have spent 30 years as a teacher, parent and community member and forever hopeful that Oregon will figure out that we need to fund education fully and possibly differently.

Has there been any talk about not renewing the SRO's contract or decreasing that? Seems like possibly making cuts to Elementary staffing, social workers, counselors, Behavioral Specialists shouldn't be the only things on the chopping block.

I don't understand why there is no savings estimate for cutting district office staff. That makes me think that it is not being seriously considered as an option, but it seems logical that cutting staff who do not directly work with students would have the least impact on student success and wellbeing. Why not start there? I understand that hard decisions have to be made here, but teachers, counselors, and social workers are at the absolute bottom of my list for cuts. Centralizing behavioral specialists, social workers, substance use specialists, and other employees who work more directly with at-risk students seems to me like it would undercut so much of the important work they're doing.

It is hard to keep social workers for some reason but they are very, very helpful!

Social workers are a vital support for students and families in our district, and losing or minimizing these positions will be detrimental to the success and belonging of our students. The description describing "overlap of services" is misleading, as social workers are mental health professionals with training that counselors and SBSs do not have. Beyond the case management responsibilities of connecting families to resources, the relationship building and connection making with students and families is VITAL. This would simply be impossible with a regional model that takes social workers out of buildings. This is already difficult as a social worker who is split between 2 buildings, and I imagine that it would only be 1000x worse if split among even more buildings. The services of mental health support, family resource connection, and being present as a positive and supportive adult (who is not responsible for grading students, which automatically adds at least a subliminal level of judgement and power imbalance) who cares for the whole child are irreplaceable. Having social workers, counselors, AND student behavior specialists on the cut list is absurd. We need more of these positions!! Also, it feels so disrespectful and misleading to not even include an estimated figure for what could be cut from the district office level. Perhaps it could be one of the largest categories, but we don't know. This makes it misleading and inefficient to complete this survey without having all of the information.

I am a parent of two children in BSD (one at an elementary school and one at a middle school). Prior to this school year my children had been homeschooled. I feel as though one aspect missing from this budget discussion is around the decrease in enrollment due to families choosing alternative educational opportunities. Thankfully, my middle schooler was selected in the lottery for next school year in the option school of their choosing. However, continuing to cut PE and Music teachers from elementary schools will not bring more people back to public education. Reducing social workers and counselors are not going to help the public schools thrive and therefore demonstrate that this is a great option for all students.

Our Social Worker and Counselors are so important to our school community right now. It would be a real loss to have their numbers reduced.

Because TOSA's have the least amount of student contact, I would reduce their numbers first to avoid major disruptions to our schools.

As a student, I see how much we need Substance use support, Counselors, and Behavioral Specialists in school every day. If we were to cut funding for these items, the effects would be detrimental. I ask you, as a student who has been in this district my entire life, please, do not cut funding for any of these. So many students rely on these supports in their day-to-day life; we need them in our schools.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

In conversation, the regional social work model is not the solution. In cutting half of our social workers, the essential job duties of social workers is not seen. Social workers help teachers in supporting students, and there is so much work that is done inside of the buildings that are not being represented in any of the budget proposals. Social workers are not just resource referral, and changing to a regional model will take away such an important piece of a student's journey. There are multiple instances where working with a social worker is what keeps a child in school. A regional social worker with multiple schools will not be able to provide the same services, and spreading the idea that switching to a regional model will be positive by saying that the students will still receive the same emotional and social support is just wrong.

It's incredibly disheartening seeing these options. All of them would impact staff and students astronomically if these are the only ways to reduce spending. As a Special Education staff, the loss of our social workers, counselors, behavior specialists, and substance use support would impact our special education identification, referrals, and evaluation process and would slow down our ability to make informed decisions and support plans about these impacted kids. In a world where technology use is growing, I am also worried about the loss of our Instructional Technology staff; many on this team aid with special education evaluation tools, and programs that help monitor educational progress. They will be stretched thin between sites and teachers, staff, and students would be delayed in technological support. Neighborhoods with low-income families will see a decline in attendance, mental health, and food security if our counselors and social workers are reduced at their schools. Centralizing them will create more of a divide on our sites, and make our students feel like they've been abandoned, leaving them to find and connect with new adults they feel safe coming to to ask for help. These are only some of the concerns that come to mind when being asked for input and rankings on who I feel should lose their job.

It seems disingenuous to to put TBD for district office. There are plenty of non student facing positions that are expensive and would impact families but they are not getting the information. Also you claim you use an equity lens but then take positions like SW and SUS and counselors which impacts our most vulnerable who are unlikely to take the survey.

Please, please, please DO NOT cut support staff in Special Education!!!! We need counselors, behavior support, and social workers!!!! Our students will struggle without their help!

Social workers are a very important part of the school community. Especially those in title 1 schools with high needs and a diverse background. The way this is being referenced is very unfair to them. I have children in multiple schools and not once has their service overlapped. They actually get to know us a family and my kids have a trusted adult that help us overcome some deep barriers.

ALWAYS reduce district office expenditures first. We're living in a time where families are scared to leave their homes even to get groceries, the district is doing VERY little to support these families, and we want to chop the limited social worker resources that we have who are often trying to even help families get food?? We don't need middle managers at the district office, especially since so much of district "guidance" for teachers and schools is to build services and curriculum ourselves (WIN class, immigrant supports, etc).

Cutting services in elementary schools will ripple up to affect middle and high school outcomes. These are cuts with long lasting and long term effects. Social workers and counselors are needed for immediate interventions that also cannot be cut. We can't short change the most important people and resources for our students.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Please strongly consider the impact counselors and social workers have on our students and our BSD community. These people are assets to our district and help us maintain a balanced system. Additionally, PE is a core class and should be considered as such. Allocating appropriate Physical Education teachers per school would enable BSD to meet the Oregon state requirements for Physical Education since we aren't meeting those requirements currently.

As a current community member, and a future BSD parent, I must insist on the district prioritizing mental health supports in the buildings. My partner works as a psychologist in the community and the amount of need he sees urgently and on a daily basis is only increasing; not just for adults, but for adolescents and kids as well. While community supports are overwhelmed, often it is the relationships students have with the mental health supports in their building that keeps them coming to school and frankly, often helps keep them alive. Taking social workers and substance use support out of buildings and centralizing them only ensures one thing; that students (the most vulnerable) will fall through the cracks. Beaverton School District is supposed to be a leader in this state, and it was when it piloted school social workers in every building. Now on the heels of the "Believe You Matter" campaign, those supports are being stripped? If you care about kids, care about their mental health. If you care about kids being in school, social workers help with attendance. If you care about kids, do not cut social workers or substance use supports.

With the current most pressing needs that our schools and students are facing today, it is incredibly short sighted to be significantly cutting supportive services that meet the basic needs of our students and families. The needs for emotional, behavioral and social supports are only increasing and our support services staff members are struggling to meet the current needs with the existing staffing as is.

Furthermore, the wording regarding the proposed shift to a regional social worker model is incredibly deceiving to the public. Where is the data on "overlap in services" that is supposedly currently occurring? A regional social work model completely eliminates some of the key roles and components of a social work role in schools, reducing the position to resource allocation when the role is so much more than that. Social workers are responding to challenging behaviors in classrooms (reducing disruption to learning and education), providing social and emotional supports and interventions, providing key mental health and psychoeducational support to students and staff alike, building relationships with underserved students and families (which also benefits attendance and learning and is foundational to helping families accessing needed resources), and much, much more. In some cases, social workers are the only adult in a student's life that they are connected to and feel safe with.

Our students cannot possibly be successful without their basic needs met. I implore you to reconsider the significant cuts to support services in general, but especially the idea of a regional social work model.

Where is Pre-K in this budget? Pre-K is a great service, but it does not go towards benefitting our K-12 population. I'd hate to see huge reductions to our Social Workers and Counselors, as these roles do SO MUCH more than is in their job descriptions. These reductions will specifically impact those who are in the most need and who have the least resources.

School Counselors are very, very important. Many kids and teens rely on counselors. And mental health is very, very important. Personally I would keep counseling your highest priority. Because with better mental states, means better learning, and better learning means better futures.

No one at the District Office should have any "work from home." If they can do that, then their role is unnecessary. Also if you cut things like Behavioral Specialists, Counselors, Instructional Coaches, and Social Workers those are the safety nets at every school. When a student is having a melt down about something in class or recess, the safety net of people are those who respond. Also centralized technology support is great but now you're asking classroom

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

teachers to give up plan time because they are no longer sending their students to "specials." And no way can a classroom teacher give the same technology learning or enrichment, there's not enough osmos or robotics in a school for that. Make some centralized support to the existing technology specialists but do not eliminate those teachers.

Kids are struggling, behaviors are at an all time high, families are struggling...please do not make teacher's job harder by taking away our support professionals: counselors, social workers, behavioral support, instructional coaches, specialists...less adults in buildings is NOT what we need during this crisis time.

Substance use is a serious issue for students and I don't think funding should be cut for it

Spend Less money on substance use. \$1 million is the most absurd thing I have ever seen. You could put that towards better meals and also better after-school programs. If they abuse drugs, that's their choice, and they have to face the consequences. It's really just common sense. But you guys don't have any after spending that much on substance abuse support. 🗨️ 🗨️ 🗨️

Pre-K should be cut. This is a great program, but there is no universal state-funded PreK, and this should be a separate line item on the state budget. Most other districts do not have free PreK. The priority should be for K-12.

School counselors and social workers are very important and do much more than just provide food/resources per family. They help with many issues at the school level and should be able to stay at 1-2 schools, not overseeing a cluster.

Dear Interim Superintendent & Budget Manager,

Please, please, please reconsider making significant reductions to social workers, counselors, and behavior support staff. These are substantially expensive line items on the presented list, however these folks are doing a tremendous amount of heavy lifting in our schools. Without these specialists, I cannot overstate how detrimental it will be to our school communities. In the years since the pandemic, we have seen increased homelessness, unemployed and drug affected parents, suicidality, ACEs, youth substance abuse, hunger, untreated medical conditions, and a lack of health care insurance. These issues make it impossible for children to learn. BHW teams provide front line support that prevent worsening mental health and classroom disruption. Lacking these supports will lead to teacher burnout, student drop out, and interference with the educational process of all students.

Before cutting any of the behavioral team members, it would be beneficial for you to observe in-person the work they do and analyze the data the BHW teams have been keeping for years. We cannot face the socio-economic impacts of our current world without these trained and dedicated specialists. An investment in social workers and behavioral specialists is money well spent that will have immeasurable long-term benefits in our children and consequently our community.

In addition, I also must encourage you to look at what options there are in the community for students in Special Ed after they graduate before cutting WEX funding. Without BSD WEX programs, there are no places for our special needs students to receive crucial education to help them participate in the work world after graduation. We simply cannot cut funding for our most vulnerable students, when our budget for them is already strained.

It is unfortunate that when money gets tight the first cuts are to the people who need the most help. Why not consider asking more fortunate groups to do more with less?

Every school should have at least one counselor. Students cannot predict when they are having a mental health crisis.

The above drop and drag feature did not allow me to accurately provide feedback. Per my opinion the drag and drop feedback design is not close to optimal. Hence commenting here in detail. Please refer to the following below points:

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

1) The budget of FLEX and Option School should be separated from regular school. The structure of education and the system of education for FLEX and Option school is different from my understanding of the education system. If FLEX and Option School can be separated, then K-12 kids can be provided education not only by their IQ but by their level of EQ and academic interest.

2) Funds regarding social workers, substance abuse and behavioral specialist are required. Having said that, per my understanding and opinion, they should not be provided by district funds. Parents and families who are facing the issues should be empowered by the district to pay for the fund. School/district and community can support them by allowing to share resources (IQ and EQ enhancement), but funding them constantly would enhance the probability of more substance abuse, more behavioral issues and in the process would spread the normality of behavioral issue and/or substance abuse to kids/families who do not fall into that demography.

3) Funds towards sports and music from district budget should be reduced. Sports and music help kids towards building social and emotional skills and some kids have special interest in them. Parents and kids who particularly want to spend more time and money on sports and music for future education and/or profession or due to passion should be empowered/encouraged to spend money from funds outside the district. District can provide facilities/resources as support.

4) Teachers should be trained to change their style of teaching per class size and kids (IQ/EQ) along with the subject. That should be primary focus. Not sure the current local levy tax is helping towards training teachers appropriately towards the mentioned effort. And/or have hired the right teachers per their teaching skills/experience/leadership and mentorship knowledge in the district/state and most importantly in the country (United States of America).

5) Per my opinion, just by focusing on increasing birth rates will not reduce the budget problem and/or quality of education problem. More money, more teachers and less number of school days creates an individualistic learning environment where kids learn in silo and drift from learning to work as team. Thus both full-time and para teachers in the school should be competent to help kids learn in school and from teachers along with the required support (IQ/EQ/resource) they receive at home, so that with the help of teachers and parents kids can become both an independent thinker and strategic collaborative leaders' of tomorrow. I believe that is the path towards equitable education-life-balance for K-12 kids.

We have struggled to get the support we need with different social workers and support specialists at different schools. Having one for an area that supports an entire family just makes sense.

Music and PE taught by Licensed Certified teachers should not be reduced at any schools. The benefits to the school community and students' SEL/confidence are numerous and vital. The savings is minimal.

The need for behavior specialists and counselors in elementary schools is very high, not just to help the one student who is having problems but because no-one in the class is learning when that one student's behavior is disruptive. None of the other students feel safe enough to learn when a classmate has not been able to control of their behavior and could become unpredictable again at any time.

Staffing should be driven by student enrollment and demonstrated need. It can create inequities when some schools maintain two teachers per grade regardless of enrollment, retain full-time specialists when a part-time allocation would meet the need, or have counseling capacity that isn't aligned to workload. There are also positions that can be more efficiently centralized across schools—such as IT support or a substance use specialist—so that limited resources are used strategically. From an equity-focused standpoint, however, it's essential that every school has reliable, site-based access to core student-support services, including counselors and social workers.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

I do feel that transitioning Social Workers to the Regional Social Worker Model will negatively impact students and staff. Specifically, Social Workers are intrinsic to their school communities. It would be incredibly challenging to serve multiple schools with the same level of intention and involvement.

I would strongly advocate for removing funding for roles such as the SSS (SBS) where it is a TOSA doing work that can otherwise be done by someone with a license to do that work (counselor, social worker, admin) it has become a stepping stone to being an Admin in our district and instead of undersatning and valuing the work of mental health specialists in our school district the offer is to get rid of the people that are already trained and experts to continue to have multiple roles of "whatever we tell you to do"

We are (and have been) so top-heavy (we have 3 AP, 1 Principal, 2 Deans of students, and a SBS for 1400 students) that people think that they don't need to work as a part of a larger team and just do what they want to put out fires from the main office - which isn't inline with MTSS or Restovitive Practices - both are in the stratigic plan.

We need strong BH&W teams - including social workers who are a part of building communities.

As a staff member, and parent volunteer who is consistently involved in schools, I see on a daily basis that it is imperative that we continue to provide as much support as possible to children in each individual school. Teachers are already overworked as it is. Removing support from councilors, social workers, and behavior specialists would be at the bottom of my list. They are crucial to the daily support of students at each individual school and having them onsite helps create relationships with the children that need it most. I feel that it moves away from the "you matter" and having a trusting adult that makes you feel seen campain that BSD has been implementing.

As an elementary teacher and parent of elementary, middle, and high school students in the district, I cannot emphasize enough how critical it is that teacher positions NOT be cut. Class sizes in some grades are untenable as it is. Best practices tell us that teachers who work in teams are better able to align curriculum and instruction for best student outcomes. Additionally, behavioral specialists play a crucial role in our schools, now more than ever. Please protect these positions.

Social workers, behavioral specialists, and counselors are things I absolutely do not want to see cut no matter what- I already see the struggle of students and staff in my community, and to reduce those numbers would be condemning not just special needs kids to a worse education, but the students around them too.

Proportional staffing definition? Ratio of staff to student is a poor model when looking at social worker, counseling, & behavioral specialists. Poverty & family demographics provides a clearer picture of schools with high needs.

The only good idea is the social worker regional model. But they still need an office and a team, like a family support liaison. This idea should be phased in at less impacted schools and refined before it happens at highly impacted schools like William Walker with Cedar Park and Meadow and BHS. And you should let social workers submit preferences for worksites and everything else. We created this position with ESSER funds and can't just pull the plug because we don't have funding. Do not cut elementary counselors. Do not cut behavior specialist. One academic coach per building is probably ok. Cuts to non student facing positions are always the right thing to do before classroom. No one wants to teach in isolation and the turnover in those situations will be heavy, in most scenarios. Setting a school up for a revolving door staffing situation and no community or institutional memory at a site. And the staff member can't refine and plan as a group and develop skills with the grade level if it changes all the time. Blends would be better.

It is important to keep full time staff at each building. Having a .8 behavior specialist, a .5 instructional coach, and a .75 counselor create havoc in a building as no-one tracks all those schedules well. And kids need their people when they need them. We need staff who will be on site all day. In these cases, two full time

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

people doing multiple roles is better than three partial staff.

Please also keep in mind that subs are not provided for support positions, so principals and counselors are often unable to do important work when other non-classroom staff are out. The more reductions here, the less focus on instructional improvement. Basic supervision and response to disregulation will trump classroom observation.

How individual schools are affected needs to be kept in mind. Will some schools lose .5 total while others lose 3 or more staff members?

This is a painful process to ponder. Mental health is a major problem in Oregon. I notice our state consistently ranks toward the bottom compared to other states for adult/youth mental stress and homelessness. A recent survey (United Health Foundation Americas Health rankings) was featured in our local KOIN news. Of note: Oregon ranks 44th out of 50 for adult non medical drug use, 46/50 for frequency of adult mental distress, 48th out of 50 for homelessness. If the adults are stressed out and homeless-imagine how their children might be coping? Local KPTV reports (Wallet Hub) Oregon has the 5th worst educational system in the country-notwithstanding the mental health/homeless problem i've noted. Proposed cuts appear fully directed at staff who are on the front line of supporting addiction/behavior. So, i'm trying to convey rationale for my responses.

I appreciate the efforts in our district over the years to prioritize wrap-around services for youth and families & i think in many ways our district is the state's bell cow for trying to do education well. However, Our funding crisis is not ours alone. Every district in our state is struggling.

The success of social workers and counselors comes with knowing the students (and families) they are serving. BSD continues to misunderstand the power and role of community. As for centralizing IT support, while I am supportive, this MUST come with a drastic reduction in use of EdTech which is expensive, potentially harmful to children, and is draining progress towards better educational outcomes. The District can't continue to fall for the failed promises of EdTech (for whom our kids are the "product") and place all of that burden on classroom teachers to navigate. Let teachers TEACH. They don't need screens and games to do it. Technology shouldn't even be a special/elective under high school. Now there's a budget idea I didn't see above.

Our superintendent and associate superintendents need to take a paycut. There is no reason [REDACTED] should ever have been making ins \$400K salary.

Enrollment might be down, but IEPs and 504s are up and we need to properly support our general ed and specialized classrooms for everyone to feel safe. I currently don't feel safe where I work (we have an extremely violent student who we know has access to guns) and that will only get worse next year when positions are cut. Shame on you BSD for putting the onus on us to try and make these decisions, when it is your poor management of the situation that has led us here.

Do not cut substance abuse program. Explain to people that Centralized really means gutting the program!

When will we stop tying staff hands to take care of Behavioral outbursts?

Kids are afraid.

One more time, KIDS ARE AFRAID!

We are bending over every which way to allow behavioral outbursts to continue and to NOT stop. There aren't even verbal boundaries set for them. We all watch in astounding sadness as we see where we've failed our children, as we sweep all of the parent neglect that we cover for, under the bleachers. All I feel after 40 years in education is disgust and disappointment.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Our students need behavioral support more than ever. If we do not have counselors, social workers, behavioral specialists and other support staff in schools, including smaller elementary schools, the most vulnerable students will not get the support they need to be successful and the rest of the children will be learning in profoundly disruptive environments. In addition, the specialized learning our students receive in music and PE are vital for their development and for connecting the school with their families. The music concerts and folk dancing bring parents together and foster community. These parents are then involved and engaged to support their local schools through fundraising and volunteering. Physical Education is necessary to help students learn how to have healthy bodies as well as minds, and to prepare their minds to be able to learn academic concepts. We cannot leave our students behind!

With mental health crises and diagnoses on the rise for youth, I think cutting social workers and counselors should be the last thing considered.

Counselors and social workers are ESSENTIAL to Beaverton's goal of "belong, believe, achieve". Students social, emotional and mental health have the greatest impact on their ability to access their education, sense of belonging and self-esteem. Removing or reducing mental health professionals in buildings will be detrimental to our staff and students. How will risk assessments be completed? Who will work with students whose mental health is preventing them from accessing their education? Who will have or take the time to build relationships with families in order to support them? Who will serve as the expert on local resources? Who will provide students with mental health support? It is negligent not to consider the massive barriers outside of school when it comes to students receiving mental health services. Families are told "your student needs counseling" but will no longer have social workers or counselors to support them in connecting with these providers. To be in a privileged enough position to be ignorant to this issue is extremely dangerous to our students and our community. With no plan as to how to support these needs in lieu of counselors and social workers, our district would be making a massive mistake in cutting funding for these ESSENTIAL positions.

How about police? Choosing police over proactive helpers like counselors and social workers is disheartening and tone deaf to vulnerable families.

Behavior specialists and social workers are an essential part of any building. Reducing these staff based on a weighted or regional model is not where cuts should be made. These staff members are constantly in contact with students, family, and staff and when they are split or have multiple buildings, communication and student focus is harder to coordinate. The question of reducing elementary classroom teachers from guaranteed two classrooms also seems like an improper reduction. If there are students/families who demonstrate negative interactions/behavior with staff or other students in their classroom they can (if all team members are in agreement) move classrooms (as happens with multiple students per year) and generally behavior or the relationship with the family improves.

I think there also are too many upper management positions at the district office and these should be the main focus of these budgetary cuts/discussions.

I am writing today as a high school counselor with almost three decades of experience working for the Beaverton School District to express deep concern about the proposal to reduce 10.5 school counseling positions and significantly cut social worker staffing across the district. These cuts stand in stark contrast to the District's own public messaging about the unprecedented levels of mental health challenges our students continue to face.

At the start of this school year, Superintendent [REDACTED] emphasized the urgency and importance of student mental health in his annual welcome message to staff:

"We've just launched our new Believe You Matter initiative, a yearlong districtwide focus on student mental health and well-being. This effort has never been

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

more important. Since the pandemic, both our district and state data show that students are experiencing more mental health challenges than ever before.”  
— Dr. Gustavo Balderas, Superintendent (9/5/25)

He further highlighted the scale and seriousness of the mental health crises occurring in our schools:

“Last year, BSD staff conducted 635 suicide screenings, including some with children as young as 5 years old. More than a third of those screenings were at the elementary level... these numbers... reflect the vigilance and care of our staff who step in when students need us most.”

— Dr. Gustavo Balderas, Superintendent (9/5/25)

These statements make clear that mental health concerns are not diminishing — they are increasing. The frequency and intensity of crises our staff support each day require more trained mental health professionals, not fewer.

**External Indicators Confirm the Need Is Growing, Not Shrinking**

The broader educational and professional landscape underscores this reality:

I recently attended a professional development event held at the University of Oregon’s Portland campus. The headline announcement was the launch of a new Behavioral Health undergraduate major — created precisely because youth mental health needs are escalating and the workforce pipeline is insufficient.

Within Beaverton School District itself, we have recently launched a Behavioral Health and Wellness CTE pathway for high school students. The District would not establish this pathway unless the demand for mental health professionals in the community were both real and acute.

This alignment between universities, statewide initiatives, and our District’s own CTE programming powerfully reinforces what we see every day in schools: the need for mental health professionals is rising, not declining.

**The Proposed Cuts Contradict the District’s Own Stated Priorities**

Given this context, the proposal to drastically reduce counseling and social worker positions sends a message sharply at odds with BSD’s public commitments. If these reductions proceed, the District will be effectively communicating that:

“The kids are now okay — they no longer need the levels of mental health support we previously said were critical.”

Yet this is neither accurate nor responsible. Our students are not experiencing fewer challenges. Our counseling teams are not less busy. The suicide screenings, crisis responses, behavioral escalations, and family mental health needs we manage are not slowing down.

If the District continues to publicly claim that mental health is a priority — while simultaneously eliminating the very staff most qualified to address it — the message becomes inconsistent at best, and disingenuous at worst. Our students, families, and staff deserve transparency and honesty about what these cuts really mean for mental health services in our schools.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

**The Real Impact**

Cutting 11.5 counseling positions and reducing social worker staffing will result in:

- Larger caseloads, reducing direct student support
- Longer wait times for crisis response
- Fewer prevention services
- Less capacity to support students with chronic attendance, behavioral, academic, and emotional needs
- Reduced ability to partner with families
- Increased emotional burden on already stretched staff

This is not just a staffing shift — it is a reduction in safety nets, relationships, and crisis intervention capacity.

**A Call for Alignment Between Vision and Action**

If the Beaverton School District truly believes, as stated, that students matter and that mental health is a top priority, then cutting the professionals who deliver that support undermines that commitment.

Budget challenges are real. But so is the mental health crisis affecting our students.

I urge the District to reconsider these cuts, explore alternative cost-saving measures, and remain aligned with its own values, its public messaging, and the lived experiences of students, families, and staff.

Our students deserve more than statements about mental health. They deserve the professionals who make that care a reality.

The substance use support program is at capacity - specialists covering multiple schools. At a time when substance use is at crisis levels, and few outside resources exist, how is it possible that this is even considered? Reducing the budget for this program (it should be increased) almost inevitably eliminates the program.

Counselors are important to the ecosystem of a school. Every student has needs and every school needs one. They do more than caseloads. They help guide the school and identify students that need intervention. How would this work in a school that doesn't have one on site?

Not proportionally staffing elementary teachers means some kids win the lottery of small class size depending on the school they are in district for. It seems unfair not to do this.

Consider using additional reserves next year while advocating for changes at the state level. The state needs to change policies to secure sustainable educational funding. Mental health and social services for students, needs to remain a priority, particularly in today's climate. Students cannot learn without meeting their basic needs, and a sense of safety and belonging.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

When you take IT specialists, LITTs, social workers, and substance-use counselors and centralize them (removing them from their individual schools), you are removing the "experts" who KNOW the school population. You will increase their workloads and consequently their stress levels. You will have a high rate of burnout because typically these are the people who are extremely knowledgeable and often spend THEIR OWN TIME helping students and staff--because that is their calling.

Removing the librarians from the individual schools cut about 50 positions and left us with THREE District librarians who are overworked and underpaid. You "saved" money "promoting" the Library Media Assistants to run the libraries at each school. These classified employees were still expected to continue doing crossing guard duty, lunch duty, recess duty, and bus duty. We got a very slight increase in pay (mostly due to adding two more hours to our day) and about 20 minutes of classroom management. When we complained, we were told by [REDACTED] who had LOST her beloved position, "You should be grateful you still have a job."

Unfortunately, some LMAs weren't as outgoing as the laid off librarians and burned out quite quickly. We were not given plan time even though we were expected to continue the schedule and we wanted to continue the curriculum of the Library Media Specialists. Students lost out because they didn't learn how to do research, how to find and cite sources, and how to relax by reading good literature.

Fast forward 13 years and we are now back to encouraging students to use physical not digital resources to learn. They have become dependent on their phones and computers and are anxious, paranoid, and socially inept. And how much money was saved from cutting the library specialists? Parents complained, teachers complained, and LMAs were leaving because they didn't feel valued by the District. If we spent extra time, our principals told us they couldn't pay us overtime and we would have to leave at 4 (usually at the end of the last bus or crossing guard duty of the day). I needed two extra hours to prep for the next day's classes--back-to-back duties and back-to-back classes didn't leave time to get ready for the next day. At [REDACTED] I was lucky to have wonderful parent volunteers who helped me process and shelve books and manage the yearly book fairs and end of year book swap--all previously done by Library Media Specialist [REDACTED]. However, after only two years of doing EVERYTHING, I was burned out. My principal told me I was being insubordinate for working extra hours. I told her I HAD to be prepared for the next day's classes or I would quit on the spot. I spent 8 years at [REDACTED] -- the last two being the "librarian" in work load only.

I was fortunate that an LMA position opened at [REDACTED] and started there in 2014. It was just two 6-hour LMAs until the District heeded the pleas of the teachers and added back the Library Specialist position. But they wouldn't admit it was a mistake in the first place by labeling the position LITT--Library and Instructional Technology Teacher. Once again, teachers and students had the benefit of a Library Science professional who could teach students AND STAFF how to utilize the library and the new technology. Yay!

Some of the LITTs were the previously cut librarians who became over-qualified classroom teachers. This was great--until the district decided that they could "save lots of money" by "regionalizing" the LITTs. Instead of one at every school, there would be ONE Litt for every two or three or more schools. Again, these professionals were asked to do double the work for the same amount of money. Did it really save that much? Oh, and don't let me forget to include school nurses in that same category.

And now, the District is considering cutting the remaining LITT positions, or even centralizing them. Centralizing the TSSs, social workers, substance abuse specialists, LITTs or any other position that deals with students or problems one on one will mean dedicated professionals will lose their jobs, students will lose resources, fixing problems like chromebooks and students' mental and physical health will dump MORE stress on the staff remaining at the schools including the overworked office personnel.

I see 63 positions listed as District Administrators or District Supervisors. These are generally quite high-paying positions. Are some of those redundant?

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Maybe it's better to cut some a few to preserve excellent customer service. Students and parents are our customers and we want to keep them pleased with the results of 13 years of education.

Making a budget is hard. With federal funding cuts it's even more difficult to decide what stays and what goes. I guess my hope is that you keep the LITT and TSS positions in the schools and not centralize them. Thank you.

Sincerely,

BSD volunteer (1993-2007), parent (1993-2013) and employee (2006-2026)

I wish these scenarios would also outline the negative outcomes that would occur as a result of these cuts. For example: proportional staffing for counselors may change the number of counselors assigned to each secondary school, but how does it affect the day-to-day of the counselors themselves? How many more students would they be taking on? How much more spread thin are we making our in-school staff with these "proportional staffing" scenarios? I'm skeptical

We need to focus on how to get students the most support, and not take away behavior specialists. Let's look into the funds for pre-k and see if we can move it out of the general fund, and use that to help the districts budgets. Also, district offices should be looked into cutting, if you want to cut resources from students who need them, then maybe start at the top.

Please consider the negative impact of taking away too many positions that work directly with students by supporting them and addressing the growing behavior and social emotional challenge present in schools today. Teachers, counselors, and behavioral specialists all have direct interaction with kids on a minute by minute basis every day, and reducing those roles to correct funding issues could lead to drastic problems in the future.

I think it is sooooo necessary that every grade level keeps two teachers who can collaborate. Even if it means blends, then two people teaching the same blend. Teacher efficacy and collaboration is an indicator of student achievement. To put one teacher alone on an "island" to plan and teach is hard. We need to prioritize the classroom teachers. I also think students are dealing with more mental and emotional struggles and the counselors play a huge role in understanding and approaching these situations. Much more than the Student Behavioral Specialists who don't necessarily have the credentials to do the job well.

I think we have too much overlap in central office administration. People are doing the same job and not having a clear vision to communicate. One administrator will say one thing which then will be backtracked. For reporting for federal grants and reports, you can hire program specialists for half the rate of an administrator's compensation. We need a change in central office leadership in order to establish and communicate strategy and deliverables. We need less emphasis on coaching and more on vision. I hope you hire a new superintendent who isn't just looking for meaningless awards to further his career like the last one did. The school board is elected to not be friends of the central office; rather, they are elected to manage our school district and make the difficult decisions to eliminate leaders who did not and do not deliver. On another topic, we used to have tech and social work centralized. We can go back to that model as long as student to teacher ratios stay small. Another reason we should not rely on proportional staffing of elementary classrooms, is that the current HMH curriculum at the elementary level does not lend itself to a blended classroom. Proportional staffing models threaten to bring schools to the lowest standard, rather than support the professionals on the ground. For example, schools who do not have vice principals rely on their instructional coaches, behavior specialists, and counselors to take on the duties a vice principal does in a larger school. If you use the proportional staffing model for school coaches, splitting their time between schools, prevents them from fulfilling the leadership jobs they perform in schools without vice principals.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Proportional staffing for councilors and regional social workers are going to kill children. This is not a hyperbole, and if you think it is, get back into the schools and actually see what it is like for our marginalized children. They are overworked as it is and this even being proposed is disgusting. We have a bloated bureaucracy in this district that needs to be addressed first, but that would require the people making decisions to cut themselves out of a job, which we know wont happen. Save lives. Don't let us be the district that forsakes children for the sake of saving money.

My reasoning begins with the community. I believe that our social workers have had a significant impact on the community, building relationships, fulfilling a vital role that is the foundation of students facing socioeconomic hardships sense of belonging. I think elementary schools continue to develop a strong sense of community and build trust through the development of foundational skills that are reflected in a student's academic growth.

Each year, class sizes continue to grow. It is essential to maintain smaller class sizes and for schools to develop clear plans to support staff with both behavioral and academic needs. Additionally, every school should have full-time counselors and social workers. If these professionals are only part-time, they cannot effectively serve the needs of the students or the school community.

Im just a child, but keep my request that Elementary school teachers dont get cut because i dont want them to lose their jobs

In general, Smaller schools and smaller class sizes really allow for great learning. Students need support from teachers and with the increase of IEP and 504 plans, we really need that support staff as a district. I'd look for ways to consolidate with Social work, Behavioral support, Counselors, learning specialists do and what might be overlapping in student support while knowing that behavioral supports and social work supports are increasing in the medical field (i.e. pediatrician's offices). perhaps there is a partnership that can grow for care coordination of some of these services. I'd also focus on overhead costs and how they can be reduced. Can we limit district office space to have more remote workers?

The substance use counselor has always helped me, he is sweet, kind and so very helpful, he never ceases to amaze me with his expertise and knowledge.

As many others have stated, this survey is offensive, poorly informed, and misguided. There are many ways to save money and there are ways to work with communities and staff in a respectful way. None of which are being done with this method. As other large entities do, they look at costs, look at ways to be more efficient, they do hiring freezes, they encourage retirements, they consider taking a day out of the calendar (non student day), and more. Instead of communicating all of the efforts being made, BSD chooses to not be accountable for their own overhead and opts for pitting staff against staff. In such uncertain times where havoc is being wrecked on our communities, our families, our students, BSD looks to cut supports while our students starve, lose their housing, and are subjected to lasting trauma. BSD can't seem to figure some key factors to attendance dropping. This is shameful. BSD needs more social workers, not less. Social workers are actively working to get students back into buildings are actually a revenue producing body. Perhaps in a future survey make sure you know the role of your workers before putting them on the chopping block.

The Impact on Our Schools

One proposed cut is the Substance Use Specialist.

Currently: 20 secondary schools share 7.5 FTE Substance Use Supports.

The Proposal: Cut 6.5 FTE and move just 1.0 FTE SUS position to the central district office to support every middle and high school with Substance Use.

This is not centralization this is program elimination.

None of these cuts will benefit students, so if we're keeping them in the forefront of our minds when making these decisions, we should prioritize cutting positions that are not student facing first. I cannot imagine what our school would be like if there were cuts to classroom teachers, BHW staff, and

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

specialists/instructional coaches all at once for the next school year. What is best for kids is consistent, sufficient, and on site adult support from a variety of trusted adults.

What might be more frustrating is the idea of moving to a regional social worker model. Our social worker has been able to do incredible work with our families because they are on site and full time. They have increased attendance for students who have struggled to come to school consistently, they have provided clothing and food to families who are struggling by reaching out to sources who can help our community, and they have some of the most amazing relationships and partnerships with students and families. I am not a social worker and yet I feel so passionate about advocating for these positions. We would be doing an immense disservice to our most vulnerable families and students if this position was to change. It's heartbreaking to think that this is even an option on the table right now, especially with everything that is happening in our country currently.

I hope that this feedback is taken seriously and that if there are any doubts about the feedback that you come into our school sites and sit down with the people who are student facing. Take the time to walk with us as we perform our daily jobs so that you have a better understanding of exactly how integral we are to the success of our sites. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

As a teacher at Greenway Elementary, I support the McKay school consolidation to Raleigh Hills and Greenway. We have worked hard to utilize every space in our school while Raleigh Hills has been using our building. We have the space for several more classes beyond the 2 per grade level that we currently have and would welcome more students, families, and teachers into our school community.

My youngest child will be at Greenway next year and I want her school experience to have a full-time counselor, full-time behavior specialist, and full-time music and PE teachers. Many students in our school are experiencing poverty/trauma and need the support of multiple adults outside of their classroom teacher to help them regulate throughout the day and the families need more support than families who are not experiencing poverty. PE and Music teachers are not just teaching their content area, but also building relationships with students in our school outside of their specials class time. They support students during transitions, arrival and dismissal, and build relationships with our students for the 6 years they are at our school.

It is important that smaller schools do not lose their rich school experience because they live in an area with a smaller school population due to boundary lines.

\*Consolidate schools with under 300 students. If this isn't possible, focus on proportional funding.

\*Only 1 OA Staff for schools under 350 students.

\*Eliminate Para positions. - compare numbers at other school districts. Para job numbers have continued to grow over the past five years while our enrollment numbers have declined. However, you should keep additional Para support at all KF classrooms. This students have not been evaluated for SPED yet.

\*Academic coaches should become a priority - Fund them and decrease Paras.

\*Social Emotional Coaches are basically additional counselors

\*The number of TSS positions compared to other districts is high

\*Social workers caseloads are light based on the current model. Other districts utilized social workers through outside companies.

\*The Flex credit Program specialist is a Registrar. Reclassify the job as a Registrar. Could the Flex Credit position be covered by the Community School Registrar?

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Savings would be \$100,000

\*If the projected budget shortfall for the 26-27 school year is \$25,000,0000 why are you only cutting \$10,000,0000?

Centralizing certain staff doesn't make sense with the way schools function. Having a Behavioral Specialist who is only at a school three days a week because the school has too few students to meet a 1.0 FTE threshold eliminates continuity for the very students who rely on these safe adult relationships and undermines their effectiveness to an exponential degree. In contrast, having Social Workers reassigned to a regional model allows them to better support families with students in multiple schools and gives the families the same access to services. It is less essential for the Social Worker to be present in a particular school during the day than the Behavioral Specialist - many of the issues that are referred to them can be solved the same day or same week rather than needing intervention in the same minute the issue occurs.

Budget cuts are never easy decisions. In the times we live in now, Mental health has to be part of the school experience. Reducing or eliminating the professionals who provide this support would lead to lower school achievement, more students showing behavioral concerns, and fewer other staff positions due to burnout from taking on another job on top of their current titles.

!Superintendent Student Advisory Committee! Keep counselors in every school at all times. It is essential to the function of the building and the aid of teachers **ESPECIALLY** at the younger ages.

I work in education and truly don't believe any of these items should be cut. However, I think my priorities are with behavioral and social workers and counselors overall, and elementary supports (proportional staffing and elementary specialists) because if our district doesn't have strong support early in the primary years, we aren't starting strong for our students. Thank you for the considerations.

Cutting 6.5 positions from the Substance Use program is not "centralizing" the program, it is eliminating the program. There are currently only 7.5 positions total (which serve all district high schools and middle schools - far less than .5/school). The survey is misleading when the term "centralized" is used when the program is being eliminated.

I would do everything possible to preserve the teachers, specialists, counselors and social workers that are in direct contact with students and building rapport with individual campuses.

Making reductions to staff at the elementary level that support students in crisis and with big behaviors is going to have a huge impact on students. These positions run on the power of relationships and it is very hard to build a relationship when you aren't in the building every day. So far it has been unclear regarding the Elementary Specialists category (music/pe) if these reductions are targeted to current 1.0 FTE schools or to everyone. I would encourage the district to look at all schools. Just like there are music/pe teachers at 1.0 FTE schools with several open periods, the same is true at 1.5 and 2.0 FTE schools. If the 2.0 FTE school have 4 open periods and the 1.0 FTE school has 4 open periods, the larger school should also be experiencing a reduction in FTE. When making these reductions to specialists, I also strongly recommend consulting the Fine Arts TOSA on how specials schedules work. They are extremely complex and in order to preserve student access to 90 minutes of pe/music every 6 days, these reductions and possible new split positions will need to be made very carefully.

In light of the very strong possibility of future school consolidations, I also urge you to take into consideration the fact that having FTE reductions that impact music/pe/counselors at only small schools means that this same staff and student population could be impacted two years in a row. Is it possible to wait on FTE reductions and do it at the same time as school consolidations? This would be so much better for the school community as a whole and much less disruptive for the students, not to mention staff.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

In the United States, Oregon has the lowest rates of access to mental health care. For many students, the only way they are able to access these resources is through their school. Cutting funding for behavioral health and substance use programs would be detrimental to students well-being.

I believe that making social workers regional instead of in schools or sharing multiple schools puts people at risk for less access to care and to try to go get help more often. Because having social workers in person helps students talk to the social workers more easily.

Along with that I have a concern with the centralized substance abuse support instead of having them inside of schools will have a huge affect. Oregon already has a lack of access to care with adolescent substance abuse care when substance issues is third in the country. So with not having that in schools it'll have a big impact

Substance use support and behavioral health resources are extremely critical to students in the community.

it is very important that students can have access to substance abuse specialists as well as counselors and social workers to help guide them in day to day life and struggles that they might have going on, FLEX credit as well as others help students be able to get the help that they need to graduate and get an education, it benefits students who need extra support and in different languages. Cutting these programs as well as some others can and will really hurt many students

This will not be written as eloquently or clearly as I want but need to get ideas down so I can submit this.

As an employee it does not feel good to be pitting myself against my colleagues about who is most important.

Our needs in the high school make it clear that we need more (not less) in the elementary and middle school for support. Our SUS is constantly busy, as counselors we could not keep up with this case work along with the daily job.

The role of a HS counselor is so multi faceted that without the SUS, social worker and behavior specialists we would not be able to get anything done. We are being stretched in every direction with social emotional support, academic supports, post high school planning, letters of recommendation.

As many others have likely stated, this survey task is beyond frustrating and disrespectful. This is essentially pitting staff against each other all based on inaccurate information. Social workers are described incorrectly in this propaganda and are actually some of your most crucial staff. Social literally work on barriers to school attendance and should be seen as essential and actually revenue generating. Social workers pay for themselves and should be increased not constantly considered for cuts. Not having actual numbers for district office is downright offensive and tone-def.

If cuts have to be made, please go with a child first model and cut from the District Office first. Leave the Social Workers alone and keep the SUS team in the Option and High Schools where they are needed.

Social workers must be in buildings. This idea that they will be more efficient if a sits across multiple buildings just will make them less available to students who need them. Our social worker never stops, never slows.... and students know and love her which means trust which means they share when they need support.

Please stop phrasing each cut as some be new super efficient model that will be better than before! These are cuts and they will hurt and will leave gaps in buildings. This slick language is hurtful for those in these positions... implying the have somehow had it easy and now we're going to finally correct that by cutting 25 million dollars.

Low class size, particularly in elementary, needs to be preserved as well as behavior specialists, counselors, and coaches who support classroom teachers. Each year we are experiencing students who are more dysregulated, more neurodivergent, have lagging social skills, and are requiring more time, effort,

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

energy, and interventions to help them succeed. This isn't about Covid anymore, this is about a changing society and students with different needs than just a few years ago. Behaviors are affecting learning in our classrooms. Please protect class sizes. And avoid blended, splits, or multi-age classrooms in elementary. The teaching demands are too great to try to balance curriculum for two grade levels. Thanks for reading ;).

Consider decreasing or eliminating the Pre-K classrooms to bring back mental health supports to the elementary schools in social workers, behavior specialists and counselors. Consider negotiating cutting one day for next year. Consider school consolidations sooner, rather than later. Turn coaching positions into direct student support as their main focus.

Please cut counselors last. My building was without a fully functioning counselor for > 1 year, and this year we have 1 FT counselor. The POSITIVE DIFFERENCE for teachers, students, parents, admin AND support staff is EXCEPTIONALLY IMPACTFUL, and affects every aspect of student learning.

Is the Superintendent Interview Committee looking at reducing the superintendent's annual salary and no bonus? The average salary for an Oregon superintendent is under \$200K. We also need a superintendent who will stay and work with schools and not just implement pet projects and then leave after he gets his bonus.

If the TIAs, counselors, social workers, coaches and student success coaches all leave, who is going to do all the duties and cover staff plan time. We need our specialists!

Please consider each school's specific needs before implementing budget cuts. Schools vary widely in size, student demographics, and required levels of support. For instance, a larger school with higher needs may require additional counselor or social worker staffing compared to a smaller school with fewer identified needs.

Additionally, current staffing allocations do not always reflect workload differences. At present, all elementary schools receive a 1.0 Student Behavior Specialist (SBS), despite significant enrollment disparities. A school serving 300 students has substantially different behavioral and supervisory demands than a school serving 500 students, yet both receive the same allocation.

Reviewing and adjusting staffing ratios according to school size and need is essential for maintaining effective support systems and ensuring equitable service for all students.

I hope the district is not actually considering a cut to the important social work and counseling staffing. We need more, not less.

General concern with the overall impact that these reductions will have on the social-emotional aspect of school and impact on student's learning and teacher's ability to teach. While student enrollment has declined over the years; student and family trauma have continued to persist or increase over the years.

Why the financial implications may be lessened with the reduction of these roles, the unintended consequences might be the increased stress and workloads to teachers, counselors (who remain), social workers (who remain) and admin (especially single site admin) who must identify how to manage these support services with reduced SEL staffing. In order for students to learn, they must first come to school, then feel safe and supported once there, and then be open to learn. Staff who directly support SEL practices are responsible for the first to steps in school.

The cuts to counseling, social workers and SUSS is ridiculous

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Being in both a title 1 school and also non title 1 school, you see the effects of not having as many paras or less staffing. I think all personnel within the schools should not be changed heavily as many schools are struggling with the amount of time students and teachers can utilize any extra help. At my school especially the needs outweigh the amount of help we have. My current school is not a title 1, thus why we have a lesser amount of resources. I think the behavioral specialists we have at my school are truly vital and losing them would make the role of the teacher much more overwhelmed than we already are.

A lot of these cuts hit elementary the hardest, and especially smaller schools. You cannot assume that because of numbers of students there are less or more needs academically, behaviorally, emotionally. Having a model, albeit a weighted model, does not work if you don't know the actual students and teachers and their needs. My concern is that it will not be equitable, no matter what model you use unless looking at the actual people. If we shift to having smaller grade levels get less teachers, even sometimes just 1 teacher with 30 students, then that affects the teachers and students at every grade level. This year 2nd grade loses a teacher, but will need 2 teachers the following year when 3rd grade loses a teacher. This is terrible for everyone. Also, we need more support from our specialists, not less. Even at smaller schools, we need full time specials teachers, social workers, counselors, and academic and behavior specialists. Having part time or sharing with other schools has been a hardship for all. I work at a school with one full time counselor, but with the growing emotional needs from our elementary students, we could really use more than one counselor.

First, I would like to say thank you for your service to our school community. I am writing to share my concern about recent communications from our school regarding possible cuts due to budget constraints. To be clear, I understand that balancing a budget requires hard choices, but I'm concerned about the way the situation is being communicated.

At the end of the newsletter that goes out on Friday afternoons, our principal shared a link to a slideshow that had been discussed at a PTO meeting and contained the link to this survey, and the names of staff members whose positions would be at risk of being cut. In fairness, there are likely budget-related communications that I'm not aware of, but I wanted to share my experience with receiving communications from [REDACTED]. I was surprised to see that there was no acknowledgment of the difficulty of these choices, and the real impact these choices will make, not only on the livelihood of these dedicated staff members, but also on the quality of education for the entire school community.

I feel it is disrespectful to both the staff members whose positions may be cut, and particularly to the school community at large, to share that information publicly without a word of regret. My aim in sending this email is to make sure that the district is doing all that they can to communicate the reality of these choices to parents, and to actually encourage their participation in decision making. Burying a survey link in a pre-holiday Friday newsletter seems like a poor way to solicit robust community input, and I hope this was not by design.

In addition to sharing this feedback, I would also love to better understand how the district is planning to protect the students at small schools from feeling a disproportionate effect of upcoming cuts. I realize small schools may be especially at risk of losing services in the name of serving the greatest number of students, and I am concerned that small schools may be de facto targeted for cuts in order to make the larger schools seem more appealing in the long run. It is not equitable for current students to lose an excessive amount of the quality of their education as a result of past long-term planning challenges, even if it is a (relatively) small number of students, and I am wondering how this will be balanced with all the various challenges the district is facing.

Finally, I cannot help but sing the praises of the staff members who did not get their due regard in the communication we received. I've included my thoughts below in order to keep this reasonably brief, and you are welcome to read my thoughts about them if you like.

Thank you for all that you do to support the wonderful children of this district and the staff that serves them.

Cordially, [REDACTED]

--

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

All of these staff members bring high levels of dedication and expertise to their work and the quality of the education our children receive would be impacted negatively without them. [REDACTED], our school counselor, seems to have a magic ability to be in twelve places at once, and has the confident self-assurance with a side of humor that you would want to have in any leader who is heading into solve daily crises and get kids ready to learn, as I know she does. [REDACTED], behavioral specialist, was a clear-eyed and warm supporter of my son when he was anxious during his kindergarten year, and is an obvious favorite among quiet kids or underdog types at the school who might otherwise be overlooked and a resource for teachers who have so many kids who need support in order to be ready to learn. [REDACTED], intervention teacher, has a calm demeanor that disarms the most rowdy seven year olds with ease and warmth, and while she was my son's second grade teacher a couple years ago, helped change his mind about school being a stressful place into a place where he might have fun and learn things he enjoyed. Our "specials" teachers, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] bring a much-appreciated balance to a mostly-female staff, and both go above and beyond to provide enriching experiences for students that make school a place that children feel they belong. Our school's music education program is an invaluable service that most of the children at [REDACTED] would not receive elsewhere, and I have been so grateful for my son to have it, as research tells us how music education boosts learning and brain development, not just in music but in STEM, collaboration, and creative thinking. PE with [REDACTED] is my son's favorite part of the day, and I feel the value of physical education cannot be underestimated. While I have not had cause to interact with our school's social worker, [REDACTED], I can imagine the importance of the services she provides, particularly given the diverse backgrounds of our school's population, and helping students have the basics they need to be ready to learn benefits the entire school community.

Less funding for dual language programs, please! Dual language has taken up a lot of funding and resources for programs that most people did not ask for. We need more behavior supports and specialized program placements available. Too many students are being denied placements because there isn't enough room. This causes schools to use counselors, admin, student success coaches, para 1's, and kinder para's as 1:1's, which means less support for other students. Beaverton is seeing an increase of students with needs coming from other school districts. We need to focus on where the need is and stop pushing funding into dual language. A good question is why is that not on the list of things to be cut but staff members that provide behavior supports are?

Proportional staffing is a loaded phrase. A fair distribution of students and teachers is proportional. Cutting staff and increasing everyone's workload/caseload may be done "proportionally," but that does not mean it is the right thing to do. I can not prioritize the needs of students who benefit from the services listed above. Cut out waste? Yes. Cut staff who are not performing to expectations? Yes. But please don't punish the students or the staff who are working diligently every day to better the lives of these students.

Please take into consideration Title 1 school needs for items such as Instructional coaches, Behavioral specialists, counselors, and social workers. Those jobs are not just about the number of staff or students. The impact that the needs of our student population has plays a major role in what those staff members take on in their daily work.

The non-classroom teachers in an elementary school are crucial to the overall success of the school and to a positive student experience. Having these people be in a building less than full time will have a serious detrimental effect on our students. The behavior response team of the counselors and behavior specialists is more necessary than ever with the extreme behaviors and trauma students are exhibiting. The specialists provide a stable long-term relationship for students throughout their elementary experience and many students who struggle academically, emotionally, or behaviorally thrive in music and/or PE class. Those specials schedules are often very complex and having a teacher who is less than full time in the building may cause unintended reductions in how much PE and music minutes students are accessing.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

The rate of substance use disorder among Oregon youth ranks third in the country, and in the past six years, 348 Oregonians aged 15 to 24 died from accidental drug overdose. That's enough to fill more than 15 high school classrooms. Early intervention saves money, improves outcomes, and keeps students connected to school. Investing in student well-being is not optional. It is foundational to academic achievement, school safety, and the long-term health of our community. We urge the reconsideration of this decision and to prioritize the resources that directly support our students' mental, emotional, and behavioral health. Maintaining the Substance Use Specialist position is not just a budget choice, it is a commitment to the safety and success of every student in our district.

I think there are ways to not completely remove things like social workers and SUSs but have one per region or one between a few schools that could result in savings but not reduce to pre-pandemic levels. We should also look at the admin calendar and reduce a day or two. Finally, many of these proposals reduce services for our most at risk students. We need to look at what class size increases looks like with the levy and perhaps an additional cut.

The entire district is over-employed. We have more PE, Music and Tech teachers, Para1, academic coaches and TOSA's, then we have classroom teachers and Para II and III. Meanwhile our state test scores are falling and we now rank at the bottom of the nations. Why are we over-funding the Administration and general education, when it's sinking. If a Para is not willing to go into special education, they shouldn't be in education.

This budget reads like you are tone deaf to what is going on in the world and blind to what our kids and adults are facing every day. In this chaotic world, you want to rid students of vital supports when so many other community supports are getting slashed? Kids need to learn skills and build relationships with positive adults, sometimes that is the only thing that gets them to school. When being one of forty in a classroom, the specialized supports you are proposing cutting takes away staff who have the capacity to form one on one relationships with students who need it. Centralizing or putting them in a regional model only ensures that these important staff are not in buildings to build relationships.

Can there please be a review of the pre-school/pre-K program to see if it still fits into the budget? With mental health and education of students on the line it feels like we should not be prioritizing pre-K.

Our students will not be successful without enough staff + staff support to ensure academic progress and social and behavioral support. Please do not cut school staff positions at the elementary level when academic, special education, and behavioral supports are critical to the success of the student in the long term!

I hope the district truly uses a lens of equity when the decisions (in this case, for cuts) are made. I have had concerns that the district uses such language, but hasn't lived up to the talk.

School boundaries, school sizes, staffing, class sizes, PTCs' abilities to financially support their schools (PTCs at schools with greater percentage low-SES status & lower funds at schools with higher needs supporting programs, including additional specialized SPED programs, while schools with smaller percentage low-SES status & greater PTC funds at schools with fewer needs, and often don't have such additional programs to support)...

Proportional Staffing: Elementary Classroom Teachers

It is news to me that the district's current practice is guaranteeing every elementary school has at least two classrooms per grade level regardless of how many students are enrolled! With lower and lower enrollment, this just seems ridiculous. So if a grade level has only 24 students (or even less), they still get 2 teachers? Yes, that would certainly be inequitable, unfair, and a frivolous spending of money! At our school last year, English-only classes were ½ the size of the

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

no-cap Dual Immersion classes and near the size of the ISC classes. While at smaller schools, parents continue to boast of regular small-class sizes, a current DI kindergarten class is at 27. I had incorrectly assumed the district already assigned teachers based on actual student enrollment at each site. Clearly this is an example of how equity had been a term tossed around loosely with actions not matching the claims!

**Regional Social Worker Model**

I hope BSD asked the Social Workers what they feel is the best way to serve our community. It seems fair to say that families who have an elementary student and a middle schooler could work with just one social worker rather than one at each school. Our elementary school, with a student population over 500 and 46% (over 230 students) experiencing poverty, I can only assume that our social worker has a significant caseload. If school websites are accurate, I see two elementary schools (Ridgewood and Cedar Mill) with similar populations to each other with close to 340 students each and 15-16% poverty rates (109 students combined) share a social worker.

**Proportional Staffing: Counselors**

See comments for the last 2! I feel like the language in these proposals is either dishonest or the district has been failing to follow any sort of standard of equity! How are staffing measures not determined by need already?!

**Centralized Instructional Technology Support**

Are you saying get rid of Technology specials in elementary school or having less tech helpers for the teachers? All I know is that I felt my child last year (1st grade) was using an ipad for far too much of her school day (half of a math period, plus literacy which didn't even include computer or ipad use in Tech Specials) or was wasting time because the ipad wasn't charged or was having other issues. I was grateful that our Tech teacher did not have them on computers for the entire Specials time, but had other STEM activities to do. We didn't even have our child use a device at home all year and we felt her amount of time on tech was far too much last year (coming from a past 1st grade teacher and software engineer as parents). Kids got an overabundance of screen time during COVID and the data shows kids are now suffering from that. We did not send our child to school to get more tech time; we want her to interact and collaborate with peers. Another concern is the lack of fine motor development as kids are pecking at a screen rather than using a pencil/math manipulatives etc. Even as our student ages, we don't see the need to put kids in front of a screen (no matter how "academic" the app is) as the way to get differentiation checked off a list.

Furthermore, it seemed that our child was never individually assessed in reading other than online with STAR & multiple choice questions. We received only papers that listed scores of where our child was academically rather than having a teacher's true perspective on our learner. This seems absurd in the elementary level.

**Proportional Staffing: Elementary Specialists**

Once again, I am shocked how you are now advocating for "fair". If that means equitable, that should have been a guiding word all along!

**Proportional Staffing: Instructional Coaches**

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

I would argue that, if we are going to keep instructional coaches, 1: they need to be high-quality coaches, 2: they should be distributed not simply by the number of classroom teachers but also how many NEWER teachers on the staff are. Our child's 1st year teacher last year could've benefited from some coaching on classroom management, but that could've/should've also come from admin walkthroughs/feedback rather than necessarily having extra staff. I don't see TOSAs on the list and wonder how critical they are when "on special assignment" is as clear as it gets.

Proportional Staffing: Behavioral Specialists

With significant disruptive behaviors on the rise, I can't imagine reducing specialists in this area!

I think we need to prioritize learning/reading specialists, reading intervention programs, Inatructional coaches, behavioral specialists, staffing for teachers and counselors.

I feel that student behaviors are ramping up as technology use becomes more common. Paraeducators and behavior specialists are extremely vital in helping the gen. ed classroom to run without major interruptions. If you were to cut behavior specialists, or the amount of paraeducators in elementary schools, I feel that all students would be negatively impacted.

Thank you for trying to provide us with cuts across the board and for making hard decisions. With that being said, I have a few thoughts.

If all of these cuts go through, elementary schools will be hit the hardest. Right now, teachers are barely hanging on with our toughest students, and that is with the full time help of behavior specialists and counselors, with our instructional coaches and social workers stepping in. This is at EVERY building. If those supports are taken away, I fear there will be a massive exodus at every level. The work is that demanding and exhausting.

Students are running around buildings, tearing down bulletin boards, being disruptive by hitting other students, making crazy noises, screaming for attention. This is not an exaggeration: just a fact that many people do not realize or will not see. These budget cut suggestions hurt every child, as the children who are most ready to learn are kept from learning by the students who need these extra supports. And that is WITHOUT cuts.

This leads me to elementary specialist cuts. It is vital that music & PE teachers are assigned to schools with increments of 0.5 FTE rather than shaving our assignments into smaller fractions. It makes scheduling and sharing staff between two schools more straightforward for administrators and staff. Carving positions into smaller FTE could lead to a lot of churn in staffing, possible retention issues, and yearly transfers. BSD is known for its support of music especially, and our music educators are some of the finest around. We run the risk of music and PE teachers leaving our district or the profession as a whole if they are forced to be at too many schools. Each music and PE teacher knows their students and what they need to keep them safe and valued, and to give them the best experience possible.

Which leads me to my final request. Please RETAIN the precedent of having a full time elementary music and PE specialist at each elementary school. BSD is known for this and proud of it! These teachers are often at the heart of each school for community building and consistency. These teachers know EVERY student and follow them K-6. They build relationships in a different and important way that helps students thrive from year to year. If you cut these positions to .5, services will be lost to these students. For example: choir, recorder clubs, intramural sports, field days, musicals, grade level programs, cross-curricular work with classroom teachers, sing-along assemblies and programs that bring in guest experts. Teachers will not be there full time to make these programs

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

happen. Leaving just a part time music and PE teacher at small elementary schools damages relationships, denies opportunities and affects building community for staff, students and teachers alike.

If specialist cuts must happen, please look at the larger schools as well as the smaller ones to make the best choices possible for our students. Smaller schools are feeling targeted and just want the process to be fair. Also, please consider delaying cuts until after school consolidation has taken place in order to avoid transferring elementary teachers multiple times in consecutive years. We will lose too many incredibly talented educators.

Thank you for listening.

I understand the the student enrollment across the district is down, but as a parent of four students in BSD, and a BSD alumni myself, I will say that I think there are multiple reasons the enrollment is down that are not listed in your analysis. Yes, birth rates are down, but I truly don't think that is the main reason for less students enrolled. For the past few I have watched more and more families decide to enroll in private schools or choose alternative programs (such has a hybrid, online school, or home school) because they feel like there is a continued push of a political ideology on our children that is not appropriate. I understand that ODE sets certain standards that BSD has to align with, but it becomes a little much when our 7 year old brings home a library book with inappropriate content, and every middle school classroom we walk into has a trans flag posted at the door. Instead of teaching kindness and a sense of belonging, our children feel like they need to be a vocal advocate or they are a bad person, and I don't feel like that is their job as a student. Not all students want the opposite gender in their bathroom or locker room, and it is becoming an uphill battle. I am very active in the schools as far as volunteering, on the PTC boards, etc, and I review content very thoroughly, and have had to speak up or question things my kids are going to hear or do hear consistently. I am a big fan of public education. I grew up here, I'm a health professional in our community, and I have four children. I will tell you that my sentiments are very common in our community, and if it doesn't improve, you will lose more families like mine. We have been so happy with our teachers and the academic experience our kids have had, but I will tell you, it is some of the curriculum content that is concerning--for example in health ENCOURAGING 11 year olds to not identify with their gender. There are so many videos that are approved curriculum videos for BSD that I have reviewed that are not age appropriate. There is a sense of urgency hear to listen to ALL families here. We feel our voices are silenced because we are not the minority, and it gets very frustrating. My son came home in tears in sixth grade that he was told he had white privilege. We had three kids in elementary school who were going through a kindness month, and were going to watch a video where a 6 year old was going to tell the audience that "cops squash black people like bugs". These are not acceptable! After multiple meetings with our pirncipal, she opted to play a different video, but I shouldn't have to fight for my children to feel safe in their community and respect police officers. It is exhausting to continually have to fight for what we feel is age appropriate or our children to hear. They are very impressionable at a young age. We preach equity throughout BSD but there is also not an equitable experience in celebrating holidays, such as Valentines day. Neighboring elementary schools get to have parties, and ours isn't allowed to. I think it is very important to keep behavioral specialists in proportion with necessity. That is another experience we've had. Our daughter was continually physically abused by a student in kindergarten, but it took a full year to get him removed from the school after multiple meetings, etc. I understand that there is FAPE, but my daughter has the right to FAPE just as much as that student, and if there are less people to aid these students, there will be more behavior issues that occur. Even with all of our negative experiences, we will continue to fight for BSD and public education. It just feels frustrating that our tax dollars are paying for their education and there are things that don't represent what we believe in at our children's expense. I realize this survey isn't about curriculum, and the budget, but please listen to all of your community to continue to serve all families, or more families will leave, and BSD will continue to struggle financially.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

i am appalled that we are considering cutting so many positions, such as social workers and counselors. How is it that district jobs are not listed as the most important cuts? How is it that programs that we pay for like AVID or Raptor are not in this list ahead of such important staff members? The class sizes and caseloads for teachers, social workers and counselors are already way too much. Our children are going to feel these cuts the most. The district should only cut things that don't affect the ones working directly with children.

Also, I almost put the list in the wrong order - my first thought was to put the most important thing at the top. I KNOW that other people may have done this. I hope not, but I had to catch myself and then put the most important thing at the bottom. I know others may have done a backwards order accidentally because of this gut feeling to put the most important at the top. Please change the way you do this survey for next time. Put something in there that makes sure people know you want the most important thing at the bottom. Yes, it's in the directions above, but this survey made me feel very emotional and my emotional response was to put social workers and counselors at the top, but I meant for them to be the most important things.

The social workers in the building and the substance use specialist are constantly working together with the at risk youth we serve at aloha high school. We've done groups and interventions that are crucial for our students and we'd like to continue this. It would be difficult for our school to function without two full time district social workers and the substance use specialist. Thank you.

Proposed cuts would disproportionately affect elementary students and especially those at smaller schools if only based on population size and not on actual need/caseload within schools. You are also proposing a lot of cuts to services that support students with mental health when the district has emphasized that it is supposedly a priority to support these kids .

Social workers and counselors are of paramount importance to supporting our students. Especially given the district's focus on equity, the increase in behavioral support needs since the pandemic, and the impact of ICE on our communities, it feels gravely important to safeguard the positions that most support both our students in need and their families.

Please do not cut student access to counselors and social workers. Education is more than classroom learning. It should be a system that meets the social, emotional, and educational needs of students. That's takes collaboration between all the members of the team. Please don't cut supports and classroom teachers from our schools.

Classroom teachers should be prioritized. With lower class sizes, students are likely to feel support from their classroom teacher(s) and additional support structures are required to a lesser extent. Social workers; however, are an important resource to ensure students are able to have the structures in place to show up for school, ready to learn and have the ability to bond with their teacher(s).

In our experience, administration is not supportive of counselor opinions and disregards their recommendations. In our experience, counselors have made promises that were not able to be kept because of administrative decision making. Because of this tension, the lack of authority in the counseling position, and because the administration has the last say, I find counseling less of a funding priority.

I'm truly sorry, but PLEASE read my extremely long remonstrance (I really hope this word means what I think it is, which should be a polite, formal reasoning). I understand that BSD's decision to remove the use of external courses for credit is due to the declining budget. However, you have to understand the reason why all of a sudden, so many students are trying to do external courses. It's because it's been changed so that we have to take so many pre-selected courses throughout freshmen and sophomore years so that we have to cram everything into the remaining two years. This does not help us grow, and this isn't the "wiser" thing to do for the sake of the students. There are a lot of smart kids in the district that are desperate to take the classes they need. They are passionate to get things done, and to get the future they need or want, depending on the scenario. You may think preventing sophomores from having any

## 2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS

February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026

space to take APs is helping them not fail classes, but this will only make us suffer later on. High school is short. With only two years of space to shove as many classes as we can, it is practically impossible to get anything done. The fact that sophomores have five mandatory classes when I could be taking classes like AP Chem and AP Lang and have so much more freedom for the rest of high school is so limiting and impossible to work around. I truly believe that you shouldn't limit the entire high school with all these required, set courses (ex: STEM Chem, Lit & Comp 10, US History, etc., these things should be a CHOICE) because if I'm being honest, I am highly concerned with my future, and how I will manage to make my application look decent in two years. Freshman year, I understand. Sophomore year is completely different. As a result, you only have two years to fit in as many classes as you can, and I'm sure you know this very well, and I completely respect that. But from my perspective, there is so, so much and the list just doesn't seem to end. I'm trying desperately to impress the colleges. Required Career Education and Higher Ed? This is just for me personally, but I am positive that they will not be helpful for me, when I need as much space as possible. You're welcome to dismiss me for being annoying and overestimating myself by saying this, sorry. If you couldn't tell, I am highly career-oriented, but I'm also afraid I'm going too far by writing this, so sorry for overstepping. But again, this is all up to you. All I'm asking is for a change. With all these requirements and restrictions placed on my transcript, I and many others are racking our brains as we turn to our solution, which is, at this point, our key to fitting at least one more AP class in; this being external courses. And that is probably the reason everyone keeps bothering the counselors about them. Two years is not enough space. I'm not saying you should necessarily allow us to take external courses freely, but instead, I'm asking for you to place TRUST in us. Trust us to make the decisions we need, and to take responsibility for the challenging classes we chose. Remove the mandatory, pre-selected courses that were chosen without much consideration for our thoughts, needs, preferences, opinions and passions, and allow us to take the science class, the social studies class, or whatever class we need, as long as we fulfill the credits. The need for taking external courses will be gone if we have the space, and the freedom, to take the courses we need at school. All students are different. Please don't generalize every student in the district to being incapable of being challenged sophomore, or even freshman year. Thank you. And one last thing: being told that I am unable to take any APs as a sophomore other than a mere one or two options made me feel a bit dumb, like I was indirectly being told that I am unfit to take classes that challenge me, or be allowed to have responsibility over how I spend my time here. The prioritization of juniors and seniors was clear, and I'm not saying that's wrong, of course. I'm just trying to point out that for some, they need to be completely committed from the very beginning, something that should be encouraged. People don't just change dramatically from sophomore to junior year, and all of a sudden they are able to go from having no APs as a sophomore to having AP classes back-to-back. Some people come straight from middle school ready to start, and some like being eased in, upping the challenge level every year. Personally, what makes this so anxious is the fact that I have the urge to do the classes that I need to do as fast as possible. Do it now, not later. Thinking about all the things I'll need to do as soon as I exit sophomore year is, quite simply, terrifying. Moving on, please hold us accountable for our choices, and welcome the different mindsets that people hold as they begin high school. I would love to welcome a change before we head on to next year!

On a side note: As a student who knows absolutely nothing about how schools work and why this is happening, please take the things I said with a grain of salt, except for when I talk about how the set courses leaving only two years for everything is making me STRUGGLE. And if you actually read all this, I am so sorry. This was such a horrible rant, and it's not even about the budget, really. I'm horrible at budgeting. And it would really suck if you decided to change it when I'm already done with my sophomore year. In that case, I'll probably write another really long rant.

Taking away mental health and substance use supports under the guise of shifting to a "regional model" and "centralizing support" without actual plans and the input of those people who actually work those jobs is incredibly misleading and harmful. It makes it feel like the district is trying to mislead the public by making it sound promising when in reality vital supports are being taken away from the most vulnerable students. Taking social workers out of schools and doing a "regional model" only gives social workers time to resource manage if given multiple schools. Resource management and coordination is only a small

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

part of what social workers do. Realistically social workers do so much more and provide direct support of students, families, AND staff, often supporting overworked counseling teams. Additionally social workers do even more with skill building and behavior management. It's a shame the district shows their priorities with these budget cuts and the placement of positions in this survey.

Hopefully I understood the instructions. Basically, keep services that support teachers and mental health for students. Release online/credit/options stuff first.

Reducing the Substance Use Program to one position (cutting 6.5 positions from a total of 7.5) does not make a centralized team - it eliminates a program. Very misleading.

Having counselors and social workers is extremely crucial, please do not cut the budgets for that. Additionally, based on some high school clubs I am in, we really need to continue with middle school clubs. These clubs are very important for their education.

Get rid of the billions of fraud in the state given to fake non profits organized by the horrific party running this state and there would be plenty of money. Not to mention the horrific teachings to dumb the children down and groom them. The children should be a focus of growth absolutely not what is happening now. Its disgusting. We will be home schooling or going to a christiaan school hopefully the rest of my child's education. Go woke go broke is an actual thing. Look at the businesses leaving the state, also part of the schools problems.

Teach don't have behavior specialists. That isn't the schools job. Thats the parents. Schools have overstepped their rolls and parents have gotten lazy. Its ridiculous.

get rid of the social services through social workers and start pushing social services out into the community. We have 100s of NGO's and other resources to deal with social services. Public schools need to get back to their primary duty, which is educating students.. We need to focus on maintaining low teacher to student classroom ratios as the primary focus.

It is incredibly important that students have access to their behavioral health professionals (substance use specialists and social workers) in their schools for ongoing rapport building to improve their effectiveness and efficiency, especially at the secondary level. It would be nice to have clear line items for budget items at the District office.

Counseling support should not be reduced. Every school should have at least one counselor. There already are insufficient counseling staff to manage needs.

Counselors are a very important part of a school. I hope they are the least impacted.

Please please please do not make any changes to our counselor, social worker or Specials (music, PE) teaching staff. The counselor in particular is doing HEROIC work at the school. Kids in over-filled classrooms need an outlet. Music, PE and counseling provides that. It's ESSENTIAL. These teachers are the face of the school. They unite the student body because everyone knows them. This fosters a sense of community, rather than silo'ed classrooms and vague connections to part-time staff. Please do everything possible to keep these amazing people.

Please prioritize protecting student-facing staffing in elementary schools and option schools. Cuts in K-5 have outsized long-term impact (class size stability, early literacy/math foundations, behavior support), and option schools are often small by design—purely “proportional” staffing can unintentionally make these programs non-viable even when they serve high-need students well.

If reductions are necessary, please start with non-classroom efficiencies (centralization/coordination, reducing duplication, district-level overhead) before reducing classroom teachers and the core supports that keep schools safe and functioning (counselors, behavioral support, essential specialists).

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

When applying the equity lens, please ensure it considers not only where needs are concentrated, but also program viability floors (minimum staffing needed to operate safely and effectively) so small schools/programs aren't disproportionately burdened. Clear guardrails—like class size targets and minimum counseling/behavior support access—would help families understand what BSD is protecting.

Us at the community school need our counselors. [REDACTED] and everyone else is crucial to our education.

I go to ISB, and I really appreciate having a social worker completely dedicated to our students. Social workers make incredible connections with the students, and I truly think that the district should take into account the impact they have on students, especially through the transition into adulthood. I know myself and many others would be disappointed to see social workers, who are extremely dedicated to their job, be let down by the budget cuts.

The options presented in this survey appear to disproportionately affect mental health services and direct student support. This is particularly concerning at a time when schools are experiencing a significant increase in student mental health needs. The positions being considered for reduction are the very roles that enable classroom teachers to concentrate on instruction. Removing or scaling back these highly skilled professionals will negatively affect students and staff across the district.

Budget reductions should prioritize areas that do not directly impact student learning or mental health services. Additionally, it is unclear why no specific details are provided regarding proposed District Office reductions.

The description of the social work role is also misleading. School social workers serve as a critical bridge between home, school, and community. They provide both direct and indirect services to students, families, and staff to support academic achievement and social-emotional well-being. This work frequently includes Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions delivered within the school setting. Transitioning to a regional model would significantly limit social workers' ability to provide consistent, responsive support at the same level.

Social workers, along with school counselors and behavior specialists (formerly student success coaches), play essential roles in supporting students. Relationship-building is foundational to this work, and reducing a social worker's presence within a school will hinder their ability to build and maintain meaningful relationships with students, families, and staff.

Do not cut counselor and substance abuse, curriculum, and staff! COVID has Lasting effects on many of our youth locally!! Our youth are struggling

As a parent of a High School Student and Staff Member in the Counseling Office at a High School, I see first hand how much the SUS, Social Workers, and Counselors do for our Students and Community. Cutting these positions is ridiculous and would only exacerbate the problems students and families face daily. In the long run this would create more problems the district would have to try to fix later and would end up costing more money than they would try to save in cutting these positions.

I've been a middle school teacher for about 10 years in the District and I have many questions about the real impacts of the reductions that are listed on the website. I wonder what caseloads are like for the positions that will be cut because I haven't heard any of my colleagues say that they have reasonable caseloads. Most teachers I know have at least one class that is over 30 students, and the specialists, SPED, Social Workers, and Counselors I know have large caseloads so making cuts to these positions will not only stress their positions, but add stress to classroom teachers and building administrators. I greatly appreciate, and am proud that BSD is using the Equity Lens, and is clear about what that is- so thank you so much for prioritizing that! I like the slide that

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

shows the percentage of the General Fund that funds each type of staffing position, and I would like to see what the percentages look like when we take into account all of the funding sources. I am looking forward to seeing the input you get from different stakeholders and how the input is taken into account when a decision is made.

We need more Counselor support, not less. I've been in this district teaching since 1999, and there is more need now than ever to have more Counselor support. Their skill set, their connections and resources, their daily intervention and assistance in kids lives is undeniable and invaluable. We need them!!!

As a classroom teacher of 30 years, I can't imagine having any less of our Counselor or Social Work support than we do now! That would be devastating!! Our Counselors are such a vital part of our work with kids in the classroom and in the school. As it is, we need more Counselors especially in our school!!

From what I have seen at schools, support staff, counselors, social workers, and specialists often spend some or most of their day on walkie responding to urgent issues across the school. Dividing them among schools regionally will probably lower schools' abilities to respond to emergent situations and decrease safety. This is why I included them last on my priority ranking. Thanks for your consideration.

Cutting counselors, social workers, and behavioral specialists will cause a major disruption to our schools and their support of students with Tier 2-3 needs as well as have an impact on resources supporting all of Tier 1. Any efforts to reduce this reduction are preferable.

Small class sizes in Elementary where kids needs are met, plans are made to assist with struggles (academic, social, emotional), and teachers can give students what they need time wise will roll up to everything being easier as the students age (higher test scores, better mental health, less behavior problems, etc.) aka less resources needed which means less funding required later on.

I've worked with substance use support for a couple years and found it very help full i used to have an addiction and substance use support helped me get over during the time. i knew i didnt need rehab because i had their support. the substance support are very important to the schools.

Why is there no option to eliminate the Mandarin program? This is a luxury item that we cannot afford. What problem is this program solving? In West Linn/Wilsonville, cutting the program amounted to 500,000 in savings. I understand that this would not solve our budget problems, however, the optics on this are awful. Maintaining (and looking to expand) luxury programs in a time when all of our students are going to be receiving less is not going to be well received.

In addition, why are we not looking at limiting the existing Spanish programs where there is lower enrollment? When programs were sitting at 14-15 children per class earlier this year, how can we justify this? Perhaps there are cost savings that could be applied. Has this been examined?

Instead, we are going to cut vital counseling and behavioral services in a time when we are seeing more pervasive and extreme behaviors from our kids, K-12. The idea that small schools could have half time behavioral specialists and counselors is appalling.

We are also seeing abysmal literacy rates in Oregon, and yet, we are potentially cutting our academic coaches and, again, impacting smaller schools with grade level teams of 1 or blends. Neither of these is considered best practices for instruction.

Furthermore, why are we cutting an EGC program when we are only seeing more students in need of this level of support? Adding para support is not a substitute for essential programs and experts.

We know that substance use among adolescents is a documented and growing challenge nationwide, and our district is no exception. Middle and high school students are navigating an era of unprecedented pressures: academic expectations, trauma, family stress, family separation and easy access to harmful substances. Removing a dedicated professional who is trained to support students through these challenges leaves a significant gap at precisely the moment when the need is highest.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

A Substance Use Specialist provides early intervention, prevention education, confidential support, and a trusted relationship for students who may have nowhere else to turn. They help students stay in school, stay engaged, and stay safe. Educators, administrators, and families rely on this role to identify concerns early and to help the student get the support they need. Without this support, we risk more students falling through the cracks, disruptions to learning, and more preventable harm.

Investing in student well-being is not optional. It is foundational to academic achievement, school safety, and the long-term health of our community. We urge the reconsideration of this decision and to prioritize the resources that directly support our students' mental, emotional, and behavioral health. Maintaining the Substance Use Specialist position is not just a budget choice, it is a commitment to the safety and success of every student in our district.

Working in a small school our jobs are not limited to our role. As BH&W staff we take on numerous other duties, supporting behavior, extra duties, conflict management and mental health needs. Our BH&W team is small but we collaborate to get the job and tasks done and support each other. Also as a smaller school we do not have an assistant principal in our building to help with behavior management supports.

If cuts are based off of numbers, the buildings with smaller schools will be impacted and potentially there will not be a BH&W team that is consistent. Despite our small enrollment we have a significant need including behavior, suicide ideation, homelessness, mental health, food scarcity, students experiencing neglect at home. It takes a village to give our students the support they need to be able to learn. Cutting our support staff (BH&W team members) will be impact all staff; (admin, teachers, and sped team) everyone will be burdened by this. It feels like the elementary schools are taking the biggest hit when we know early intervention has the best outcomes (it feels inequitable) to set students for success. Cutting staff would affect our school leadership program in our building, availability of the wellness room, and school wide initiatives, and academic and behavioral interventions, food drives/pantry which would greatly affect our students and families. All of these items make school school safe and students feel loved. If cuts happen especially with BH&W staff, my fear is that family partnerships and student relationships will not be able to happen at the depth they are currently at. Question: I am curious, if cuts occur, when will staff be notified that they are getting cut? Will there be opportunity to stay in the district? How does this align with internal job fairs that occur at the end of the year and budget timeline?

I believe the logistics and structural integrity of this proposal are closely tied to the expectations and job model assigned to each role. of all of the proposed regional positions move to a regional model, then the work inherently shifts from direct service delivery to primarily care coordination.

While a coordination-focused model may be more feasible at the elementary level, it becomes significantly more complex at the middle and high school levels, where student needs are more immediate, layered, and intensive. In those settings, direct service is often essential to maintaining student safety, mental health stability, and consistent school engagement.

I want to respectfully advocate for clarity around expectations. If these roles are structured regionally, we need to be transparent about how that impacts direct student access to services and what supports may be reduced or delayed. It is important that any structural change accounts for developmental differences across grade levels and ensures that students with higher-acuity needs continue to receive timely, meaningful intervention, not solely coordination.

Having behavioral and counseling support full time in each school is extremely important.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

There should be no mental health or behavior interventionists cut (ie: social workers, psychs, counselors). The behaviors in school have only increased and become more aggressive interrupting learning for others. Teaching and low student ratio also should be protected, especially with increased behavior needs. It goes without saying that student supports are pivotal to offering an education to all students. When students are struggling it often takes the building of solid relationships with counselors and/or social workers who work with those students to get them on the right track. Reducing these support staff won't make the need for support magically disappear, it will put that load on teachers and other staff such as principals. When a child is disrupting a classroom and the staff who specialize in diffusing those situations are in another building it will then become the responsibility of the teacher who should be focusing on teaching. Cuts need to happen, absolutely but if Beaverton decided to shut down all of its fire stations except one to save money would you vote for that? Probably not especially if you lived far away from it.

want to share my deep concern about the direction of the proposed budget reductions and their impact on students.

The cuts being considered — particularly to mental health supports, student services, and programs designed to remove barriers — will directly affect students' ability to access school and succeed. Increasing class sizes while reducing specialized supports feels misaligned with our stated commitment to equity and student well-being.

Enrollment trends have been declining for years, and PERS contribution rates are known in advance. Given these predictable factors, I struggle to understand how we arrived at a position requiring reductions of this magnitude. It is also difficult to reconcile reductions to direct student services without clearer evidence that administrative and executive-level adjustments have been meaningfully explored.

We have launched initiatives to better support students, only to scale them back when funding becomes unstable. This pattern makes it difficult to build sustainable systems and erodes confidence in long-term planning.

I am sharing this not simply as a reaction to this year's reductions, but as an expression of concern about the structural approach to budgeting and sustainability. The students who rely on these services will feel these impacts most acutely.

I believe we owe them stronger long-term planning and a clearer alignment between our fiscal decisions and our stated values.

The written plan for substance use specialists and social workers is framed to make a "centralized model" and "regional model" sound great to the public and to people who may not fully understand what these positions do. For substance use, you are not proposing a centralized model, you are proposing gutting an entire program and leaving one person to handle every referral for every school. The substance use specialists not only handle referrals, and refer to outside agencies, they also provide in school support, health class education, parent education, and many other things. Our substance use program as is has helped many students receive treatment needed over just being expelled or suspended without any resources or support. The "regional model" for social workers, takes social workers out of buildings, where rapport and relationships have been built. This regional model acts more as a care coordination role which is only a small snippet of what social workers actually do. Social workers address behavior issues directly in schools, work with students on skills, provide psychoeducation to students, parents and staff, as well as resource referrals and many other tasks. If you take social workers out of schools, you're taking away the only trained mental health professional in the school buildings. Social workers provide a direct support and consult to overworked counseling teams and

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

SPED departments. The district's proposal of a "regional model" so services won't "overlap" is frankly insulting and making assumptions that services are overlapping. Every social worker works together with other school staff to provide a more holistic and robust support of our students, engaging in case consultation and collaboration as part of the social work ethics. Taking away these two vital supports while running the "Believe You Matter" campaign in a time of a mass youth mental crisis and pushing them to pure resource referrals (because that's all they'd be able to do with multiple schools) when resources are strapped and cut already is abandoning our students at a time when they are most needing these supports. Taking these resources away is reckless and reproachful.

The world and our schools need behavior health and support to be priority. Education is highly impacted when a students mental health needs cannot be met or addressed. Further, this survey is misleading when the number of positions cut are not referenced with the total number of current positions (e.g. 6.5 Substance Use Specialists, 6.5 out of ??? - FYI the Substance Use is 6.5 out of 7.5.)

This is an impossible task for everyone involved, at the building levels, District level, and School Board level. I wish we weren't in this position and I have taken the action of regularly calling my representatives to strongly urge them to provide stable and adequate funding for public schools. I don't envy the burden our Board faces in making these decisions.

The majority of the 13 cuts we have to choose from are disappointing. I am hit especially hard by the proposals to cut nearly 40% of social workers. Social workers are often the staff members who are directly supporting our most vulnerable students and families (also the families least likely to engage in systems of power and budget surveys).

Social work practice is, inherently, relational. It relies on building trusting, supportive, approachable relationships that break down barriers to even talking with someone in an authoritative role so that our students and families can not only begin to trust the school system, but come to experience school as a safe, welcoming community space. That work does not happen at a distance, but in the thick of the tough moments. That BSD would consider such a devastating cut to our students and families during a time when the needs for mental and behavioral health supports, access to food and housing, shelter from federal trauma, and suicide prevention, among other things, have never been higher is unthinkable. It makes me wonder if BSD understands the revolutionary ABAR practice of school social work.

I am disappointed with what is not being considered as we look to responsibly balance our budget:

~~(Temporarily?) discontinue Pre-K.

While I am wholeheartedly in favor of pre-K, it is not yet mandated. We are\* mandated to nurture and provide robust services for our K-12 students. If we are unable to provide adequate services for the students we are required to serve, it is irresponsible to cut K-12 services before discontinuing our pre-K program.

~~Add 1 student per class

~~Remove a non-student day

~~Remove a student day

~~Incentivize retirements

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

~~Consolidate our small schools! (I have the honor of working at two schools, one small, one large. I can confidently say that the community at my large school is thriving, wonderful, warm, and connected.)

Please, please strongly consider maintaining our mental and behavioral health supports in schools. I assure you, both as a parent and a staff member, these supports are essential in keeping our students well and our classrooms running. These staff members include social workers, counselors, behavior specialists, and PE/Music teachers.

Thank you for considering,  
Jennifer

Schools need the most support. Cutting staff who directly interact with students all day is a mistake. Teachers, counselors, and social workers are working so hard to stay above water.

We need to keep our elementary schools staffed with counselors, SBS, and social workers. Teachers can not teach with today's disruptions and we need behavior support staff.

Being new to the district, I am constantly overwhelmed by the sheer number of staff in the schools - but this is a good thing! Coming from a district where there are no school social workers or behavior specialists, counselors have a caseload ratio of 442:1, instructional coaches were seen once a year at the beginning of the year PD and were at central office the remainder of the time, I feel qualified to give insights on how this worked. It didn't. All of these services were pushed onto teachers because all of the specialists split between schools were never given adequate time with students on their caseload. Tech support was centralized and we would be lucky if our tech tickets were resolved in under two weeks. I went a whole semester without a projector despite putting in multiple tickets when all that was needed was a new bulb. Teachers were filling out and filing McKinney-Vento paperwork and meeting with parents (or trying to). Teachers were ensuring that students received the correct services OR they were forced to sit back and watch students sit through the cracks because they couldn't get someone to come and evaluate a student. Teachers were burnt out and leaving the district in droves (myself included). And this was one of the top districts in the state (not Oregon).

I have seen first hand how much the instructional coaches do to support teachers day to day here and it is invaluable. The weight it takes off of teachers is immense. Not to mention the instructional coaches are usually the ones who are helping to plan and execute events like science fairs, new student supports, parent teacher conferences, in addition to the classroom support. But it is not just the instructional coaches. It's the counselors and social workers and specialists. They are there to consistently support not just the students, but also the teachers. I have seen how quickly a teacher is supported when a student needs to leave a classroom. In my time teaching outside of this district, I called exactly once for support because I knew people wouldn't show up. The one time I called, no one came for over 20 minutes. I say all this because it may seem easy to centralize a lot of these positions or assign them to a cluster of schools, but I really begging that this does not happen. It looks great on paper, but it does not work in practice. This is also a slippery slope of making these cuts now makes it only too easy to get rid of the positions all together in the future due to "poor performance." If you handcuff these professionals from doing their job by pulling them in many different directions and then use that to justify cutting the whole position, that is not fair to anyone. I urge you to consider a different option.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

I also bring up other areas the district is spending money. I recently learned of a survey that was completed in middle school gym classes about going out and being active. It was my understanding that this was to see if the district could make parks or other recreational areas more accessible to encourage kids to be more active. This is great and I agree that kids should be more active, but why is it on the district? Should putting sidewalks in or improving parks (not on school grounds) be a city of Beaverton issue? Why would a school district take care of small infrastructure like that? How many other projects are like this? I agree that schools are part of the community, but with already so little funding why spend it on this and not in schools?

With all that said, I am constantly blown away by so many amazing things this district is doing. Opportunities that are available, like the option schools, and the support for teachers is truly phenomenal. The deployable subs are a great idea and takes so much off of teachers and schools knowing a sub will be available. There are so many things this district is doing well, I fear this is a slippery slope moving backward instead of forward. I am not naive enough to say no cuts should ever be made, but I worry these are not the things we should be looking at.

All Elementary Schools Should keep at least a 1.0 Counselor FTE regardless of the size. We need more Mental Health Staff in buildings such as contracted therapists to work as contract workers just Tigard/Tualatin, Hillsboro and Portland Public Schools do. Tigard/Tualatin contracts out with Pacific NW Behavioral Health and Hillsboro has a Contract with Youth Contact. Each of their high schools has an outside mental health provider in building at no cost to the district, just the use of space. Many districts also arrange the counseling model in a non-traditional way such as having some counselors focus on SEL/Mental Health and others focusing on academics and future planning. A reduction in counseling staff would be detrimental to schools and a lot of the work they do would not get done or would likely create more work for administrators.

It's disheartening to see us go from leaders in the state to build an effective and critically essential social work program only to once again have it threatened to be decimated. Other school districts have looked to Beaverton to help build their own social work programs and we have been a beacon statewide for this effort. The regional model allows for surface level interventions and leaves schools feeling unsupported with complex mental health issues. Social workers serving a family do not overlap in services but rather they collaborate to avoid duplication of services and also, to serve the needs of every individual child. The needs of a kindergartner are very different than those of a senior in high school.

As one of the original social workers in our district serving 11 schools at one time, I can assure you the quality of work upon being placed in one school dramatically improved, allowing relationship growth and bridge building, ability to respond to crises in the school, opportunities to help teachers better understand the needs of students impacted by behavioral health issues, support professional development, implement school-based interventions such as groups and suicide prevention programs like Sources of Strength and so much more. This will disappear with a regional model.

Additionally, as a CTE Teacher supporting the new Behavioral Health program, it was hard to show this to students. As they prepare to enter this profession, the disillusion and frustration of seeing their own school district, the one that just created a program for them to pursue this career, put behavioral health programs in our district on the chopping block is unconscionable. This budget is in direct conflict with the state led task force under House Bill 4151 to "Develop recommendations to establish state-issued professional authorizations to support expanding the behavioral health workforce that serves the youth population of this state. How do I as a CTE teacher effectively engage students in this work and encourage this career path when they see jobs being undervalued and cut in their own schools. This makes no sense.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

When will our district hold to the standard of ensuring that students have the supports that they need to learn and recognize that behavioral health supports are not a luxury but a necessity. States across the country have maintained social work programs in their schools for decades upon decades. Why can't we figure this out? Additionally, with some of the worst access in the nation to addiction treatment services for adolescence, taking away the lifeline of the SUS positions is again, in direct conflict with our state's plans and priorities. Please do better.

Leaving a school without support from IC's, SBS's and Counselors is not a good move. We cannot move forward academics without instructional and behavioral support.

Cut a majority of the social emotional lessons & focus more on academics, like schools used to do.

We have more students with mental & behavioral health issues than ever before. You can see it in classrooms across BSD. Taking away any support staff from schools is insulting & shows a complete lack of common sense on your part. Stop the nonsense spending on remodeling so many schools with unnecessary needs & learn to budget better rather than taking away from your employees. There is endless surplus of older school supplies that go where? New covered outdoor areas that cost how much money? Do better. Stop overspending! Maybe then you wouldn't have to continue taking away from the ones working in your schools!

We need to prioritize having the extra support for children with behavioral disabilities ; without this, the rest of the school is suffering; our teachers are spending all of their time dealing with behavioral (often violent!) issues rather than teaching the other 28 kids in the class. I've had it.

Please do not cut our SUS program.

It is critical to maintain behavior supports for classrooms and middle school option programs- both are a must for student success for all children.

This generation of kids needs all the mental, emotional, and behavioral support they can get.

This also includes art, movement, music!!!!

At the high school I work at, the amount of students abusing substances is higher than I think most people recognize. Having in building support helps them keep coming to school.

Me ayudado en no usar sustancias porque eso me afecta en la escuela y en mi casa. Aprendi como lidiar con mis emociones y tambien crear metas que pueda yo cumplir.

It has helped me not use substances because that affects me at school and at home. I learned how to deal with my emotions and also create goals that I can achieve.

Es importante para la mayoría de niños que tienen adicciones. Este apoyo nos ayuda a superar el uso y a entrar en razón ya que pensamos que nos ayudan pero aprendemos que no. A mi me a ayudado mucho en despejar mi mente y concentrarme en mis estudios y tener metas. Tambien ayudado con mi familia y estar mas cercanos con mis amigas.

It is important for most children who have addictions. This support helps us overcome substance use and come to our senses, since we think they help us but we learn that they do not. It has helped me a lot to clear my mind, focus on my studies, and have goals. It has also helped with my family and to be closer with my friends.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

<p>2 classes per grade at least , protect teacher's roles.7</p>
<p>Elementary schools should have at least two classes per grade to make it possible for students to be in different classes if they struggle together. It is beneficial for teachers to have grade level thought partners at the same school.</p>
<p>Keeping class sizes small is a top priority as a teacher and a parent. I can do so much more with the kids, even the most challenging, with a class of 20 vs. 28. Keeping counselors and behavioral specialists are vital at this point with the amount of students struggling in our gen ed classes.</p>
<p>Class size matters. I have had 30 2nd graders the past two years and it's not possible to meet all their needs.</p>
<p>While it is critical to prioritize minimizing direct impacts on classroom instruction, it is equally important to ensure that essential supports for students and educators are not reduced to a level that creates greater long-term challenges. Many of our students are currently navigating significant academic, social, and emotional hardships, and reductions in support services risk exacerbating these existing needs.</p>
<p>As the district explores cost-saving measures, one potential strategy to consider is the use of voluntary retirement incentives for staff who are nearing retirement eligibility. Encouraging planned, voluntary retirements at higher salary levels could result in meaningful budget savings through natural attrition, while avoiding reductions that directly affect student services and instructional support.</p>
<p>It's hard to know if doing the budget cuts of moving teachers who work directly with students will actually be a good thing or not. Being at a large title 1 school, we are in DESPERATE need of keeping all teachers, support staff, behavior health and wellness teams here in the building. Smaller class sizes are NECESSARY. Counselors are NECESSARY. If the proportional staffing means taking away positions, then that will not be helpful for the kids.</p>
<p>Do anything possible to prevent cutting classroom teaching positions. Class size directly impacts student engagement and academic progress. Coaches are a luxury during a time of cuts, consider cutting coaching programs more to off set cutting of classroom and specialist positions.</p>
<p>Please, please, please keep elementary class reasonable and by reasonable I mean less than 25-26. Most of the problems we have in our classroom are a direct result of my ratio of 30:1. It's nearly impossible to meet the needs of students and their families.</p>
<p>The high priority should be district building cuts not classroom cuts. In elementary the primary focus should be keep small class sizes especially K-1.</p>
<p>Prioritize teachers and direct student support and resources. Streamline or consolidate extended support systems if needed. Thank you for all that you do!</p>
<p>Preserving class sizes/resources at the elementary level should be the priority of the district... and I work primarily at option schools with my own kids headed into 6th and 9th grades. Also, the district could save money if they quit reworking the curriculum every few years. The Harcourt investment at the elementary level is hated by every student I've talked with, and I hate to imagine how much the district is about to invest in a new math curriculum. Sadly, as amazing as our option schools are, they serve a small population that is already well-resourced.</p>
<p>Small class size must remain a #1 priority. The district does not need to keep buying all the unnecessary frivolous items. Just give teachers manageable class sizes with support staff and we can teach them!</p>
<p>We need to protect classrooms and specialist as much as possible. We also really need behavior support in schools. I believe that reductions should come from central office and in other areas long before reductions happen in classrooms and what really affects kids.</p>
<p>Classroom teachers should absolutely be the last cut made. Larger class sizes makes everything more difficult for students, staff, and families. If there are cuts to classroom teachers, counselors, and behavioral specialists, there will be many more challenges for everyone.</p>
<p>I am curious about increasing class sizes to reduce the number of teachers needed in the district - this was not one of the options.</p>

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

CLASS SIZE. Protect class size. This has always been more impactful on outcomes than having Instructional Coaches or PDs. Take a year or two where you work on paras supporting classroom teachers and less PD and subs.

Please preserve the number teachers in classrooms at every level. Our first priority as a school district is student learning. Teachers are the largest expenditure in the budget because teachers deliver the services promised to the community.

BSD has poorly allocated personnel over the past decade: The fundamental shift between classroom teachers and endless bureaucracy creep has damaged instruction. Ideology and identity politics seems to trump pedagogy. Classroom student sizes are too high. we have far too many support staff and middle management. The ratio of support staff to teachers is absurd. Flatten your org. chart! Close a few facilities and sell prime property such as Terra Nova, a program that could be efficiently run on any regional farm.

The District has lost its focus on our core function: educating children. WE NEED TO CUT SUPPORT STAFF AND ADD CLASSROOM TEACHERS!

It is really important that student facing staff be less effected. Class sizes are already higher than they should be and teachers are inundated with behaviors from students that are very disruptive to learning.

Please prioritize class size and the workload for classroom teachers.

Can there be consideration for the weighting of ELD support? This might also need to include an additional attempt to identify students with second languages at home.

Could schools, where Library is not in the specials rotation, become that way? This adds more instructional time to classrooms and might create some savings for this area.

Is there consideration to delay the math adoption in order to save the funds?

Please consider class size in primary grades. This results in challenges that all grades face when the primary grades have high class sizes along with significant needs and work to identify students.

Keeping classrooms adequately staff with small student:teacher ratios is of vital importance. If this is truly a student-faced approach, with the best interest of students, families, and teachers in mind, this should be the most prudent focus to NOT have any cuts, continued combination of grade levels, and increased class sizes. Oregon is already lacking in educational quality compared to the rest of the country, and increasing teacher:student ratios will only contribute to our grossly lacking public education system.

Keep the teachers!

Don't treat anything like "budget dust." Consider smaller cuts too. Admin should not be printing color handouts for meetings. Stop heating our buildings to 70 degrees! Cap the heat at 68. Transportation costs? Some busses leave school less than half full. Is that cost efficient? \$2.2 million = 1 day, and you don't have "cut school days" anywhere on your proposal? Cut days before cutting staff like counselors, building IT, or social workers. These people come to our rescue at the drop of a hat. They can't do that if they are shared between buildings! Our secondary schools operate on an A-B model. Ending on an A-day before a long vacation is a wasted day. Furlough that day. Cut the entire week before Labor Day. Oregon does not start school in August. Top priority: Keep class sizes small. 20 max for K-1, 25 max for 2-5, 30 max for 6-12.

We transferred from Hillsboro School District because our experience in Beaverton has been significantly better and more well-rounded. My son actually feels safe going to school now and is no longer being bullied every day. That alone has made a huge difference for our family.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

I strongly believe the district should not follow the path Hillsboro School District has taken. Beaverton is doing a far better job, and I hope they continue to prioritize our children's education and well-being.

It is important to keep class sizes small—ideally around 25 students or fewer—and to continue offering specials along with strong staff support. These are essential to a quality education.

If budget reductions are necessary, I believe the district should look first at reductions within district offices rather than cutting resources from schools. Schools are already operating on very tight budgets. The district could also evaluate extra or optional programs, such as flex or online programs, before making cuts that directly impact students in classrooms.

Also, try to get kids to complete open enrollment transfers to boost your numbers. Even for upcoming kindergarten classes for future years. Just because numbers are low now doesn't mean they'll stay low. You have to remember the kids coming in kindergarten now and next year were during the peak of Covid, so a lot of people waited to have kids. And so you might not see those kids start school until closer to 27-28 school year.

**SAVE TEACHER JOBS!** With the huge increase in behaviors we must have smaller class sizes and that means keeping as many teachers as we can.

Less TOSA's and District admin-- less PD days and smaller class sizes for teachers. We need a counselor and Behavior specialist at every school. Remove the positions that don't work with students. We don't need more meetings, we need more support or smaller class sizes.

Here are some cuts/don't cuts that I would be happy to see:

-Change LAS positions to classroom or ELD positions. It is a frivolous expense.

-Reduce professional development that requires subs. We are overloaded with PD, and would prefer to digest and practice fewer PDs than have to make sub plans and pay for subs to attend more PD.

-It is imperative to keep the idea of redistricting in mind. A few schools are highly impacted by behaviors, newcomer needs, and poverty. Others are not as impacted but have similar amount of staff.

-Custodial services need to be allocated by square footage, number of bathrooms/classrooms, ISC classrooms, etc. There are elementary schools of 800 students who have the same number of custodians as a school with far fewer students. I'm NOT saying hire more. I'm saying spread them according to need which should not be equal per building.

-I understand that the work of the budget is complicated, but I wish that instead of typing "TBD" for some of the options above, we could have had a range of savings, especially if the start of the range is higher than some of the figures above.

-Eliminate snacks at PDs (every little bit helps)

-Be diligent in verifying whether leaves or absences are actually necessary.

-Above all...protect elementary regular ed class sizes. This is the heart of everything.

Thanks for your work.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

I think cutting the elementary teachers would be the worst thing to cut. Class sizes would be bigger which would greatly affect students and how teachers would be able to provide services. I have found some items at district office to be unhelpful and not directly help students. Services like the mentor program could be allocated in a different way to be more school centered, that could save salary funds.

Save teachers at all costs -- our classroom staffed are stretched thin as is!

We need to prioritize classroom sizes, and student mental health support. Reducing the support staff who is already stretched thin would be detrimental to all student learning and teacher success.

Beaverton School District has the largest class size averages of any school district in Oregon. Sunset, Westview, Mountainside, Stoller, and Tumwater regularly exceed classes of at least forty students. Rather than cutting teachers and increasing these class sizes even more, we should close option schools. ISB, BASE, ACMA, and Rachel Carson should not exist, as they are completely against our pillar of equity. This would allow us to focus on improving the educational offerings at our comprehensive schools, improving the education for all students, rather than a select few that get in through a "lottery". Another area where we spend excessive money is in continuing the IB system, which in many ways is inferior to the AP system, as well as being more expensive. We also pay to have every student take the ACT, even though many schools no longer require that test. These extra expenses could easily be removed from the budget.

Please do not cut teachers or counselors. These types of cuts will increase staff burnout and will not meet students' needs academically or in a social/emotional sense. Our instructional coaches, social workers, and behavior specialists are also vital to the success of our students. Our middle school class sizes are already astronomical and should not be increased at all. Please preserve all teaching positions at all levels.

We need to retain the school counselors and teachers. They are a PRIORITY!

Classroom teachers should be the absolute last thing cut. You should be looking at getting rid of instructional coaches and putting them back in the classroom. It would benefit a school much more to have lower class sizes. In the building I am in, the staff are not willing to be coached, and our Instructional Coach has turned into a data collector, and PD giver for our administrator. I don't see the benefit in the classroom or to me as an educator. If we had extra money laying around, then that is one thing. But this is saying we aren't, so they should all be put back in classrooms to make more classrooms and lower class sizes.

Also, I do not understand why the district is not looking at cutting DL or stopping these programs. Be transparent about how much extra money you are spending on these. Because other districts around us have been, and we know they aren't cheap.

Small class sizes and smaller ratio teacher to student

Keeping low classroom size is my top priority.

We need to keep staff that has direct daily contact with students as the priority! Class sizes low as possible.

We need small class sizes in elementary so students learn the basics so they are able to move on in their education.

Smaller class sizes are critical. There are behavioral and emotional issues in all schools.

Please keep classroom sizes manageable. If class sizes are smaller, extra support will work as a centralized model - Social Workers, etc.

I am witnessing the tragic repercussions of only having one English speaking classroom for our Kindergarten and first grade students. These include: higher numbers of students accessing 504/IEP/ELL accommodations and support per class, siblings not being able to be separated who need to be (twins, adopted, foster, other), high behaviors with no way to balance the class, loss of educational time, class size near 30 for our youngest learners is not equitable when developing foundational skills (including SEL, reading and math), difficulties with timely transitions that lead to more loss of instructional time, not enough

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

supplies for students, and not enough space for students to feel a sense of belonging (cubbies, furniture, and carpets). "You reap what you sow." I'm not sure I want to see what these future consequences would be if we continue down this road...

Classrooms over way over enrollment! Save by cutting certified support positions (such as reading coach or behavioral specialist or counselor)

This was not an easy decision to make as a parent of two in the elementary/ soon to be middle school grades. I think it's very important to have smaller class sizes per teacher to get the best learning experience. In these times, I think it's very important to have counselors and social workers available to the students. I believe programs like music and physical education should be a right and now a privilege as school may be the only way students have these available otherwise. Can we look at what other school districts are doing to better their students? Thank you

I strongly oppose any reduction of counselor services at the secondary level. Their work is vital from an academic, logistical, and social emotional level, and they are already stretched thin. We can't overestimate how their loss would negatively affect students and teachers.

Reducing elementary classroom teachers hampers our ability to separate students as needed and isolates a lone grade-level teacher from collaboration. Additionally, prevention is the best cure in my mind. If we're reducing behavior supports for elementary, we must not also reduce the number of high quality instructors available to problem solve and support students at the elementary level.

I went to the district office recently and saw a very large, new 3D wall art installation in the Douglas Fir conference room, and my thought was, how gauche? Who needed this, when our students are suffering? I placed district cuts at the top of my list (under the credit recovery that is being billed as zero impact) because while I don't want to undervalue district workers, I don't have faith that the district is currently operating with the lean budgets schools are already experiencing. Between reducing the staff that directly interface with students and the staff that support those student-facing positions, I would preserve students' trusted adults almost every time.

Having previously worked in districts with only one teacher per grade level, I experienced firsthand how the absence of a team diminished the sense of community, collaboration, and joy in teaching. Teaching without a partner can feel incredibly isolating. Having a grade-level teammate is not a luxury, it is essential to our effectiveness, our well-being, and the quality of work we do for students. Please do not take away our teaching partners.

At the end of the day... it's the classroom teachers who are the most highly qualified to teach the children. This should be the last on the table. Everything else...is gravy. Let's get back to the basics of teaching the children. Instructional coaching seems to be a box checking activity and has very little impact on teachers or students in my 25 years of experience. Social workers, counselors, behavior specialists follow around the kids in the red, who mostly know better and seem to be working this system, and those extra adults often never interact with the rest of the school population.

Please prioritize Elementary classrooms, specialists, and behavioral support. Thank you.

The amount of funding that disproportionately goes towards small, under-enrolled schools in need of extreme physical repair where the majority of students already have high economic advantages compared to larger, more diverse Title 1 schools is disgraceful. This is not equity.

Parents in the wealthier zip codes of BSD fund PTOs with thousands of dollars of personal checks, plus employer matches. This is in addition to the higher funding that those students receive from the district. Meanwhile, students at Title 1 schools don't have even a fraction of the same funds to provide for manageable class sizes, adequate numbers of Paras for 1-on-1 support, enrichment activities, and more.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

At William Walker, with a student body of approximately 506, we raised a mere fraction of what other schools do at our annual 2025 school jog-a-thon: \$22,000. How would other schools and parents feel about this if it was their school? How do you, as a district, feel about this?

Can the district implement a fundraising cap requiring anything raised above a certain amount gets distributed throughout the district to provide equal opportunities to students at schools that don't have the high means of others?

Parents at Title 1 schools aren't spending our limited amounts of extra resources on custom made t-shirts bashing large schools with low test scores (absolutely atrocious). We're spending it on food for our school food bank to literally feed our classmates who might not have dinner that night.

This past Fall, William Walker lost two full time teachers to wealthier schools within BSD. This resulted in larger class sizes at our Title 1 school where our students need more support than ever. How is this ok?

Personally, as a Substitute and a parent within BSD, I have seen the stark discrepancy of learning environments within the district. We are failing our schools that need help the most. If a student stepped foot between one school and the next, would "Belong, Believe, Achieve?" resonate?

The idea of having a single LITT for the district is insane. We need these people more than ever with all the Lightspeed, AI, and general tech stuff going on with kids and staff. Further, they do a hundred little things every day to help staff that may not be in the job description. The TSSs rely on LITTs to help implement tech in the classrooms so students and staff use the tools effectively and properly. With LITT already a .5 FTE/.5 FTE between two schools, they are really do two nearly full time jobs for the cost of one. Juggling daily commnications, lessons for Library research and tech tools with students, and planning and implementing staff development for 2 schools is a huge responsibility. Being able to react and help in real-time keeps schools running so much smoother, enhancing the student experience as a result.

Further, any increase in class size in Elementary schools is also a terrible idea. Kids who experience crowded classrooms in elementary carry that diminished experience to middle school and high school. Cuts need to come not just as far from classrooms as possible, but as far from schools as possible. Start with cutting the fat at the district office level where most positions are far more expensive to maintain.

We must have smaller class sizes, no more than 22.

Class size ratio is important , 2 classes per grade level At least!

I think this is a time to start thinking creatively and to look at how we could do things in new ways- consider grade level blends to reduce class sizes, consider a 4 day school week with longer hours but not Fridays (reduce operational costs), etc. What are schools across the nation doing to handle these cuts?

We must prioritize classroom teachers above all else. In elementary schools especially, classroom teachers are often the adults who know students best—their strengths, their struggles, and the circumstances that shape their lives. Academic success does not happen in isolation; it grows out of trust, connection, and meaningful relationships with caring adults. When we increase class sizes, eliminate in-class teachers, or stretch educators so thin that relationships become

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

harder to build, we undermine the very foundation of student success. This approach does not save schools—it weakens them, and ultimately places our students at risk.

Classroom teachers should be the LAST positions cut!!

Classroom teachers crucial.

I would appreciate clarification on what is meant by “District Office Reductions”. I’ve worked in the district for 13 years and have seen some Central Office areas grow over time (for example, HR increasing from two to four Executive Admin positions). If this refers to administrative growth rather than direct student support roles, I would rank this higher as a potential area for reduction. I have also seen significant cuts to Teaching and Learning just a few years ago.

If cost savings can be realized through greater centralization of staff groups, that seems worth exploring. We also have a number of DAO staff who work remotely; it may be helpful to consider whether more regular on-site presence could improve centralized support and coordination.

As both a staff member and a parent, I rank reductions to classroom teachers—including music and PE—as my last choice. I currently have a 2nd grader, will have two Kindergarteners in the 2027–28 school year, and also have an adult child who graduated from Southridge in 2017 with an IEP. During his 8th-grade year, the district cut hundreds of teaching positions, and the impact on students—especially those receiving Special Education services—was significant and harmful.

From both professional and personal experience, I strongly believe that maintaining classroom and instructional staff should be prioritized over reductions that directly affect students.

Classroom teachers are essential!!

Keep student ratio down for k-2 dual language school with english only at 2 classes no matter what

Keep student ratio down for k-2 dual language school with english only at 2 classes no matter what

Keep student ratio down for k-2 dual language school with english only at 2 classes no matter what

Keep student ratio down for k-2 dual language school with english only at 2 classes no matter what

Keep student ratio down for k-2 dual language school with english only at 2 classes no matter what

Students are so impacted by the inability to read and write right now! Elementary classroom teacher should NOT be cut—we need teachers in the early years and a lower teacher to student ratio makes a huge impact. We need people in the classes working directly with students to increase academic gains.

"Proportionate staffing" and providing the right number of teachers to small schools is not just a good way to save money, it's 100% necessary to be fair and equitable to all of the students and teachers in the district. Why should my child's class be larger and my child's teacher be more overworked so a smaller school can have extra teachers, tiny class sizes and huge amounts of counselor and music and PE teacher time for the number of students they have? BSD should fix this inequity even if you don't need to make budget cuts.

Teachers are being squeezed with larger class sizes, behavior issues and less resources and support. The demand at the school level to cut and use their own money builds resentment and it will discourage people to seek a career in education. Please take a closer look at the personnel number and excesses at the main office and the programs which are "fluff" to those programs critical for learning delivery.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

We need more days of instruction and more overall classroom instruction hours. BSD is among the lowest in the entire country - which makes it among the lowest in the entire developed world - for classroom instruction hours. Start small - add a couple days to the calendar or add 5-10 minutes to every school's bell schedule. The goal is to educate!

Further, BSD needs to take decisive action to remove problematic children from the classroom / school / district. We are wasting countless resources trying to "manage" children who refuse to adhere to even basic classroom behavior and thus take away from every other student in the classroom / school / district with their endless disruptions. As noted above, we don't have enough classroom hours as it is. Give our teachers a chance to teach by solving disruptive classrooms with urgency. The solution is not to consume even MORE resources by adding BSD employees to the room. (Parent of Cedar Mill student who has lost 5-10% of instruction time to the same disruptive student year-to-date)

I think you HAVE to look at people who are making the most money in our district and start there. Knowing there are district level admin making over 100k more than teachers, specialists, and counselors IN the schools doing the most valuable work WITH children is crazy. Cutting teachers and building support should not even be an option.

Staff needs more help with the children and behaviors that are happening. We need to cut from everywhere we can before taking teachers and support away from our children. Our teachers already work two jobs just to paybills and deal with our children. District needs to cut from top down before letting teachers go. Pay cuts suck but they would still have a job which is better then shorting our children. Back to the basics please

Prioritize classroom teachers and counselors. (I teach high school social studies and already have over 180 students!)

Beaverton should be focusing their money on core classes and prioritizing staffing levels around key subjects, math, reading, science, etc. Keep class sizes lower in core classes & reduce in areas that do not focus on those core skills.

Parents need to take more responsibility in the social/emotional education of their children. The district's priority should be in teaching kids key skills to succeed in adult life, not spending resources/time in every aspect of raising a child.

Cut days. Big/bigger class size are way less effective for teaching than reasonable class sizes. Better to have fewer successful days than many trying ones

An increase in classroom teacher allocations across k-12 (looking at individual class sizes vs. total students at a school to allocate teachers so the numbers are more even -there are always "bubble" grades.

Keep class sizes in early elementary below 22 per classroom.

Please do everything you can to keep classroom teacher positions and classroom sizes as small as possible. I personally believe that small class sizes is the single largest contributing factor in student success and teacher retention.

It is easy to look at class sizes and think, well, we can lose some teachers, but lower class sizes in elementary school have been the best thing I've experienced in 18 years in this district. Finally having less than 30 Kindergartners at my school is amazing.

Top priority is core education, with emphasis on small class sizes for younger students.

smaller class sizes

The best way to set students and staff up for success is to have the smallest possible class sizes especially in elementary. If the tax-paying public could look at our big school and see that we have about 13 certified staff who are not in the classrooms. While classroom teachers appreciate the support, that makes our

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

classes bigger while the public do not understand that dynamic. I vote for certified teachers to be classroom teachers. I also vote for classroom teachers to be ESOL endorsed. I think that solves the diverse needs of our large district as far as managing newcomer needs. I have felt like adding an LAS position has lightened the burden of administration (which is positive), but has not yet directly impacted our ELD team or our students; but has significantly added to classroom teachers' meetings and time away from students. Teachers can be most effective with fewer students (and families) to teach, assess, and care for each year. Thank you for your leadership.

Most importantly we need to preserve classroom teachers, and reduce class sizes. Support staff could be reduced in order to go back into the classroom--making smaller class sizes. The coaching model is ineffective and does not guarantee students growth and success. The coaching model has added more meetings, more goal setting for teachers, and overall added to the teacher's workload and time out of the classroom (need for subs/sub plans)--instead of working with students to actually support their needs. ELD/LAS teachers are not being used appropriately either.

Reducing class sizes enables teachers at all levels to do their job effectively. If support staff are reduced, a smaller class size is the best way to meet students' needs. A coaching model has not benefited my student outcomes as much as smaller class sizes, which allow me to meet their needs. The coaching model has added to my workload while increasing class size. This model has also taken time away from me being in the classroom and given me an additional workload to create sub plans!

Pre-K could be looked into as a cost saving measure.

Switch to a 4 days per week model. No school on Fridays and longer days/shorter summer break.

Larger class sizes but also more support staff.

We need to maintain smaller class sizes!

Elementary is vital (I'm not an elementary teacher). Making class sizes not grow is most important for student success AT all grades.

Please do not reduce staffing, as it is already far too low. I believe that better staffing and smaller class sizes is of the utmost importance for both student achievement and teachers' qualities of lives.

Smaller class sizes should be the number 1 priority. This is said as a parent, teacher, and community member. It is what is best for the students which is why we do what we do.

One class per grade is okay and I am voting for that.

2 classes per grade level

Low teacher :student ratio. 2 classes per grade level even in dual language schools. Not fair to have only 1 English only cohort

Close small schools. Close option schools. Close schools before eliminating an educational program/position. Focus on small class sizes, but keep the mental health supports that students need. I appreciate the plan to focus on "proportional staffing" rather than eradicating programs across the district.

In the case of our students, cutting staff is always the worst thing to do. When a teacher or specialist or support staff member has a disproportional number of students then it becomes harder to do their jobs effectively. However, that has to be balanced with the places where targeted and thoughtful reductions will save the most money for the district. Until Oregon as a state better funds our schools, these hard decisions must be made. However, I only propose cutting

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

staff when there are clear caps for numbers of students in classrooms that go hand in hand with this - less we end up with more schools that have overly large class sizes even as the district discusses lower enrollment. Is this not an opportunity to better serve the students we do have?

Please try and preserve the quality of the classroom experience for students. Specifically, class size is very important to achieve a quality experience, especially for elementary students.

As a high school teacher I will say that the best thing for students is smaller class sizes. Cut the grad mentors and academic coaches. The only thing they do with kids is pull them out of class to hang out. Students use them as an opportunity to avoid class. Total waste and counter productive.

Do not cut counselors, that's ridiculous.

The ratio of students to teachers and support staff needs to be reviewed. We need MORE teachers/ MORE support staff in the classrooms not less. The smaller the student to teacher ration is- the more likely behaviors will decrease, testing scores will increase leading to less burnout and turnover.

I'm most concerned with class sizes. I teach at Mountainside, where we currently have many classes in the high 30s and low 40s, and this is prior to the looming "budget cuts". Please be mindful about how class sizes will be affected at all schools.

Targeting elementary schools for budget cuts is short-sighted and inequitable. Early childhood and elementary education lay the foundation for every student's long-term academic, social, and emotional success. When we reduce funding at the elementary level, we are not just trimming expenses — we are weakening the very base that supports future achievement in middle and high school.

Elementary schools are where students learn to read, build number sense, develop emotional regulation, and form their first relationships with school as a safe and supportive place. Cuts at this level often mean larger class sizes, fewer intervention supports, reduced access to specialists, and fewer enrichment opportunities. These losses disproportionately impact our youngest learners and our most vulnerable students, widening opportunity gaps before students even reach secondary school.

If we are committed to student success, equity, and long-term fiscal responsibility, we must protect the earliest years of education. Investing in elementary schools is not optional — it is preventative, strategic, and essential. Prioritizing cuts at this level undermines the district's mission and creates greater costs — academically and socially — down the line.

Do not cut teachers!!

I have been teaching in this District for almost 30 years. I have never worked harder and more intensely than I do now - as a core teacher in a middle school, I have 180 students. Seven years ago, I had 90 students (granted, that was a low year for me), and I taught them for 90 minutes per day. Now I have double the students for half of the time. Yet, we wonder why students are struggling with reading, writing, and math. An every-other-day schedule does not seem to work for language arts, math, science and social studies, if we are concerned about proficiency in these areas.

I understand that the budget is out of our control as we rely so heavily on the General Fund. I hope that District Administration is lobbying for removal of the State's Kicker Law - the money that gets returned to people each year is ludicrous when we have to go through these outrageous shortfalls so frequently. The State should have a healthy reserve, too, for just these times.

Starting a Dual Language Program District-wide seems short-sighted in light of these issues, too. I am in favor of dual language schools, but question whether

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

we need these programs District-wide.

In addition, the ELD program does not seem effective as a push-in model compared to when it was a classroom model. It seems that we have too many FTE allocated to this program, mostly because these teachers need to move from class to class. It is an ineffective use of resources - very little time is used for instruction when the intention is "team teaching". A lot of waiting for instruction to occur, almost no ability to actually plan ahead of time - not a good use of District resources. Students performed better (and were more comfortable learning English) when they had the security of a classroom where everyone was in the same situation as beginner or intermediate ELL students.

Our Social Workers and Counselors are needed badly in our schools! Kids' anxiety overall is higher than in years past, economic issues are driving too many families into poverty, leading to additional SEL issues for our kids. Please do NOT change the staffing of SW and Counseling in the buildings. Regional models do not work for this type of care.

Same comment for Centralized Substance Use Support. If we really want to be supporting these kids, we need people who are seen regularly in our buildings, not a few people at the District level who are stretched too thin to do any good.

Advocate for the Oregon Health Plan for All and it would save the BSD at least 25 million dollars.

Every grade should have at least 2 classes despite class size.

Cut things that are not immediately or directly tied to classroom learning at any grade level. Class sizes need to be as low as possible for the core classes. Cut Specialty or elective courses if needed to keep the core classes of Math Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts more manageable.

There are way too many subject area TOSAs and district level administrators. Cut the fat. Teachers have SO much on their plates that our class sizes need to be prioritized.

2 classes per grade level despite enrollment!

I do not agree in increasing class sizes by outcomes from proportional staffing at the elementary level. Even if a school doesn't meet the threshold for an additional grade classroom, class sizes need to stay reasonable to provide enough student support. How will the district manage a larger class size and still meet student goals?

Low class sizes for k-2

Two classes per grade level especially k-2

Don't cut anything that could increase class sizes or teacher workloads. Those two are already beyond maxed out.

2 classes per grade level even in dual language schools

Low class size in k-2

Keep 2 classes per grade level in k-2

Don't cut on the support staff like para educators 1 and 2 because of the teachers have bigger classes student support will help.

every elementary school has at least two classrooms per grade level regardless of how many students are enrolled

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

guaranteeing every elementary school has at least two classrooms per grade level regardless of how many students are enrolled

Prioritize not increasing class sizes

Please prioritize smaller class sizes in K-2. 25+ students is unmanageable and does not set students up for success. It leads to more behavioral problems and less time to focus on academics.

Academics and Electives should be protected at all cost. Also keeping class sizes small is imperative for learning and safety.

I think the priority should be manageable class sizes, especially in elementary and in particular k-2. As a 3-5 teacher for over 20 years, I can say 25 and under is ideal, anything over 26 is just managing behavior. I am so much more effective when I have a smaller class size-- I know what each student needs to move forward and I can more effectively meet their needs. Class size makes all the difference!

I also think having smaller class sizes for kindergarten and first grade would have exponential benefits to students and schools. If we can meet student needs and give them effective foundational instruction in kindergarten and first grade, we can eliminate the need for intervention later on. Our priority needs to be giving our youngest students a strong foundation (this is coming from an upper grade teacher and the mom of middle school aged children).

One thing I notice is that I feel there is a need for PD around basic classroom management strategies for classroom teachers. I feel we could greatly benefit from Anita Archer-like PD where teachers learn how to set up structures and routines to help all students succeed. I believe if we could improve classroom/behavior management, teachers would need less overall support and we would see an increase in academic achievement.

As a BSD alumni, any plans to cut corners with the amount of teaching staff employed at any level, be it elementary, middle or high school need to be thrown out immediately. From direct personal experience having been enrolled in 3 different BSD schools, larger class sizes benefit absolutely no one- teachers who have to account for larger groups of students have significantly less time to meet students' individual needs. Additionally, the quality of instruction decreases as a result of the burnout that many teachers experience from a higher case load of students.

2 classes per grade level regardless of enrollment

2 classes per grade level is a baseline standard especially at title 1 school.

I want my children to feel safe in the classroom. This doesn't happen when they are overcrowded and have students throwing things when they can't control their emotions.

Teachers are the key to our schools and the success of students. Keeping as many teachers and keeping classrooms the smallest they can be around 20 students is the most important.

Don't cut actual teacher positions. We need more teachers, not less.

The priority should be on classroom teachers and specialists. Providing stability for students includes having consistent teachers at their school. There has already been significant cuts to music and PE programs over time and I do not want to see that cut any further. They are both very important parts of childhood education. I have seen the direct impact of having adequate staffing at a school when there are students who need more support. Without that staffing and support, students will suffer.

Blended classrooms don't seem to work at Title I schools. Please take that into consideration.

Please protect classroom teachers, staff that directly support students and office staff. Those staff are already at bare bone numbers and are very needed.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

The main priority is class sizes. The second priority is equity. Don't make blanket decisions about number of staff. Each building has different needs. Our most underserved communities should not be impacted by any of these actions.

STOP over-protecting reserves. Use the funds that the district is allocated as intended. The slideshow demonstrated how we match the other districts in so many ways, except that we are sitting on way more money. We can begin the fight for funding allocation from the state, but you must use the reserves in the meantime.

Keep cuts out of the classroom, especially in elementary.

Please prioritize direct, in classroom instruction and support staff as the most important.

District Office Reductions really need to be taken more seriously than programs with staff that interact with children on a daily basis. Do we really need these high production videos being produced daily, and all the other frivolous jobs at the district office? No! We need teachers and counselors helping the kids.

How about reducing administrators and TOSAs? Dip into your contingency fund.

Look at eliminating administrators at central office and special education?

I would like to know why cuts at the district level are left as TBD. That made it very hard to rank.

The district does not need its own graphic arts and videography department. The safe routes to school group could also be decreased.

I would always prioritize administration cuts. It makes all kinds of sense to not guarantee 2 classes of each grade per school - I support that wholeheartedly, but put it lower as other changes seemed to align with administrative changes instead of teaching changes first.

If District Office Reductions are considered, please be transparent about the ratio/proportion of District Office Administrators vs. TOSAs vs. Professional Learning/Curriculum Funding, etc. Reductions in each of these categories would have different impact on students.

I find it very problematic that District Centralized Staff has no \$\$ amount listed - if you are serious about cuts, stop making it about social workers and teachers and focus on the areas that have the least student impact.

slash district admin positions first! It is way too bloated with people who don't respond to teachers or parents.

BSDs priorities are short sighted and do not take into consideration the best outcomes for its student population, which it is beholden to serve. I am severely concerned about the current leaderships abilities to put student well being first as the past and interim superintendent have shown through their dismissive actions and lack of willingness to listen to public commentary. I would like to see the outsized superintendent salary reassessed and accountability taken by including a renegotiation of the annual raise %. If the superintendent wants to see the school district and its children thrive, accountability starts at the top.

The amount of money that the district spends on TOSAs and behavioral specialists is APPALLING. These people sit around and dream up things to do to make more work for classroom teachers to legitimize their TOSA position. I hear them sitting in their office all times of day chatting away the day while classroom teachers are WORKING WITH CHILDREN. The behavior specialist at our school has so much time on their hands that they sit in the front office and help the secretaries answer the phones. Appalling. Dig much more deeper with cuts there.

Eliminating the assistant superintendent position would greatly reduce costs and have little impact on the schools themselves. The district should focus on cutting as many corporate jobs as possible before cutting resources to students, cutting teacher jobs, or impacting the currently great community school environment. Can the district use the new under utilized Raleigh Hills to house some of the corporate offices and decrease the need for the giant district office building?

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Cutting student facing positions is not the way to go - it harms students and prohibits us from giving our community the full quality education they deserve. The district's current ICE safety plan relies almost exclusively on counselors and social workers, so cutting those positions would mean that we have no real plan to protect our students from ICE and the harm they cause. Cut central admin positions first and trim it down as far as it can to save money.

Reduce TOSAs

Cuts to the top will have the smallest negative impact on students. The professionals working with them each day and in person need to be consistent and available as students navigate their personal, academic, and global lives.

DO NOT CUT STAFF IN ANY SCHOOL. Full stop. No school staff cuts. Cut staff in the Central Admin ONLY. Redundancies in school staffing are NECESSARY. EACH elementary school needs at least one counselor, one social worker, one nurse, one music teacher, one PE teacher, one CERTIFIED TEACHER librarian, one library assistant. Some larger elementary schools need more than that, but NOT ONE CAN FUNCTION PROPERLY WITH LESS. EACH middle schools NEEDS one certified teacher librarian and one assistant, one social worker, a band/orchestra teacher, a choir teacher, a theater teacher, and a shop teacher (metals, woods, drafting), a social worker, and a nurse. Each middle school also NEEDS one counselor per grade level, and one PE teacher per grade level, (at least one of whom identifies as female, and one male). Larger schools need more of each of these, but smaller schools never need fewer. High schools and option schools need the same, and a substance abuse specialist, a nurse staffed health clinic for urgent care and confidential health advice, one social worker per grade level, two counselors per grade level, two library assistants for the certified teacher librarian, two PE teachers per grade level, one each gender. Cut ALL extracurricular activities except academic clubs (chess, speech & debate, robotics, ham radio), and all sports except one mixed gender team for in-district intramural fun games, no trophies or state competitions. Eliminate all testing except one round of state testing the last two weeks of the school year. Quit buying online math curriculum every two years and go back to physical text books that can be used for 10 to 20 years before replacement. Same with science. Get rid of Chromebooks, go back to pencils and paper.

Nice try pretending you don't know what making cuts at the district office would save us but you know exactly what cutting teachers and counselors would cost. You don't care about students!

All of these things are important. I think the district office should take the time to review what they can do to minimize the impact of these budget issues. Our students and community deserve it.

Reducing superintendent pay should be on here. The amount Balderas increased his pay would cover 1-2 positions.

Administrators should take a pay cut since they are not serving students directly, especially the district superintendent.

Think big. Make sure the public knows that the teachers union chose big raises versus more teachers.

Reduce central office and administration at schools. Keep teachers.

And how about adding 10 school days back to the year so we can get back to the nationwide average. And at no additional pay to teachers.

I find it funny how the District Office Reductions estimated savings is TBD. The superintendent is making ~\$500,000 a year. That is absolutely ridiculous. Cut the incoming superintendents salary in half and cuts wouldn't have to be made to some programs. Do you really believe a superintendent should make this much when the district cannot even stay within budget? It's ridiculous how BSD has created a top-heavy district administration model while school programs are suffering. Why does [REDACTED] have 8 executive administrators under [REDACTED]? Is there no room for streamlining duties and creating hundreds of thousands of dollars in the budget? I run the member experience program for the largest health insurance company in Oregon with membership in 8 states. Guess what? We are a team of 3 people. Can the Administrator of Public Safety and Transportation not be combined? Why are there 3 Executive Administrators in Human

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Resources? Three? Why not one Executive Administrator and 2 managers beneath that position. Yes, I don't have the ins and outs of what each does, but it is shocking to look at the BSD org chart and not believe that the largest estimated savings should be in District Office Reductions. Stop screwing over our children so that you can line your pockets with money and power. It's no wonder parents are not enrolling their children in this school district. Why would they? You want to cut programs that children love and need and instead promote BS policies. As you go through this process, try to think about providing an education for our children focused on reading, writing, and arithmetic, physical education, technology, music, and art, and less focus on power and promoting BS agendas.

District cuts and less TOSAs - especially looking at different curriculum, need to be cut first. The schools itself need certified staff supporting both academically and socially. The amount of time spent on behavior and academic intervention is invaluable. At this point, all the money should be going to the actual staff IN the schools. This will benefit students, which is why we are here.

I'd like to see cuts from the top, not the bottom. Cut the salary of the superintendent first.

Reduce redundancies in BSD staff! The "assistant superintendent" appears to be nearly incompetent. You wasted so much time and money on the [REDACTED], when all you had to do was do the jobs you're hired for and listen to the community. It seems insane to me that the district is not capable of making decisions or engaging with community without the help of an outside consultant. Ban consultancies, save money!

OR! Why not take a look at how expensive it is to maintain the separate corporate office on Waterhouse? You need to fill the new RH? Sell the corporate office and have everyone work from Raleigh Hills, or have little offices in the "underutilized" schools so that perhaps some of these people making decisions see what schools are like day to day. The overhead from the District office is likely much more expensive. It is telling that you just put "TBD" bc of course BSD would not be transparent about how much could actually be cut from the corporate area of BSD.

If the goal is truly to bolster enrollment, cutting teachers and making classes bigger will not attract anyone. Cutting excess from the corporate side will show your commitment to the kids.

TOSAs, in schools should pitch in if teaching subs are need in the building.

Please do everything you can to keep cuts away from classrooms. We do not need so many administrators and we do not need to be paying a superintendent over \$200,000. No one needs that much money.

Stop wasting money on TOSA's. Teachers should be spending most of their time teaching students.

The previous superintendents salary was concerningly high. I'm not sure what the new one is slotted at but 500k is ridiculous when our schools and teachers are struggling. Also having a better plan to protect families from ICE which is I'm sure contributing to low enrollment rates.

Focus more cuts on district level and supporting positions

I believe all these proposed cuts are very well thought out. These reductions would have the least amount of impact. I would add TOSA's to the list of cuts. They can be in classrooms and do TOSA stuff outside of school hours, at a much reduced cost. Do you need to be paid teacher salary to plan a couple 2 hour PD's per year? there are more than enough TOSA's to put one in each school as a full-time teacher.

Does FLEX need a principal or assistant? Can they fall under a smaller high school or option school? same with early college?

What is the percentage of funds spent on the MLD program in relationship to the number of students serviced?

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Let's talk about reducing the number of schools in the district. It's a hard conversation for parents, but it saves significant amounts of money that can be used directly to educate students and not maintain old, small buildings with small populations. These smaller schools in BSD are smaller than nearby private schools, but using public dollars.

Can the options programs be located in on central location or in an existing building? How about ISB moves to a smaller middle school? Meadow Park? Cedar Park?

This is just the beginning of budget reductions as people move away and populations decrease. Let's make big impact reductions now and not later and save current programs.

Let's cut from the top starting with the superintendent salary and working down. We need our teachers and support staff and we need our community schools that's what embodies the BSD values

Administration reduction

It must be cost prohibitive to hire a new superintendent every few years. Maybe focus on hiring someone that you can retain and isn't a social climber. The previous superintendent seemed to be more focused on applying for awards and looking for his next job than the current job he was in. Also, you probably have too many administrators at the school level. The teachers seem to do most of the heavy lifting anyway.

Why are there no values to the district office reductions? This ends up making the survey a "loaded question" survey because it leads people to not pick that one as much since there isn't a dollar amount they can see saved.

The TOSA positions should go first in my opinion.

Stop paying for central office staff to have cars and for their gas if they live in another city. Stop wasting money on unnecessary travel for district office staff. Investing in the teachers, counselors, and behavior support teams who work directly with students is an investment in students.

No one in the school district should make more than \$200,000.

The budget for the district office needs to be reduced first and until it is operating on the slimmest of margins. This is a non-essential component to the district as a whole. For example, BSD currently does not have a superintendent, but schools are functioning just fine without one. Schools and the people who work directly with kids should be sheltered from the budget cuts.

Put TOSAS back in the classroom.

What about TOSA's? Perhaps these positions should be eliminated. How about the mentor program?

This might be covered under "District Office Reductions" or "Instructional Coaches," but it needs to be explicit – The centralized TOSA model of this district is out of control. They make our lives harder, not easier. They treat us as our superiors, not our partners, and they treat us as if we are not smart enough to get out of the classroom, which is where the work of the district supposedly happens. When they ask for our input, they misrepresent our feedback to the district (the recent ELA curriculum adoption and the ELD overhaul are only the most expensive and egregious examples). Cut as many district-level TOSAs as humanly possible, and you can avoid several of the above proposed cuts. More generally, all cuts that make it harder for centralized control of our classrooms should absolutely be first to be implemented.

We have TOSAs making 140k a year to do very little. Some of them are in schools right now as "equity" experts using taxpayer money to sit in offices for multiple periods a day without students or classes. This is wrong. We should use that money to hire teachers for core classes. That would produce real equity.

How about Facilities? Can there be reductions made there as well?

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Restructure maintenance and custodial. So much money being waisted in both departments.

Always keep as many schools open as possible and as many teachers on staff as possible. Always cut the district office first and put as many employees working directly with kids as possible. Low class size matters. Having one elementary option school (FLEX) matters. Protect elementary - it is the foundation of everything else. Focus on educators not programs or materials.

Consider cutting general education TOSAS and sped administrators. Provide more funding to special education programs.

Maybe we don't need to spend as much money in bonuses and incentives for our Super this time around

It is difficult to trust any of this process or the descriptions. Everything is written to sound like there is no impact, which makes it unclear why you need any input. This indicates that we aren't seeing the full story. You also did not report on the financial allocations between the different FTE categories. So while the slice of pie is small for FTE at the central admin office, how does that compare to salary/benefits allocated across FTE categories? The district has completely destroyed all trust, and while I'm engaging because I feel it's my obligation as a parent, it remains very hard to believe anything the district puts out.

In the current landscapes of unstable school funding, I urge you to look at other things besides anything that directly impacts the people that are in schools and their support staff. We have two district office buildings. We have a TON of district level positions that do not have a clear role to community members and have overlap. Please look at streamlining some of these expensive positions before you start chipping away at the support staff in buildings. Get creative! Don't rent the whole DO building and instead move some of those executive positions and T & L positions to schools around the district so they aren't so removed from the day to day life in a school.

Has consideration been given to eliminating student use of technology in grades k-5? Research has begun to show that use of technology by students (ie ipads, laptops, etc) reduces engagement and development of motor memory, fine motor skills, and critical thinking skills. Reserving use of these tools to upper grades and limiting their use to strategically beneficial learning tasks could reduce costs for equipment, maintenance, and technology related administrative support, while increasing active student learning.

Staffing and support needed to ensure acquisition of grade level literacy and critical thinking skills should be of greatest priority. While it is encouraging to see the district's graduation rate increase, it is disheartening to hear that many graduates lack functional skills in reading, writing, grammar and mathematics.

district office reductions are near the bottom, but if we could separately itemize the public safety department's qdoba budget, it would be at the top

For items that are TBD (i.e., district office reduction; Flex staffing), I believe these estimates should be explicitly stated ASAP to help people make the most informed decision on this survey. In general and regardless of the number, reductions should be made from the top at the district office level FIRST, before considering reducing or restructuring student facing services that will result in less staff available to support students on a daily basis being that people would be split between buildings.

BSD has still not returned to the model that existed pre-2013 cuts that laid off many teachers and classified staff, while cutting very few administrative positions. Since that time, the administrative group has grown exponentially compared to any other group. This seems to be a much larger group of "middle" administrators, who manage even more administrators. If we were to close a bit of the gap between our highest-paid employees and our lowest paid employees we would see a significant cut in budget. BSD needs to reexamine how we are funding ACTUAL STUDENT SUPPORT.

Interesting how quickly you could calculate cuts to complex services but not cuts to your own office. People are less likely to uprank items without a dollar amount, the district office could use this as a shield for not making their own cuts by saying people didn't preference it. This concerns me.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

The fact that potential cuts to the district office have not been calculated at all is interesting and has been noted by your educators and community. Seeing where your priorities lie is disappointing but not surprising.

Decisions should be made in relation to how far from actual students the impact is. District office is most definitely the first place cuts should occur as they are the farthest from actual students. Because elementary is the foundation of everything else, cuts to elementary teachers (who are the closest) to students should be very last.

There needs to be a reduction of positions at the district office level. There has been a glaring model of job title and new position creation at the district level over the past 5 + years that could benefit from an audit and reduction. I think there are a considerable number of positions at the district level that do not serve our students nor meet the standards of the efficiency model being messaged to our community.

The district should be looking at multiple other options instead of these options. We are spending significant amounts on unnecessary curriculum expenses (e.g., Savvas), ineffective programs (e.g., Character Strong, Hox Hunt, etc.), and redundant buildings (e.g., two district office buildings), etc. Cut things like this before you cut people.

Why do we have 2 central office buildings and multiple administrators that I couldn't even begin to explain what their jobs are? Why are there no cuts here?

I was wondering why facilities weren't mentioned in the cuts? Was that intentional or maybe they are already pretty slim as of now. On another note, while I know this isn't the biggest number in savings but the amount of food exec. admin and DAO admin spend for every meeting, get together, and just because is a frivolous waste of money. Also those funds come directly from the general fund, seems odd to me. Other might agree.

Yes! Working at BASE I see a huge discrepancy between the case loads of the MS teachers and the HS teachers. For example, HS class are smaller. One example is that a Psychology class has 12 students and MS classes average well above 30 kids. Many of the HS teachers are veteran teachers, high on the pay scale and yet have fewer students and a smaller case load. Wouldn't it make more sense for a class which only enrolls 12 students to be taught at a localized HS space (or once a year) or every other year to maximize teacher instruction while balancing course offerings? Secondly, as a PE/Health teacher we have one TOSA for k-12 Health and PE. A definite cost savings compared to other subject areas. TOSA's are typically veteran teachers costing the district more \$. When looking at Math, the amount of TOSA's is large, especially in comparison and yet when I ask our math teachers about the help these TOSA's provide considering the cost to the school district, well, our Math teachers have verbally reported that the help is minimal. If staff are reporting that TOSA's are not helpful (in 6 years I have seen one LA TOSA and one Math TOSA in our building) then why is the district continuing to spend the funds when the math scores are not increasing. Where is the value to our students and our tax payers?

Teachers are tired of the district cutting our support staff and our funding. Time to trim district office.

I notice there are no administrators listed here as an option for reduction...This sends the message, whether intentional or not, that those making the most money are the most valuable to the district. Reducing administrators, who make mid to high six-figure incomes, would have the greatest reduction impact than those working to improve student outcomes and build best practices of teachers. How telling.

Any job cuts should be done at the district office this would have very little impact on what's important and that's students education

I dunno, maybe cutting the salary of some of the Central office higher-ups.

Convenient to leave out the estimated savings of cutting at the district admin level, but that's where cuts should happen first. This survey is also worded weird so hopefully people understand how to rank their suggestions with the bottom being the highest priority for keeping as is.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

I appreciate the desire to take care of our admin, I truly do. However, I do wonder about the optics and actual cost of catering at admin meetings and trainings. I know that some of food falls under grants, but what would be the savings per year for admin to bring their own breakfasts/lunches to meetings? Little things add up, and it sends a positive message to the whole district (who pack their lunches every day).

It doesn't make sense to keep cutting at the district office when we have fewer students in classrooms. We need to cut teachers. If we used our dollars toward actual education, rather than trying to pick up the slack for health and human service agencies that aren't doing their jobs, we would be in a much better financial situation.

Cuts at the district office and TOSA support should go first.

Work with the state to create affordable housing to help grow enrollment if that is such a big reason for declining enrollment. Also, consider budgeting better by hire less admin/district people so that this does not continue to happen.

Where do the TOSA's fit on this plan because they can be cut with the district office reductions.

Where do the TOSA's fit on this plan? TOSA's needed to be cut within the district office reductions.

District-level TOSA roles often operate invisibly, yet they are critical to sustaining high-quality instruction and equitable student outcomes. The work I do—curriculum support, professional learning, implementation guidance, and cross-school coordination—ensures that programs function as intended and that teachers and students receive consistent support. These responsibilities are not easily transferable and require specialized expertise and sustained attention. Eliminating this role would shift essential work to already overextended administrators or leave key systems unsupported, increasing the risk of fragmentation and reduced effectiveness at the classroom level.

There are so many ways to cut a budget and targeting elementary school supports should be the absolute last option. Try taking a look at public safety, how many people they've hired under the newest administration, how many brand new cars sit in our parking lot wrapped on their department name, who we contract with, and what companies we dumped money into that still haven't produced a viable option for recording safety concerns.

How many conferences do K-8 executives need to go to and how is that supporting their buildings or content areas?

Why have we out money into paying Bright Mornings to consult on a coaching model that has no plan of how to roll out out and no established "why" when it was put into place.

If we cut FTE from 3 positions at elementary schools, who is going to cover for the admin when they are pulled out for all day catered meetings?

I believe an audit should be done to see where district funds have been spent on initiatives and conferences which have instantly died the next school year (MTSS, SEL, RP) and make those using district funds to attend conferences account for how it's supporting the students and staff of the entire district.

Absolutely continue to fund the LITT position in all the schools. There NO WAY one person at the District Office level can assist all the schools for this vital position. Reduce the number of administrators at the District Office. Also, it is very disingenuous to list \$ amounts for all other reductions and list District Office reductions as TBD. Propose at least 3 school days to be reduced next calendar year for savings.

Get rid of District office and TOSA positions, Success Coaches, AVID

I used to work for BSD and there is a lot of staff at the top that could be eliminated without effecting the students very much. That is what should be done first.

Significantly reduce the staffing for the Office of Equity and Inclusion. This office contributes little to the overall education of students and instead focuses on "Equity" which is defined as the equality of outcome. I strongly recommend that BSD prioritize teaching reading, writing, math, and science over social justice.

Please also consider cancelling third party contracts with Equity and Inclusion non-profit organizations.

**2026-27 BUDGET PRIORITIES SURVEY – OPEN COMMENTS**  
**February 4, 2026 – February 28, 2026**

Cutting necessary services and staffing is appalling. You speak of providing quality education and services but seek to stretch staff and access so thin under the pretense of saving money that the long term effects of student impact will be severely hindered. The DO needs to do better. I know there are so many ineffective members at leadership at school and district level and if cuts need to happen, it would be them first. I have little to no confidence in BSD to make the right decisions for students and I'm only kept afloat by the current quality staff for my child (most of them). However, I don't see that as sustainable given BSD's hiring and retention practices. Cut your bloated wages at district level first!

Pay cut for the super/board would be great.

Did you look at possible expense reductions in Facilities and Maintenance? Given that we are evaluating ideas across the district, it would have been nice to at least see one idea for savings in this area included on the list.

Allow the teachers who don't quite get a full load to be priority choices for FLEX teachers. This would be far more efficient than having teachers drive to different locations and ensure FLEX students can access all electives even if there are not enough to fund a whole teacher (and FLEX teachers can teach their best areas).

Consider a co-taught inclusion model in schools that don't quite have 2 full classes per grade, this could balance enrollment with kids who are already receiving transportation.

Also consider slashing all central district personnel by a third or more. There is zero need to have 2+ staff in every small department, you can have one and then some cross-training to cover vacations. Admin should wear multiple hats not specialize.

Cut administrative staff and executive staff!!! Stop wasteful spending that is happening daily. Do not offer a longevity bonus to the incoming superintendent. Stop having lunches at admin meetings. Stop having schools hold doors open for dismissal and arrivals because the amount of heat/AC that is wasted is insane!!! Make parents pay for what their child breaks. Make sure after school programs are following ALL the rules so that it's not costing our district more. And lastly, maybe work on "work shouldn't hurt" because my guess is our worker's compensation insurance is higher than it should be! Less hurt staff means a better premium.

District cuts should be first and resources for students should be cut last.

A significant percentage of needed budget cuts this year should come from Central Office. Eliminating roles like "Chief of Staff", and rolling "Chief Technology Officer" under a superintendent are difficult but necessary steps to flatten the organization and become more efficient. Additionally, two administrators handling Long Range Planning is excessive. Reducing the manager layers in services like Transportation, as well as the over-staffed Communications department, are also necessary.

Making highly-produced videos does little to further the mission of the district to Belong, Believe Achieve and should be deprioritized in favor of preserving essential services like social work.

Additionally, I would like to see a detailed review of the EdTech contracts in place in the district and see what areas can be reduced or eliminated, both to save cost and more effectively advance the academic mission.

District office employees need to be cut first !! Also district office employees need to move into school buildings to cut costs of the the district office location before any positions who actually work with students on a daily basis are cut!!!