Budget Reduction Scenario

DOCUMENT IS IN PROGRESS

June 2026

Purpose

This document provides the Board of Education with a summary of proposed budget reductions developed through a structured scoring process. Each proposal was evaluated across six weighted criteria to assess impact, risk, and feasibility. Savings figures reflect actual FTE and actual dollar savings as entered in the scoring matrix.

Reduction Goal: $12,000,000

Current Scenario Total (Actual Savings): $11,639,351

Total Proposals Included: 37

Average Weighted Score: 4.32 out of 5.0

Notes

Special education remains one of our highest priorities and largest areas of investment in the district. As we move forward, all special education programs will continue to be staffed in alignment with state and county requirements, including:

- Certified teachers
- Paraprofessionals
- Related service providers

These decisions are guided by each student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) and are mandated to comply with all legal and educational standards. As we adapt to a state-led shift in service delivery, we are diligently working to enhance our programs. While we continue to provide services based on IEP needs and state requirements, we will make responsible adjustments to ensure the long-term sustainability of our programs.

Historical Special Education Costs				
Description	**2018-2019**	**2024-2025**	**Change**	
Special Education Costs – IEP & non-IEP	$16,744,610	$29,210,999	$12,466,389	74%
Special Education Count	1,332	1,367	35	3%

Summary of Reductions by Area

The table below summarizes proposed reductions by department, showing actual savings associated with each area.

Department / Area	# of Proposals	Actual Annual Savings
Athletics	1	103,000
Business Services	3	708,980
Communications	1	87,870
District-wide	7	3,099,376
Elementary	6	1,716,531
Employee Services	2	356,972
Secondary	5	1,687,800
Special Education – Classroom Instruction	4	1,396,573
Special Education – Non-instructional	4	1,833,312
Teaching & Learning	2	563,523
Technology Services	2	85,412
TOTAL	**37**	**$ 11,639,351**

Detailed Proposal List

Area	Proposal	Savings	Score	Tier
Athletics	Athletic programming adjustments	103,000	4.60	Tier 1
Business Services	Reclass Debt Payments from Gen Fund to Sinking Fund	438,700	5.00	Tier 1
Business Services	Operations - reduce FTE (one HVAC & two maintenance techs)	185,280	4.85	Tier 1
Business Services	DM Burr contract savings	85,000	4.80	Tier 1
Communications	Reduction of release time, back to the classroom	87,870	4.90	Tier 1
District-wide	Buyout Savings - Minimum expected savings	1,500,000	4.90	Tier 1
District-wide	District-wide Purchased Services/Supplies budget reductions	400,000	5.00	Tier 1
District-wide	Attendance secretary reduction (from 12 full-time FTE to 12 half-time FTE at EL) and (from 2 to 0 FTE at HS)	386,326	4.30	Tier 1
District-wide	Schedule C Items - 20% Reduction	380,000	4.70	Tier 1
District-wide	Administrator reductions (2 FTE)	258,050	4.90	Tier 1
District-wide	SEC Director Contract Adjustment	100,000	4.90	Tier 1
District-wide	Legal Fees	75,000	4.85	Tier 1
Elementary	Reduce Elementary Gen Ed Positions (3 Kindergarten and 2 Second Gr)	783,000	4.20	Tier 1
Elementary	Reduce Math Specialists (from 8 to 2 FTE)	522,000	3.70	Tier 2
Elementary	Reduce ELD Specialists (from 14.6 to 12.6 FTE)	174,000	3.40	Tier 2

Area	Proposal	Savings	Score	Tier
Elementary	Reduce Media Specialists (from 10.5 to 9.5 FTE)	87,000	4.30	Tier 1
Elementary	Reduce Literacy Specialists (from 15 to 14 FTE)	87,000	3.40	Tier 2
Elementary	Reduce Media Aides (2 district-wide)	63,531	4.30	Tier 1
Employee Services	Reduce building substitute allocation to buildings	284,310	4.55	Tier 1
Employee Services	Edustaff/Receptionist Position Combined Due to Retirement	72,662	4.85	Tier 1
Secondary	Reduce Secondary General Education by 10 FTE	870,000	4.20	Tier 1
Secondary	Reduce Math Specialists (from 6 to 2.8 FTE)	278,400	3.70	Tier 2
Secondary	Reduce Literacy Specialists (from 6 to 2.8 FTE)	278,400	3.40	Tier 2
Secondary	Reduce HS Counselors (from 16 to 14 FTE)	261,000	4.20	Tier 1
Special Education - Instruction	Adjust TC/RR staff to meet county targets (3.7 Elementary, 3.6 Secondary)	635,100	2.95	Tier 3
Special Education - Instruction	Teacher reduction based on new county level plan (A, B, C) (3 L4, 1 ECP)	348,000	4.10	Tier 1
Special Education - Instruction	Paraprofessional reduction based on new county level plan (A, B, C)	236,270	4.10	Tier 1
Special Education - Instruction	Elementary Resource Room paraprofessionals reduction	177,203	3.85	Tier 2
Special Education - Non-instruction	Student Support Aide – Gen Ed (from 158 to 104 FTE)	1,334,362	4.15	Tier 1
Special Education - Non-instruction	Social Workers Reduction (from 24.4 to 21.4 FTE)	348,000	3.90	Tier 2
Special Education - Non-instruction	Psychologist Reduction (from 10 to 9 FTE)	116,000	3.90	Tier 2
Special Education - Non-instruction	Special Ed Secretary	34,951	4.35	Tier 1
Teaching & Learning	T&L Reductions (subscriptions and PD)	450,000	4.90	Tier 1
Teaching & Learning	Secondary ELD Para reduction (from 11 to 8 FTE)	113,523	3.75	Tier 2
Technology Services	Technology Consultant reduction (1 FTE)	60,000	5.00	Tier 1
Technology Services	Review building tech structure to evaluate need	25,412	4.55	Tier 1
Items above in red indicate the board's desires for further conversations				

Scenario Summary by Tier

Proposals are organized into three tiers based on their weighted scores. The tier distribution of the current scenario is shown below.

Tier	Actual Annual Savings	% of Total
Tier 1 – Strong Candidate	8,909,725	76.5%
Tier 2 – Consider	2,094,526	18.0%
Tier 3 – High Risk	635,100	5.5%
TOTAL SCENARIO SAVINGS	**$11,639,351**	**100.0%**

Scoring Methodology

Each proposal was scored on a 1–5 scale across six criteria. Criteria were weighted to reflect the district's priorities. The weighted total score determines tier placement and helps prioritize proposals for the reduction scenario.

Scoring Criteria and Weights

Scoring Criterion	Weight	Description
Impact on Student Learning	**30%**	Measures the degree to which the reduction affects direct instruction, academic programming, or student supports. Higher scores indicate minimal disruption to core learning.
Equity Impact	**20%**	Evaluates whether the reduction disproportionately affects high-need, underrepresented, or protected student populations. Higher scores indicate equitable outcomes.
Legal / Compliance Risk	**15%**	Assesses exposure to grievances, regulatory violations, or breach of contract. Higher scores indicate full compliance with laws, board policy, and labor agreements.
Cost Savings Amount	**15%**	Reflects the magnitude of recurring savings relative to the structural deficit. Higher scores indicate substantial, ongoing savings that meaningfully close the gap.
Feasibility / Timeline	**10%**	Considers whether the reduction can be implemented within the required timeframe with available internal capacity. Higher scores indicate ready implementation.
Stakeholder Support	**10%**	Gauges anticipated reaction from staff, families, and community. Higher scores reflect broad understanding and manageable concerns.

Score Scale

Score	Rating	General Meaning
5	Strong / Low Risk	Minimal negative impact; highly feasible; broad support
4	Good / Manageable	Limited impact; manageable with mitigation
3	Moderate Concern	Noticeable impact; requires planning and communication
2	Significant Risk	Meaningful disruption; difficult to mitigate; notable resistance
1	High Risk	Severe impact or legal risk; low feasibility; widespread opposition

Tier Definitions

Tier	Score Range	Meaning
Tier 1 – Strong Candidate	4.0 – 5.0	Low risk, strong savings, high feasibility. Recommended for inclusion in the reduction scenario.
Tier 2 – Consider	3.0 – 3.9	Moderate concern in one or more areas. May be included with additional planning, mitigation, or phased implementation.
Tier 3 – High Risk	Below 3.0	Significant legal, equity, or operational risks. Requires further study or redesign before consideration.

Note: A weighted total score of 5.0 indicates the highest performance across all criteria. Proposals scoring below 4.0 may still be included in a scenario if savings are critical to meeting the reduction goal, but require additional planning, communication, and mitigation efforts.