

Eliminate Storage unit that has COVID supplies

Cost: \$12,000

Many schools have limited storage, this may not be practical
Determine what we are able to in buildings and then reevaluate.
Are Covid supplies still required? If not, get rid of the storage
longer be needed
This could have a negative impact on health and psychological function of students. COVID is a virulent virus that continues to mutate and spread. It is important to have an adequate supply of basic supplies on hand to stop the spread, prevent a second shut down, and ensure safety during times of risk for infection will help to keep operations running and kids in the classroom.
We should cut this...Our classroom teachers cannot even get the supplies/furniture when they have asked for it.
Get rid of this, very little impact on student learning
I think this is a minimal impact overall, not effecting staffing or student experience.
There are more than likely enough storage spaces throughout the various schools through organizing current storage spaces. Elimination would have minimal impact.
Little cuts make a difference maintaining student programs
Not needed...sell items not needed
I can support this even though we have no district storage for anything. I have hopes of trying to reduce my Custodial supply cost by purchasing in bulk and have a central storage. A thought I have would be to pour a concrete floor in the pig shed and finish closing in the side for this storage. It would be a 1 time cost but would reduce the need to rent space.
absolutely no impact on students
It makes sense that COVID supplies be stored at each individual building and accessible to everyone as it is needed. While it is still very rampant throughout our community, it is not so much of a threat that we should dedicate and entire storage unit to supplies.
can be housed within existing buildings, easy savings
It is sad to see that this is even something that was ever in action.
ESD has VERY LITTLE storage. This will be very challenging to meet needs.

Hanover Research Equity Services and Resources

Cost: \$16,500

Seems low impact due from staff perspective.
appears that this would be a reasonable savings place, while it wouldn't be as simple, there could be far less expensive ways to gather the information with existing technology
This does not have big impacts on student learning/growth
Very little immediate impact on student learning if cut
Elimination would appear to have minimal impact. Focus groups or other more cost effective methods of gathering data are available.
*Find a different way to collect this data
no impact on students
change systems (can use technology and programs already in place an available to conduct surveys and other data collecting programs)
I feel that this could be easily eliminated with minimal impact.

Hot Spots

Cost: \$60,000

It isn't perfect or what is wanted but we could consider significantly reducing district hotspots if the policy and expectation from the schools is that homework is being done at home. How much are the wifi hotspots being used now?
There are internet programs for low income families through other sources as well to offer as an option.
Eliminate
Positive impact... prior to COVID these students did not have the option to access hot spots at the schools. Many local businesses and the library offer free internet access.
would advocate for significant reductions here to only be available when there are confirmed, known barriers for a student to access their learning opportunities from home. would also need to open the schools or make opportunities available for students to access school wifi in off hours
Low impact. Pre Covid these were not utilized. If data suggest use of hotspots, reevaluate, and reduce cost, to match the data/need.
Reduce spots, but still ensure students who need it, get it
These were not in use pre-Covid. Evaluate use of hotspots. If still a need, reduce cost to match current need. Consider moving to tech levy funded.
since we back in building, hots spots should not needed any more
Reducing Hot Spots could make it more difficult for the students who don't have reliable internet access at home. Low income students would be disproportionately impacted by this cut.

If there is a way to help those in need but reduce the need for hot spots so that it doesn't impact other students learning abilities.
Reduce the number of hot spots available to reduce costs if not all are being used. But, this should be kept to allow for students to access internet that is needed for school work.
COVID is passed. Seems there could be an equity study conducted to ensure access to internet but during hard times, students need to focus on learning at school and this is low hanging fruit that can be easily absorbed. Students at the secondary level are not doing much homework at home as is in post COVID times.
As long as all students have access to the internet, this seems reasonable. Will reducing the number of hot spots make learning difficult/more challenging for some students? Students should not be penalized in any way.
It makes sense to cut down hotspots if they are not needed, however we must ensure that there are still enough to provide students who do not have access to the internet a safe way for them to access the internet and complete their work.
Is there a way to reduce the amount of hot spots available to students instead of cancel them all together?
Some hot spots can be funded by Homeless or Title IA to support disadvantaged students.
apply for grant funding from state, federal, nonprofit, etc. to provide equitable internet access (possible to work with the city/local communications on this?)
No negative impact to reducing hot spots that are redundant where Wi-Fi is already available. Can at least reduce the overall cost by assessing the actual need. A fairly robust source of funding considering the minor negative impact.

No Seattle PLC institute except for the free spots

Cost: \$20,000

Cut unless free
Positive impact is that the program could be offered on a rotational or seniority basis. Those who attend could return and regurgitate to those who were unable to attend that year.
This was a voluntary training for staff. It was not paid. Consider evaluating current understandings, refining our current practices, hosting a voluntary event in Ellensburg to eliminate the cost of lodging, registration, meals, travel, etc.
Impacts are minimal compared to the budget impact of reducing costs by \$20,000.
We have to be able to invest in professional growth: it helps us improve for students and it helps us retain high quality staff.
yes
use only free spots, do not pay, not directly impacting students (easy to add back in when available)
This was funded by LAP, \$, not general funds this past year. Not applicable
Maybe needed to meet our goals.
minimal impact to staff and students- those who attend will need to bring the ideas back to the others and provide that information through other times

Reduce capital project transfer from General fund to Capital \$600,000 to \$300,000.

Cost: \$300,000

The long term impact of a large decrease should be evaluated. What is the current balance in this fund? Evaluate the current balance, upcoming needs/projects, and consider reducing at a reduced rate to achieve the 1-million-dollar goal. I.E. is reducing by 100,000 or 150,000 less impactful?

This could delay many capital projects that have already been on hold over the last few years. Further delay could end up costing the district even more money in the long run. This money could also help fund getting our district in compliance with HB1257. We must be in compliance starting in 2027.

Reduce

Although this sounds good and could be a savings, there could still be things that come up and need to be replaced, fixed, and this fund will help the district in such cases

If times are tight, lets limp along with regards to this capitol project funding

Often the large budget impact garners a lot of attention. However, the impact long-term is often greater and causes more reductions in the future because expenses are greater in the future.

funding for capital projects could still be funded out of the general fund if this were to happen and it could be done IF there is a pressing need, but the money from capital projects fund cannot be spent on general fund items- this just eliminates the one-way transfer but emergencies could still be covered from the fund balance

In the interest of keeping critical staff who work with students, reducing capital projects temporarily is a good choice.

This would have a positive impact on the overall budget and not impact staffing. This would help in allowing staffing to stay the same.

Summer Building LIT Day

Cost: \$12,000

As a participant in building LIT, while I find the summer day beneficial, a half-day would be sufficient to launch the school year.

How do the LIT members feel about this? Will reducing the time increase their efficiency? Will they be able to complete the task in less time?

Cut to half day

Less impact on student learning, therefore could be cut

Buildings could either cover the costs, if needed, or there may need to be some activities and decisions saved for the start of the school year- slight delay in some decision-making

limited impact on students

make this an optional day not every staff member may need to attend, will paying for staff members to choose not to attend LIT day.

\$3000 Global PD

Reduce moving costs from budget by 35,000, leaving

**10,000 for any necessary moves (was budgeted for 45,000 due to movement with new schools)
Reduce (1) Mental Health Counselor. (KVHN will be funding (1) FTE Counselor for ESD through tax dollars)**

Cost: \$83,000

This would still provide (2) MH counselors to the district and would decrease costs.
Students need this support, will fill a whole in our community services for quicker action.
If funded by another source, positive with no known negative impacts.
This seems like an no-brainer- no impact to current service model and it is good for kids
Yes, reduce since we will still get the same level of support with KVH
Would this be going from 2 ESSER Funded MH Counselor to 1 Funded Position plus the KVHN position? Or would this be just the KVHN position? The KVHN (actually KCHN and they are contracted with Comprehensive Healthcare to fill the position) is a 4-year grant funded program (not local taxes). After 4 years if new funding is not identified the position would be eliminated. Mental Health needs are growing and the mental health of students impacts all outcomes from graduation rates, attendance, to overall learning and retaining information. Mental Health staff are specialized and can see students beyond the school counselors' scope of practice and limits in ASCA guidelines. They respond to crisis situations, suicide ideology and self-harm and behaviors in the classrooms that impact the student in crisis but peers as well. Clinical depression and anxiety are on the rise
Given a choice between family liaisons and mental health specialists who are shared between 6 schools, maintaining APs and Deans is a more effective service for students.
This seems like a good compromise to eliminating both position (previously mentioned).
mental health was announced in the levy campaign- would go against what the voters agreed to pay for
I don't understand how the same level of service is able to be provided when there is a reduction of 1 Mental Health Counselor. More and more students are having mental health issues impacting their ability to learn inside the classroom. I believe we need more not less and the impacts would be felt in other areas of the learning environment.
Yes this should be done to save money
keep all mental health services who have direct impacts on students

New ESSER (1) Family Liaison

Cost: \$55,988

Will reduce opportunity for ESD staff to support parents and families with direct supports with the community. ie: health care, hope source, referrals to outside community providers

Will return the work load back on building counselors to track and monitor categories of students: Migrant, Homeless, American Indian, etc.

Less resources to support students directly with challenges

With one position already vacated-reduce staffing to 1 family liaison to support families. Possibly look at shifting some responsibilities from them to dean of students to help strengthen their relationships with families as well.

Family Liaisons have been an important linkage between families/students and school buildings. They have worked to identify resources to support families/students both directly and with referral to outside services. They have provided support to ECEAP and case management, including screening and home-visits per program requirements to preschool/transitional kindergarten families and are a huge component to the early learning center.

Eliminate the vacant position

Cutting this would harm educational justice which is a priority for ESSR funding.

Identify the roles of this person and how those could be absorbed in remaining school staffing. Example...if working with families on attendance, this would be supported by building assistant principals/deans. If supporting families with community supports (i.e. vision vouchers, housing, food needs, etc) designate who would be responsible for this in each building. As a side note, pre this role, these were achieved at a building level in many cases.

maybe keeping one for one more year as we transition out of ESSER funds. Cut one now and cut the other next year

this is a Covid related position that is no longer needed

responsibilities currently being covered by the family liaison (one already eliminated due to attrition) would have to be absorbed at the building level

If it was paid for by ESSER it should be cut

Budget has 2, but only 1 position currently filled. Keep the 1, don't fill 2nd slot

I would recommend not filling these currently vacant positions due to attrition. The impacts are reduced.

Overall Estimated Savings is 604,808

Plus Efficiencies at 372,000

Overall Recommended Reduction is about \$976, 808 dollars