



School Board Budget Committee Meeting Agenda

May 13, 2025, 5:00 PM

Location:

Education Center, Board Room #314
520 NW Wall Street
Bend, OR 97703

1. **Call to Order**
Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair Cara Marsh-Rhodes
2. **Review of Agenda**
Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair Cara Marsh-Rhodes
3. **Public Comment**
Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair Marsh Rhodes
4. **Consent Agenda**
Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair Marsh Rhodes
Description: Items that are routine in nature are placed on the Consent Agenda. Any item placed on the Consent for Action may be removed at the request of any Board member prior to the time a vote is taken. All remaining items of the Consent for Action are then disposed of in a single motion.
 - A. Approval of Minutes 2
Description: April 8, 2025, Budget Committee Meeting; *Reference: ORS 192.650 and ORS 332.057*
Attachments:
4.8.25 Budget Committee Meeting Minutes - DRAFT 2
5. **Reports**
 - A. 2025-26 Budget Information Update 4
Speaker(s): Dan Emerson, Chief Financial Officer
Attachments:
- 5.13.25 District Follow-up to BLS Proposed Budget Questions 4
6. **Action Items**
 - A. Budget Committee Approval of 2025-2026 Budget
Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair Marsh Rhodes
7. **Adjourn**
Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair Marsh Rhodes



School Board Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Location:

Education Center, Board Room #314
520 NW Wall Street
Bend, OR 97703

Meeting Date: April 8, 2025

Board Members

Kina Chadwick:	Present
Cameron Fischer:	Absent
Marcus LeGrand:	Present
Carrie McPherson Douglass:	Absent
Shirley Olson:	Present
Amy Tatom:	Present
Ross Tomlin:	Present

Director Kina Chadwick joined the meeting at 4:10 pm.

Budget Committee Members in Attendance:

Cara Marsh-Rhodes
Natasha McFarland
Sharon Bellusci
Ned Lutz
Seth Isenberg

1. Call to Order

Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair Cara Marsh-Rhodes

Discussion: The meeting was called to order by Budget Committee Chair Cara Marsh-Rhodes at 4:00 pm.

2. Review of Agenda

Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair Cara Marsh-Rhodes

Discussion: There were no changes to the agenda.

3. Election of Budget Committee Officers

Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair Cara Marsh-Rhodes

Action(s): I move to nominate Cara Marsh Rhodes as Chair. This motion, made by Natasha McFarland and seconded by Amy Tatom, Carried.

Voting Detail: Kina Chadwick: Yea, Marcus LeGrand: Yea, Shirley Olson: Yea, Amy Tatom: Yea, Ross Tomlin: Yea, Natasha McFarland: Yea, Sharon Bellusci: Yea, Ned Lutz: Yea, Seth Isenberg: Yea, Cara Marsh-Rhodes: Abstain with Conflict

Voting Summary: Yea: 9, Nay: 0, Abstain with Conflict: 1

Action(s): I move to nominate Natasha McFarland as Vice Chair. This motion, made by Amy Tatom and seconded by Marcus LeGrand, Carried.

Voting Detail: Kina Chadwick: Yea, Marcus LeGrand: Yea, Shirley Olson: Yea, Amy Tatom: Yea, Ross Tomlin: Yea, Natasha McFarland: Abstain with Conflict, Sharon Bellusci: Yea, Ned Lutz: Yea, Seth Isenberg: Yea, Cara

Marsh-Rhodes: Yea

Voting Summary: Yea: 9, Nay: 0, Abstain with Conflict: 1

4. **Public Comment**

Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair

Discussion: There were no requests to provide public comment.

5. **Reports**

Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair

A. **2025-26 Budget**

Speaker(s): Dan Emerson, Chief Financial Officer

Description:

- 2025-26 Proposed Budget

Attachments: Presentation: FY 2025-26 Proposed Budget

Discussion: Superintendent Cook read his budget message from the 2025-26 Proposed Budget.

Dan Emerson, Chief Financial Officer, reviewed the budget assumptions explaining the importance of assumptions for 2025-26 as the SSF (State School Fund) allocation has not yet been released. He highlighted the revenue assumptions for SIA (Student Investment Account), HSS (High School Success), the uncertainty of federal funds, and the proposed increase to the early literacy grant. He also reviewed the SSF assumptions from 2015 through 2027. The expenditure assumptions related to personnel were discussed, as well as the major personnel and operating cost assumptions. It was noted that 85% of the general fund operations are made up of personnel expenditures.

Emerson provided an overview of the budget process internally that starts with meetings with and requests from department heads and level leaders to build the proposed budget with the least impact on school staffing. He noted that the SSF does not come in as expected, the district will need to make an additional \$3 million in cuts that most likely cannot be absorbed by additional cuts in the operations department budgets. Emerson shared a graph that depicts resources versus requirements and the impact on the ending fund balance as well as the reserve requirement per Board policy. He asked that questions related to the budget be directed to the budget email address provided no later than May 6th, so they could be addressed and included in the board packet for the May 13th meeting.

Deputy Superintendent Birk discussed the district's strategic initiatives as a centering document for all of the "things" that impact the district's budget.

6. **Adjourn**

Speaker(s): Budget Committee Chair

Description: Meeting will be adjourned with next Budget Committee Meeting scheduled for May 13, 2025.

Discussion: Budget Committee Chair Cara Marsh-Rhodes adjourned the meeting at 4:56 pm.

Recorded by: Janet Bojanowski, Board Clerk



**District Follow-up to Budget Committee Member Questions Received Regarding 2025-26 Proposed Budget
Following April 8, 2025, Budget Committee Meeting**

Question	District Response
p. 12 – property tax estimated at 4% increase...when do we have a final estimate?	This is a confusing sentence and can be removed for the adopted budget. At a state-wide level we estimate taxes will increase by 4%, locally we budget taxes to increase by 4.7% and those funds will be put into the statewide pot. We will not have final actuals on these projections until July of 2026.
Ending fund balance 8%...move up?	It would be fiscally prudent to have a higher ending fund balance given the financial cliff we are projecting.
p. 15—target class size...can we keep these ratios if funding drops? How will we estimate, at which grade levels will be recommended changes; we know that we have small classes now in some schools.	If funding drops we would not be able to keep current staffing ratios. We have budgeted 11.6M for SSF funding, should it come in lower (11.4B) we would need to reduce FTE and thereby increase target class sizes. For the upcoming FY, we believe we have right sized areas where we had small class sizes this current year, (due to natural decline in enrollment we reduced 25 elementary level FTE), therefore we don't anticipate having one off areas or grades where class sizes are significantly below projections, and so we would seek to make equitable increases to the target class size across all levels and schools.
p. 16—have we been transparent in FTE allocated to schools with more student needs?	There is probably room for improvement in this area in the budget document. For instance high poverty schools, high SPED population and ELL schools along with smaller schools with additional programs receive additional FTE allocations.
p. 20—related to the FTE question above...do we identify the actual schools or programs that receive this additional funding?	The extra funding is baked into our staffing formulas; we don't explicitly call out which schools receive those FTE in our budget document, but it is defined in our staffing formulas at either the district or school level. If a staffing formula is district wide, like the formula for SPED Inclusion EA's, the SPED leadership will work with schools to allocate individual FTE based on student needs.
p.23—very concerned about limited reserves in the long-term projections	We share this concern. Without large additional resource increases we will need to cut a significant amount of personnel in FY27, and possibly in FY26 depending on where SSF lands in late May. This is a position that the vast majority of large districts are unfortunately in, and is the reason we are advocating so diligently at the State level for additional funding.
p. 32-73—proposed vs. adopted FTE...translate to staff reductions???	Can you provide more clarification on this question? Are you looking for potential staff reduction impacts between this proposed budget and the upcoming adopted budget in July should SSF revenue come in below budget. Or are you asking for the difference between the FY25 adopted budget FTE and FY26 proposed budget FTE?
p.77—athletics general fund transfer....increase in student participation, coach stipends, other costs.....\$1m+++	In the past, the athletics fund has had a carry-over fund balance which could be used to reduce the annual transfer amount. However, that fund balance has now been completely utilized, so the transfer amount has increased since there is no offsetting fund balance. In addition, we did hire an AD Director and moved AD's from the certified salary range to BLAST range while adding a couple new sports/programs.



District Follow-up to Budget Committee Member Questions Received Regarding 2025-26 Proposed Budget
Following April 8, 2025, Budget Committee Meeting

Question	District Response
<p>p.87—facility usage...no general fund transfer? Does that mean that any outside organization who uses facilities is expected to fund staff/equipment/facility costs???</p>	<p>The facilities fund has a carry-over fund balance which we are utilizing this year to cover their budgeted costs instead of transferring GF resources. Outside groups have always had a nominal fee for facility usage, that will not change, the fee is not enough to begin to cover the cost of facilities related to this fund.</p>
<p>p.98—special revenue funds...federal grants for supplemental programs may be the MOST affected if educational funds are restricted. How do we intend to provide like programs and services?</p>	<p>We receive approximately \$15M in Federal funds. Should those funds be cut we would have to make significant decisions about programmatic cuts, including prioritization of programs and assessing which programs we would need to continue and support with GF dollars and what we would need to reduce or cut. Ultimately, if we were to lose all Federal funding or even a portion of it, we would need to make reductions to service level or cuts either to the Federally funded program, or somewhere else to be able to balance the budget.</p>
<p>p. 116—do we use all these scholarship funds each year?</p>	<p>No. We only manage the long-term trusts, smaller scholarships are managed directly by schools.</p>
<p>p. 120-129—have these changes in FTE by category been translated to individual schools/programs?</p>	<p>Yes, schools and programs have received their FY26 staffing allocations which are a reflection of the larger aggregated FTE numbers you find in the personnel section of the budget book.</p>