



**Date:** November 3, 2025

**To:** Co-Chair Senator Kate Lieber, Joint Interim Committee on Ways and Means  
Co-Chair Representative Tawna Sanchez, Joint Interim Committee on Ways and Means

**From:** Director Dr. Charlene Williams, Oregon Department of Education

**RE:** ODE Budget Reduction Options

Enclosed, please find the Oregon Department of Education's (ODE) budget reduction options, as requested by the Legislative Fiscal Office for consideration as part of the 2026 rebalance plan.

## ODE Mission

ODE's mission is to foster equity and excellence for every learner through collaboration with educators, partners, and communities. The Department's vision is that all students have access to and benefit from a world-class, well-rounded, and equitable education system.

ODE provides leadership for all elementary and secondary students in Oregon's public schools and education service districts. The agency is responsible for developing state standards, guiding school improvement efforts, developing and implementing Oregon's statewide student assessment system, and reporting student performance. Responsibilities also extend to public preschool programs, the Oregon School for the Deaf, regional programs for children with disabilities, education programs for youth in Oregon correctional facilities, and a variety of other federal and state education programs.

## Funding Sources

ODE's activities are funded with a combination of General Fund, Lottery Funds, federal grants, corporate activity taxes, and miscellaneous other funds (primarily from grants and fees). For this budget planning exercise, ODE's reduction options are across four different fund types:

- General Fund (2.5% = \$18.8M and 5% = \$37.6M)
- Other Funds (2.5% = \$11.1M and 5% = \$22M)
- CAT-Funded Programs (2.5% = \$57.3M and 5% = \$114.7M)
- State School Fund (0.05% = \$56.8M and 5% = \$564.9M)

## Agency Approach to Budget Reduction Planning

In developing these reduction options, ODE sought to identify thoughtful and balanced approaches that uphold statutory responsibilities while minimizing impacts on students, families, and districts. We prioritized reductions that limit disruptions to core instructional programs and student-facing services, preserving essential staff and operational capacity wherever possible.



Decisions were guided by clear criteria: safeguard the agency's core mission, maintain statutory compliance, and protect student-centered supports that promote access and inclusion. We also sought to maintain organizational stability to ensure ODE remains positioned to implement legislative priorities and provide high-quality service to Oregon's schools and communities. In this same vein, the Department has reviewed the totality of the cuts, and through the decision lens shared above has identified a path that would surpass even the 2.5% target in General Fund savings through strategic reductions to the State School Fund carveouts. By eliminating the statutory transfer to the Educator Advancement Fund coupled with other carveout reductions, the Department could leverage greater savings and reduce impacts on general fund direct to student services programs like High School Success and Every Day Matters.

### **Programs Held Harmless**

Throughout this reduction planning process, the Department prioritized protecting programs that are statutorily required or directly tied to essential student services. The following programs are held harmless to ensure continuity of critical support for students, families, and districts, particularly in areas tied to health, nutrition, special education, and equity-driven initiatives.

#### **Grant in Aid Programs**

- **Reach Out to Read / Oregon Reads**
- **Student Success Plans**
- **Public Charter Equity Grants**
- **After-School Meal / Snack Program**
- **Breakfast and Summer Lunch Programs**
- **Family Day Care Home Sponsorship Program**
- **Farm to School Programs**
- **Tribal Attendance Grants**
- **Rural Technical Support Grants**
- **Statewide School Safety and Prevention Systems**
- **Literacy School Grants**
- **Literacy Community and Tribal Grants**
- **Summer Learning**

#### **Mandated Caseload**

- **Youth Corrections and Juvenile Detention Education Programs (YCEP / JDEP)**
- **Early Intervention (EI) & Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)**



- Regional Programs
- Hospital Programs
- Long-Term Care and Treatment (LTCT)

#### Youth Development Oregon (YDO)

- Strategic Initiatives Grants
- Juvenile Crime Prevention
- Youth Investments

#### Operations Reductions

Across all fund types, the Department has identified operational savings through a combination of vacancy management, position eliminations, and targeted line-item reductions. These actions reflect responsible fiscal stewardship and a commitment to aligning resources with the Department's highest priorities while minimizing disruption to core services. Operational adjustments were designed to protect mission-critical work and maintain the Department's capacity to fulfill statutory obligations, implement legislative directives, and support Oregon's schools and students effectively.

#### Summary of Key Reductions - First 2.5%

The most significant impacts in the 2.5% reduction scenario occur in Career and Technical Education (CTE); Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM); and targeted learning initiatives. While several programs are proposed for full elimination under this scenario, ODE has structured these changes to provide partial funding in the first year to allow for an orderly transition and planning period, followed by full elimination in the second year. This approach balances fiscal responsibility with the need to minimize disruption to districts, educators, and students who rely on these services.

- **Start Making a Reader Today (SMART):** Funded in year one to support the literacy partnership program providing early reading interventions through community volunteers; fully eliminated in year two.
- **Mathways:** Funded in year one to support the statewide mathematics pathways initiative (aligning high school coursework, post-secondary readiness, and CTE pathways); fully eliminated in year two.
- **Agricultural Summer Grants:** Funded in year one for Oregon FFA support of equitable CTE Agriculture opportunities (leadership, workforce skills, post-secondary pathways, especially rural and underserved students); fully eliminated in year two.
- **Student Leadership Centers:** Funded in year one for CTE Student Leadership Center statewide support for Career & Technical Student Organizations; fully eliminated in year two.



- **STEM Innovation:** Funded in year one to support ODE's STEM Innovation Grant program through regional STEM hubs (innovative STEM/CTE education, equity-driven, P-20 pathways); fully eliminated in year two.
- **Supporting Accelerated Learning (Regional Promise):** Funded in year one to maintain regional partnerships that expand early college credit and postsecondary transition opportunities for high school students; fully eliminated in year two.
- **Future Farmers of America (FFA):** Funded in year one to continue supporting statewide FFA programs that foster leadership development, agricultural education, and workforce readiness for students; fully eliminated in year two.

In addition to the programs proposed for phased elimination, several initiatives are partially reduced under the 2.5% scenario. These adjustments preserve core program functions and statewide coordination while scaling back discretionary activities, grant funding, and supplemental supports.

- **Every Day Matters (Chronic Absenteeism):** Partially reduced in both years, maintaining essential statewide coordination and technical assistance to districts while scaling back grant funding and outreach activities.
- **Physical Education (PE) Grants:** Partially reduced, maintaining limited funding for district implementation and compliance support while reducing discretionary grant awards.
- **East Metro Outreach, Prevention and Intervention (EMOPI):** Partially reduced, maintaining core outreach, prevention, and intervention services that support at-risk youth in East Multnomah County through mentorship, case management, and community-based partnerships.
- **Interfund Transfer:** Reflects a transfer between fund types to align with statutory expenditure authority and ensure available resources are utilized efficiently across programs; implemented in year one to support balanced fund management and maintain compliance with statewide budget requirements. This partial reduction is to the High School Success General Fund to Other Fund transfer. The Department would urge this reduction be removed in light of the deeper reduction proposed with the elimination of the EAC in the second year.

### Summary of Key Reductions — Second 2.5%

At the cumulative 5% reduction level (representing the second 2.5%), the Department expands reductions to include three full program eliminations and additional operational adjustments to meet the higher savings target. The focus remains on limiting classroom impact and maintaining alignment with Governor and statutory priorities.

- **STEM Regional Network (Backbone) Grants :** Funded in year one to support Oregon's network



of regional STEM Hubs that coordinate local and statewide efforts to improve STEM education, professional learning, and workforce connections; fully eliminated in year two.

- **CTE Revitalization Grants:** Funded in year one to provide district-level grants that modernize and expand high-quality CTE programs in high-wage, high-demand fields, particularly for historically underserved students; fully eliminated in year two.
- **CTE Career Pathway:** Partially reduced to maintain essential program support for districts while scaling back investments in program modernization, equipment purchases, and pathway expansion.
- **Transition Network Facilitators:** Partially reduced, maintaining limited coordination support for regional efforts that assist students in transitioning between K–12, postsecondary, and career pathways.
- **Youth Development Oregon (YDO) – Gang Prevention and Intervention:** Expanded reduction from the initial 2.5% to further scale back grant-in-aid funding for community-based programs that provide outreach, intervention, and prevention services for at-risk youth statewide.
- **Interfund Transfer:** Reflects a transfer between fund types to align with statutory expenditure authority and ensure available resources are utilized efficiently across programs; implemented in year one to support balanced fund management and maintain compliance with statewide budget requirements.

### Other Funds – First 2.5%

At the 2.5% reduction level, the Department focused on targeted adjustments that maintain essential operations and statewide priorities while minimizing direct impact on students and districts. This reduction option is tied to the GF reduction in HSS interfund transfer and the elimination of the Educator Advancement Council in year 2 of the biennium. This reduction represents a deeper reduction than the required 2.5%, resulting in additional General Fund savings.

- **High School Success Grants (Measure 98):** Partially reduced in year one, preserving supports for high school graduation, dropout prevention, and college/career readiness programs while reducing district allocations.
- **Educator Advancement Council (EAC):** Partially reduced to sustain critical educator mentorship, training, and professional learning supports while pausing new or expanded grant initiatives in the first year of the biennium. This assumes the EAC funding will be eliminated in the second year.

### Other Funds – Second 2.5%

At the cumulative 5% reduction level (representing the second 2.5%), the Department extends



additional reductions to High School Success as this is corresponding funding to the General Fund to Other Fund Interfund transfer identified in the General Fund reductions. These adjustments are designed to preserve core instructional and equity-focused services while reducing flexible or discretionary funding.

- **High School Success Grants (Measure 98)** (Additional Reduction - tied to the General Fund reduction of Interfund Transfers): Expanded reduction to district allocations supporting career and technical education pathways, graduation supports, and college/career readiness initiatives. The department recommends that due to the increased overall reduction provided in the 2.5% scenario, this reduction be removed.

### Other Funds – Student Success Act (First 2.5%)

At the 2.5% reduction level, the Department identified targeted adjustments across key statewide initiatives and grant programs to meet required savings while prioritizing core instructional and equity-focused investments. The approach maintains essential services in year one where possible, with some programs scheduled for full elimination in the second year.

- **ESD Technical Assistance Support Grants:** Partially reduced in year one, rolling back to GRB, maintaining essential technical assistance and regional coordination services for districts while scaling back discretionary and expansion projects.
- **Early Warning System Grants:** Funded in year one at a reduced level to continue early identification of at-risk students through data-driven tools and district supports; fully eliminated in year two.
- **Electronic Warning System Technical Assistance:** Funded in year one at a reduced level to maintain limited implementation support for early warning systems; fully eliminated in year two.
- **Hunger-Free Schools Program Grants:** Partially reduced, maintaining core meal service funding while relying on the ending fund balance to minimize near-term district impact.
- **Educator Professional Development Grants:** Funded in year one to provide professional development and mentorship programs for educators; fully eliminated in year two, with some functions to be absorbed by Other Funds balance through TSPC alignment.
- **DELIC Early Learning Transfer:** Partially reduced through adjustments to early learning transfer funding to reflect updated program alignment and ending fund balance availability. The specific recommendations related to this will be shared by the Department of Early Learning and Care.
- **Recovery Schools:** Partially reduced, maintaining core funding needed for operation of established schools.
- **Student Investment Intensive Program:** Partially reduced to maintain base need for these



program supports and assistance.

### Other Funds – Student Success Act (Second 2.5%)

At the cumulative 5% reduction level (representing the second 2.5%), the Department extends reductions across additional grant and transfer programs to meet higher savings requirements. The focus remains on protecting classroom instruction, district stability, and statutory compliance while targeting areas with available reserves or scalability.

- **Student Investment Account (SIA):** Reduced by approximately 1.98% at the 5% level, reflecting a proportional adjustment to formula-driven grants while maintaining the overall integrity of Student Success Act investments.
- **High School Success Grants (Measure 98):** Expanded reduction to district allocations supporting high school graduation, dropout prevention, and college/career readiness programs.
- **Youth Development Oregon (YDO) – Youth Engagement Grants:** Reduced to preserve statewide youth engagement programming while scaling back discretionary community partnership activities.
- **DELC Early Learning Transfer:** Further reduced to reflect available savings from early learning program alignment and ending fund balance adjustments. The specific recommendations related to this will be shared by the Department of Early Learning and Care.
- **Recovery Schools:** Partially reduced, maintaining core funding needed for operation of established schools.
- **Student Investment Intensive Program:** Further reduction to reach 5% target while still maintaining support and assistance at 75% of full funding.

### State School Fund (SSF) Reductions

To achieve the required savings target, the Department applied proportional reductions to the State School Fund in 0.5% increments through the 5% level in each funding type within the State School Fund. This approach allows for measured scaling aligned with statewide fiscal conditions while minimizing disruption to districts and classrooms.

### SSF Funding Sources

The State School Fund is made up of four fund types: General Fund, Lottery Funds, Corporate Activity Tax (CAT), Other Funds. For this budget planning exercise, ODE's reduction options are across four different fund types:

- General Fund (.05% = \$49.3M, 2.5% = \$246.7M, 5% = \$493.4M )
- Other Funds (.05% = \$220K, 2.5% = \$1.1M, 5% = \$2.2M)



- CAT Other Fund (.05% = \$4.1M, 2.5% = \$20.9M and 5% = \$41.9M)
- Lottery Fund (.05% = \$3M, 2.5% = \$15.1M and 5% = \$30.3M)

## Carveout Reductions

The department proposes a reduction to the carveouts as a mechanism to implement the General Fund reduction targets, while limiting the direct impact to students. Due to the nature and design of the State School Fund distribution formula, the carveouts, while a part of the total State School Fund budget, are removed from the distribution formula. With the following strategic reductions in the carveouts, it is the intent to limit reductions to already established Total Formula Revenue that is used for distribution to all school districts and educational service districts.

### Proposed Eliminations in the Second Year of the Biennium:

- **Educator Advancement Council (EAC) Transfer:** Full program elimination in the second year of the biennium.
- **Menstrual Dignity Program:** Full program elimination, including one position supporting program implementation.
- **Speech Pathologist Support:** Full program elimination.
- **10th Grade Assessment:** Full program elimination, with resources reallocated to statutory assessment priorities.
- **Local Option Equalization Grants:** Full program elimination for the 2025–27 biennium.
- **Talented and Gifted (TAG) Program:** Full program elimination for the 2025–27 biennium, including associated staff positions effective April 1, 2026.

### Carveout (Transfer) Reductions and Sweeps

To supplement savings, the Department identified transfer reductions and fund sweeps that leverage ample ending fund balances. These adjustments prioritize maintaining direct student services by drawing from available reserves rather than programmatic cuts.

- **English Language Learner Fund:** Transfer of unobligated balance.
- **Healthy Schools Fund:** Transfer of unobligated balance.
- **EAC SSF Transfer Reduction:** Utilizes remaining ending balance if full first year limitation is spent.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) has outlined a full 2.5 percent General Fund reduction plan in alignment with the statewide budget planning exercise. In developing this plan, ODE prioritized strategies that minimize disruption to programs and services that directly support students and



schools. To further strengthen this approach, the Department proposes the elimination of the Educator Advancement Council (EAC) in the second year of the biennium. This proposal generates savings that exceed the 2.5 percent target and provides an opportunity to lessen the impact of reductions on other essential education programs. ODE respectfully requests consideration of applying savings generated through the EAC elimination to reduce the magnitude of reductions across programs that directly serve students, thereby maintaining stability and continuity for schools, families, and communities statewide.

If the Legislature selects this reduction option, ODE would remove specific General Fund reductions historically tied to programs that provide direct student services. The following programs are suggested to be preserved:

- Intrafund Transfer (High School Success transfer)
- Student Leadership Centers
- Future Farmers of America (FFA)
- Supporting Accelerated Learning (Regional Promise)
- Every Day Matters / Attendance
- STEM Innovation
- CTE Revitalization

### **Discuss programs or services that are duplicative (within agency or across state)**

ODE's programs are designed to build upon one another rather than duplicate efforts. The agency's portfolio includes foundational programs that establish core services, such as Career and Technical Education (CTE), Summer Learning, and STEM Hubs, and supplemental or enhancement programs that expand the reach and impact of these foundational efforts.

For example, base programs like CTE provide statewide infrastructure for career-connected learning, while CTE Revitalization Grants enhance and modernize those efforts through targeted investments. Similarly, Summer Learning serves as a core initiative to support students statewide, while specialized Summer Learning opportunities, such as those focused on agriculture or STEM, extend access to specific student populations or content areas.

The reductions presented in this plan, for the most part, contemplate reducing or eliminating these enhancement programs rather than eliminating the foundational services. This approach allows ODE to preserve the base programs essential to district operations while proportionally reducing investments that, while valuable, extend beyond the statutory core.



# Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor



**OREGON**  
**DEPARTMENT OF**  
**EDUCATION**

*Oregon achieves . . . together!*

**Dr. Charlene Williams**

Director of the Department of Education

In this way, ODE's reduction strategy minimizes duplication and maintains alignment across programs, ensuring that each remaining investment continues to advance the Department's mission of equity and excellence for every learner.

Oregon Department of Education (ODE) - Agency Reduction Options																
2025-27 Biennium																
2025-27 LAB			753,482,685	-	444,476,252	2,294,114,409	-	3,492,073,346								
Detail of Reductions to 2025-27 Legislatively Adopted Budget																
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	13	14	15	16	17	
Priority (ranked most to least preferred)		Agency	SCR or Activity Initials	Program Unit/Activity Description	GF	LF	OF	SSA-OF	FF	TOTAL FUNDS	Pos.	FTE	Gov. Reduction Target Yes / No	One-Time Yes / No	Describe the reduction and associated impact on services and outcomes. Please identify the source of Other Funds reductions.	
Dept	Prgm/ Div															
ODE	OPS	ODE	010	ODE Operations	3,558,414			3,426,208		\$ 6,984,622	8	8.00	Yes	Yes	This includes 8 positions and then the Dept intends to take savings measures such as reduction to training and travel and holding vacancies for period of time before hiring.	
YDO	OPS	ODE	010	YDO Operations	89,721			28,874		\$ 118,595			Yes	Yes	YDO intends to take savings measures such as reduction to training and travel and holding vacancies for period of time before hiring	
OSD	OPS	ODE	020	OSD Operations	316,206					\$ 316,206			No	Yes	OSD intends to take savings measures such as reduction to training and travel and holding vacancies for period of time before hiring	
EAC	OPS	ODE		EAC Operations				1,497,352		\$ 1,497,352	5	5.00	No	No	This reduction includes 5 vacant positions for permanent reduction	
OTLA	GIA	ODE	050	Start Making A Reader Today	153,642					\$ 153,642			No	No	A reduction in funding for SMART Reading could harm Oregon’s educational progress, especially in advancing equity and closing opportunity gaps. The program supports early literacy by providing reading practice and access to books for underserved students. Without it, fewer children would receive early reading support, potentially widening achievement gaps and undermining long-term academic success. Because historically underserved students may have less access to books, cutting this program would likely deepen existing literacy and opportunity gaps.	
OTLA	GIA	ODE	050	Mathways	1,085,764					\$ 1,085,764			No	No	The Mathways grant program is Oregon’s only dedicated investment in improving students’ academic experiences and outcomes in mathematics education. Without continued funding, progress toward modernizing instruction would stall, widening opportunity gaps for students to access higher quality mathematical instruction in middle school and high school, thus deepening inequities. Oregon already ranks 49th nationally in Grade 8 math on NAEP, and 69% of students did not meet proficiency on recent state assessments. Eliminating Mathways would dismantle the only mechanism for improving math academic outcomes for students and halt development of modernized math pathways that link math learning across K-12 to college and careers. In the short term, reductions to the Mathways grant could result in lost positions and slowed innovation within STEM Hubs and ESD partnerships. Work would likely shift from a coordinated regional approach across 13 STEM Hub regions to localized decision-making, creating statewide variability. In the long term, restarting statewide and regional efforts would be challenging without regional positions, and trust among Hubs, ESDs, and districts would need repair before work could resume. An uncoordinated approach could allow external organizations to shape Oregon’s math improvement narrative. The impact of funding loss may be especially acute in rural districts, which could revert to outdated course sequences that fail to engage diverse learners or reflect current workforce and postsecondary expectations. Mathways is Oregon’s only statewide investment dedicated to improving math outcomes and advancing equity. It ensures that every student, regardless of geography or background, has access to rigorous, relevant pathways that connect math learning to future goals. Without investments in systemic math education improvements like Mathways, Oregon risks stagnation on key metrics, such as 8th-grade math outcomes identified in SB 141. The absence of Mathway funding would risk losing coordinated strategies essential for closing opportunity gaps statewide in mathematics.	

OEII	GIA	ODE	050	STEM Innovation Grants	2,872,686					\$	2,872,686			No	Yes	<p>STEM Innovation grants are the primary catalyst for scaling equitable STEM education to Oregon’s most underserved students, directly working to close opportunity gaps that ultimately determine which children can access tomorrow’s high-demand careers. Without these grants, the programming Hubs provide, especially for historically marginalized students, would disappear, widening existing gaps. Continued investment, even if reduced, ensures early STEM curiosity, an increase in math proficiency, and equitable exposure to high-demand career pathways that prepare all Oregon students for a rapidly evolving, technology-driven economy.</p> <p>Eliminating or reducing this funding would immediately sever the lifeline that keeps Oregon educators trained on the high-quality instructional practices and materials that bridge K-12 education to the high-skilled industries Oregon depends on to thrive. As districts face cuts, Hubs work to help fill gaps, ensuring educators receive consistent training and students access rigorous science and math instruction, along with STEM learning experiences. Long term, the loss would dismantle one of Oregon’s more effective connectors between education and industry. Without Hubs advancing career-connected learning and computer science/AI pathways, Oregon would risk producing fewer workforce-ready graduates, weakening efforts to retain high-revenue industries such as semiconductors, healthcare, advanced manufacturing, technology, etc.</p> <p>Without these grants, Oregon would lose its only statewide funding dedicated to science and computer science education, and one of only two sources for math improvement, effectively abandoning the state’s most scalable mechanism for closing STEM achievement gaps for all of our diverse Oregon communities, both rural and urban. The loss of these programming efforts, currently equitably distributed through the statewide STEM Hub Network, would create inconsistent STEM Education access, ultimately widening achievement gaps. The Hub Network is well-established and uniquely positioned to drive innovation and ensure all students engage in future-ready learning.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	Student Leadership Centers	411,405					\$	411,405			No	No	<p>Elimination of the CTE Student Leadership Center funding impacts students from the eight career learning areas to facilitate the program organization and administration of student centered leadership and career development events (competitions). The Career Technical Student Organizations (CTSO) affected include (DECA, FBLA, FCCLA, FNRL, HOSA, Skills USA, TSA and to a lesser degree FFA). 2024-25 FFA participation*:15,780 FFA members within 123 Chapters</p> <p>Elimination would halt immediate state level activities and students would lose the opportunity for leadership development, CTSO degrees, awards, recognition, and scholarships.</p> <p>Short term, upon the announcement of the 100% reduction in funding the Oregon CTE Student Leadership Foundation (OCTESLF) would inform their constituents and partners of the budget constraints. This would invoke a reaction of the CTSO students, parents, and business organizations that would likely reach out to the elected officials and educational administrators (ODE leadership).</p> <p>The response from the public would likely be significant and draw media attention. The OCTESLF and related CTSO organization would likely be on the capital steps and in the offices of elected officials.</p> <p>School districts would weigh the value of the CTSO chapters and the total cost of participation. Programs and student opportunities would be cut.</p> <p>Without funding “match” to help make student leadership programs work for schools, there could be continued disengagement within the public school system for other alternative models that support the leadership opportunities, career awareness opportunities and networking that the CTSO model provides.</p> <p>Eliminating the CTSO removes a support that helps students to find their identity and path forward into career, postsecondary education and training, and civic engagement.</p>

OEII	GIA	ODE	050	Agricultural Summer Program Grants	339,736						\$	339,736			No	No	<p>Oregon FFA funding supports 15,780 students across 123 schools in CTE Agriculture programs. Grants provide summer engagement, leadership development, scholarships, and access to FFA degrees—especially for historically underserved students. In 2024, 49 grants served 2,496 students; in 2025, 35 grants served 1,352. A 5% cut would reduce grant volume and student access. FFA is Oregon’s most successful CTE leadership program, and reductions would limit opportunities for focal populations, weakening pathways to postsecondary success and local workforce development.</p> <p>A 5% reduction to FFA Administration funding would shift grant management back to ODE, requiring development of 80+ agreements internally. The Oregon FFA would notify constituents, likely prompting public outcry, media attention, and advocacy from students, industry leaders, and legislators. Reducing support for Oregon’s most successful CTE leadership program would impact rural economies, where agriculture is vital and 66% of districts are rural. Key legislative champions of the 2019 initiative would likely question the change, as it threatens student access, leadership development, and workforce readiness.</p> <p>With 97 years of proven impact, FFA engages students in academic, leadership, and career development through agriculture. Removing funding would jeopardize opportunities for CTE agriculture students, especially historically underserved and rural male students at risk of disengagement. FFA helps students stay enrolled, graduate, and discover their identity and future path. Eliminating this program would widen equity gaps and reduce access to meaningful engagement, particularly in rural communities where agriculture is central to the economy and education.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	CTE Revitalization Grants	1,891,507						\$	1,891,507			No	Yes	<p>The average grant during the 23-25 cycle was \$246,091.90, and the total number of grants released was 31. Reducing the total grant fund by 15% would change the likely number of grants released to 27. It is not anticipated that the grant values would change; there would simply be fewer of them.</p> <p>CTE Revitalization has been popular among suburban, rural, and isolated rural programs because of the flexibility to fund equipment and facilities. This option will exist for fewer programs. Schools that focus/self-fund CTE work will likely need to divert funds (e.g., HSS funds) and/or seek other funding sources. Families and learners will have fewer choices. Legislative elected officials who typically support CTE Revitalization may be disappointed. The CTE Revitalization was introduced to the State of Oregon within the 2011 legislative session and was sponsored by BOLI, union/trade and management of industry groups. This was conducted during the Great Recession and was identified as a priority for the state, in spite of the challenges of the economic circumstances. Phasing back the investment for the CTE Revitalization could be seen as an assault on the greater CTE efforts within the state.</p> <p>Learners involved in CTE consistently experience higher engagement and graduation rates when compared to all learners. Access and equity are part of the CTE Revitalization mission. While not all programs participate, those programs that get their start with CTE Revitalization grow in size, scope and quality. The overall trajectory of CTE growth would be slowed with the anticipated cuts to the CTE Revitalization.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	Future Farmers of America Association	809,704						\$	809,704			No	Yes	<p>This would reduce funding after dsicstribution of first year allocations.</p> <p>There are 123 high schools with FFA chapters within the state. Students would lose the opportunity for leadership development, FFA degrees, awards, recognition and scholarships if the program is eliminated. The FFA is the most successful CTE student leadership organization.</p> <p>The Oregon FFA facilitates 24 state level career development events / competitions.</p> <p>Canceling of the 97th annual 2025 Oregon FFA Convention where 3000 FFA Members and 750+ teachers, administrators, parents, community members and business and industry partners gather to culminate the year.</p> <p>The value of the FFA is that it provides student engagement, academic attainment, personal leadership and career growth within the context of agriculture (plants, animals, mechanical systems and agribusiness). The FFA helps retain and engage students, leading students to stay enrolled within the school system. The FFA helps students graduate and allows them to find their identity and path forward.</p>

OTLA	GIA	ODE	050	Supporting Accelerated Learning Opportunities	1,306,999					\$	1,306,999			No	Yes	<p>This would reduce funding after dsistribution of first year allocations.</p> <p>Students experiencing poverty will lose free or reduced cost access to Advanced Placement and/or International Baccalaureate tests. The test fee program has been funded since 2006. In spring of 2024, this grant reduced the cost (by \$20) of IB exams for 6832 students and covered the full cost for 1,016 IB exams for students experiencing poverty. The grant also reduced the cost of AP tests for 27,108 students and covered the full cost of 7,347 AP exams for students experiencing poverty. Reduction or elimination of this funding would impact students who have been historically underserved by accelerated college credit programs, and districts who struggle to provide these opportunities to students as required in statute (ORS 340.300).</p> <p>Oregon students who participate in college credit opportunities during high school are 30% more likely to graduate from high school, 25% more likely to enroll in college and, 22% more likely to persist in college than those who do not. Money saved for families: College tuition for students who score high enough on the tests. At \$471 per credit hour at Oregon public universities, potential savings for students and families by utilizing these programs is over \$35 million.</p> <p>Program participation has grown and now exceeds pre-Covid levels (2019) The number of tests taken and the percentage of those tests that earn college credit have both increased. In 2025, 4.4% more students participated in an AP course than in 2024, including 16.2% more Black/African American students and 4.1% more Hispanic/Latinx students. Losing this funding could jeopardize that growth. More than 40,000 classes in Oregon public colleges and universities were taken by high school students. Reduction of partnership programs funds would hinder district effects to expand equitable access to these opportunities for all Oregon students. AP and IB scores are a bright spot in Oregon's assessment landscape.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	Everyday Matters	1,887,284					\$	1,887,284			No	Yes	<p>These funds are the sole funds Oregon designates for attendance. Reducing these funds reduces the only investment in attendance initiatives. Reducing this funding will lead to reduced services that support students and families with the root causes of chronic absenteeism including support for before/after school programs, mentoring for students, wrap around services, and community support. It also will reduce the ability of ESDs to support local district efforts to increase regular attendance at a time when many ESDs have put these programs in place after Oregon changed the way it funded attendance initiatives approximately 4 years ago.</p> <p>Reductions to these grants will likely lead to staffing reductions at ESDs and community based organizations. Fewer personnel supporting explicit attendance efforts means those duties are spread to other personnel or shift from ESDs to school districts and efforts are watered down or become a lower priority. Additionally, data collection and analysis is a key function of ESD support for small and rural schools. Losing ESD support in this area puts a new burden and cost on those small districts that often lack the time, personnel and data systems to do this on their own. CBO grantees also provide direct supports for students and families, who will immediately feel a reduction in services that help families and increase attendance.</p> <p>Oregon's gains in reducing chronic absenteeism are slowing down. Further reducing direct investments in attendance may result in those gains reversing. Historical data shows that attendance for focal student groups lags behind their white counterparts, and the gaps between these groups - which has been closing - may widen again. Further Oregon has named increased attendance as a key outcome for it's Strategic Planning efforts. Other improvement efforts can support the root causes of absenteeism, but no other funds are dedicated to this effort.</p>

YDO	GIA	ODE	040	EMOPI & Gang Prevention and Interventions Grants	440,807					\$	440,807			No	No	<p>The EMOPI &amp; Gang Prevention &amp; Intervention fund supports two grant programs: the East Metro Prevention and Intervention program administered by the city of Gresham, and the competitive VGP grant. The reduction proposed would leave EMOPI fully funded, but cut the VGP grant, which has not yet been opened for applications for the 25-27 biennium. This would result in 6-8 fewer small grants to support programs that conduct outreach, mentoring and other services directed at youth who are at risk of victimization or involvement in youth community violence.</p> <p>This reduction would leave the EMOPI program intact in Gresham/East Multnomah County, but significantly reduce or eliminate resources that support other youth violence prevention and intervention programs in the Metro area and in other Oregon communities. These programs are designed to interrupt community violence, via outreach and mentoring from credible community messengers, resources for youth and families including positive youth development activities, sports, training and employment support, counseling, and academic support. Cutting this funding reduces the availability of these effective violence reduction interventions.</p> <p>Interrupting and eliminating youth violence is critical in supporting positive youth development, well-being, and avoidance of harm and justice system involvement. VGP programs have served youth and families from historically underserved communities, and the elimination of this grant would take away a valuable and impactful resource in community efforts to stop youth violence and prevent justice system involvement and community harm.</p>
OTLA	GIA	ODE	050	Physical Education Grants	200,000					\$	200,000			No	Yes	<p>The reductions would reduce students' access to quality physical education, limiting the academic, health, and social-emotional benefits PE provides. Research links regular physical activity to improved focus, behavior, and learning, so reduced PE may weaken academic outcomes. Fewer funds could mean larger class sizes, fewer certified PE teachers, and staffing pressures (such as needing to combine PE with another position; needing to find other funds to meet the FTE needs; and/or needing to reduce the PE position to part time, thereby reducing the ability to recruit and maintain certified PE teachers).</p> <p>In the short term, class sizes may grow, PE professional development and time for staff collaboration would also decline, reducing the quality and quantity of PE instruction students receive. Families would face fewer school-based opportunities for activity and wellness, increasing reliance on potentially inaccessible extracurricular options. Long-term, reduced PE can widen health and learning disparities, lower physical fitness, and harm social and emotional well-being.</p> <p>Reductions would widen opportunity gaps in accessing physical education. PEEK-8 ensures all students access quality, standards-based PE taught by certified teachers and that schools fulfill the required instructional minutes for PE. Reduced funding could mean fewer teachers, larger classes, or fewer instructional minutes, disproportionately affecting rural and low-income students. Physical education supports focus, attendance, behavior, and social-emotional development. At a systems level, cuts slow Oregon's progress toward whole-child learning, signaling that PE is optional rather than essential.</p>

OEII	GIA	ODE	050	Student Investment Intensive Program: High Need				975,404		\$	975,404			No	Yes	<p>Program participation has grown and now exceeds pre-Covid levels (2019) The number of tests taken and the percentage of those tests that earn college credit have both increased. In 2025, 4.4% more students participated in an AP course than in 2024, including 16.2% more Black/African American students and 4.1% more Hispanic/Latinx students. Losing this funding could jeopardize that growth. More than 40,000 classes in Oregon public colleges and universities were taken by high school students. Reduction of partnership programs funds would hinder district effects to expand equitable access to these opportunities for all Oregon students. AP and IB scores are a bright spot in Oregon's assessment landscape.</p> <p>Short-term impacts of a five percent reduction are minimal given the need to adjust rules for the program. Long-term impacts of a reduction could be more substantial given the need to bring more school districts into the program and the need to have adequate grant in aid resources to support their participation.</p> <p>The reduction is modest, and the program is to go “above and beyond” other programmatic investments to meet the moment for high-need school districts. Ultimately, the impact to the program is minimal, but the stacking effect of reductions to other programs in addition to the Intensive Program will have more significant impacts over time.</p>
EAC	GIA	ODE	050	EAC Grant Programs				26,712,824		\$	26,712,824			No	Yes	<p>Reduction of this funding would likely result in the reduction or elimination of HS CTE and career programs, as well as educators in classrooms, as grants provide funding to districts, educator candidates, and educator preparation programs for ensuring emergency teaching and administrator license holders are enrolled and qualify to continue as the teacher of record or school administrator. Impacts would be felt to the delivery of high school programs supporting CTE and dual-enrollment programs, through which students receive college or CTE credits. Ending of high school career programs and vacancies in classrooms or school buildings is disruptive to student learning and impacts academic success and career readiness.</p> <p>Reduction of this funding would also likely result in the reduction or elimination of positions at ESDs, school districts, and educator preparation programs that provide program coordination, pre-service and in-service educator mentoring, and professional development planning and facilitation. Without these programs, educators will feel this reduction in reduced services and support which could have the effect of lowering retention, particularly among novice educators and educators in high need areas (SPED, ESOL, rural districts). Funding for educator recruitment and candidate development may also be impacted, potentially reducing the pool of qualified candidates from which districts can hire.</p> <p>In Oregon, the impacts are felt exponentially by small and rural schools, which continue to face barriers to recruiting and hiring qualified educators. In the years since the pandemic, Oregon school districts have struggled to employ, develop, and retain qualified educators, compounding Oregon's post-pandemic recovery and improvement of student outcomes.</p> <p>Reducing or eliminating programs to recruit, develop, support, and retain educators has a long term impact on student academic success and outcomes. It is difficult to bring back these programs after elimination because of the time required to restart programs including re-hiring staff into key positions.</p>

EAC	GIA	ODE	050	Educator Professional Development Grants				2,767,644		\$	2,767,644			No	Yes	<p>This reduction would result in just under \$1 million remaining for the Professional Dev platform that EAC is working on. This would assume that the \$1.7m transfer to TSPS would be moved over to Other Funds which would utilize the EAF ending balance.</p> <p>Reduction or elimination of this program would impact educator professional development programs for all educators to develop effective instructional practices for students through the implementation of a new, statewide professional learning platform that provides open access for all educators to high quality professional development, particularly in early literacy. The reduction or elimination of grants supporting roll out of the new platform would impact educators ability to provide effective learning environments and instructional practices for students, which is part of the state's Accountability Initiative. Reduction or elimination of funding would impact programs that remove barriers for qualified, multilingual educator candidates to complete licensing requirements and all teaching candidates to demonstrate mastery of content knowledge, which could impact the availability and quality of educators in school districts in Oregon.</p> <p>State efforts related to Accountability and Early Literacy will be impacted as professional development access, particularly for educators in small and rural school districts, would remain inequitable, impacting student outcomes. Licensing costs and testing requirements may deter multilingual educator candidates from completing preparation programs and pursuing teaching jobs in Oregon. Educator recruitment and preparation, particularly among novice educators and educators in high need areas (SPED, ESOL, rural districts) could also be impacted.</p> <p>A reduction undermines Oregon's progress toward educational equity and long-term success, particularly in literacy. Early literacy is foundational—students who don't read proficiently by 3rd grade struggle across all subjects. Cuts would disproportionately harm historically underserved students, including those in rural areas, Multilingual Learners, and students with disabilities, by reducing access to high quality, effective educators. Reducing funding now risks stalling momentum on the roll out of the new open access professional learning platform, forcing the state to change course just as we are building the capacity, consistency, and understanding needed to deliver strong, sustainable professional development programs.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	Early Warning System Grants				1,981,791		\$	1,981,791			No	No	<p>Reduction or elimination of this funding would impact school districts' ability to support a cohesive system for organizing data, aligning school practices, and engaging with students and families to support student success. The EWS grants have improved local student success systems. Statewide grantee spending shows 60% of funds support system software and subscriptions; 20% support staff to manage and maintain systems; and 14% support data analysis and research. Cutting these funds reduces grantee capacity to sustain systems and use data for improvement. These systems integrate data on attendance, 9th grade on-track, and high school graduation—three of Oregon's key performance metrics.</p> <p>Eliminating these funds burdens districts that rely on them to fund software, maintenance, and subscriptions, often tied to multi-year contracts. State fund cuts don't eliminate these costs for districts and instead shift them to district budgets. To meet contractual obligations, districts may need to reduce spending on other vital student services, jeopardizing efforts to improve the very metrics these systems track in favor of simply keeping the systems operational.</p> <p>Oregon has emphasized the importance of student data systems for continuous improvement through the Student Success Act and High School Success program. These grants were included in SSA to help grantees build capacity for data system work. Without a statewide data system, eliminating this funding raises concerns about Oregon's commitment to using data for improvement, including disaggregating data to identify and address opportunity gaps for focal student groups. Oregon has been making strides in data transparency, which is also a key component of SB141, and Oregon's data system relies on high-quality, local data. The impact would be greater on small and rural districts, many of which used these funds to purchase such systems for the first time and lack the budget flexibility to absorb the costs.</p>

ORMS	GIA	ODE	050	Recovery Schools				144,646		\$	144,646			No	Yes	<p>Oregon’s Recovery Schools Program provides vital education and daily substance use and mental health supports. Students in these programs are 10% more likely to graduate than their peers in traditional settings and 58% more likely to abstain from substance use after high school. A reduction would force recovery schools to cap enrollment, directly limiting access for students seeking to re-engage with school while maintaining sobriety. This would necessitate staffing cuts, weakening the daily mental health and substance use recovery supports that make these schools so effective. Increasing the risk of student relapses, mental health crises, and reduced academic engagement.</p> <p>The short-term ripple effects would be an immediate increase in risks to student safety, including a sharply elevated chance of overdose and death, compounded by a rise in juvenile detention placements given that 30% of students are justice-involved. Community-wide, this reduction would strain an already-broken system by increasing demand for scarce mental health and substance use treatment beds—an expensive alternative to the \$5,500-per-month recovery school model.</p> <p>Ultimately, this funding cut compromises Oregon’s long-term educational trajectory and its ability to advance equity. With 44% of recovery school students identifying as students of color, the forced reduction in capacity would disproportionately limit opportunities for diverse youth, thus perpetuating racial disparities and opportunity gaps. Losing this proven intervention, especially as Oregon faces a catastrophic surge in youth overdose deaths, will not only lead to tragic individual outcomes but will also burden the state with higher costs for the justice, behavioral health, and adult treatment systems that will inevitably inherit these students. The reduction signals a retreat from sustaining positive outcomes, stifling the program’s ability to expand into underserved communities and severely undermining the state’s commitment to protecting its most at-risk students.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	Electronic Warning System Tech Assist				991,673		\$	991,673			No	No	<p>Reduction or elimination of this funding would impact the technical assistance and learning provided to grant recipients to successfully implement Early Indicator and Intervention Systems (Early Warning Systems). These supports currently include a statewide community of practice, development of an EIS toolkit and related training, and customized coaching and professional learning contracts for districts and ESDs to better implement multi-tiered systems of support. Eliminating technical assistance funds would effectively end state-level support from ODE for implementing these systems. The program’s work would fall to just 1.5 FTE at ODE to manage grant allocations and all technical assistance statewide. In the short term, ODE would cancel a CCPL contract for Lane ESD and City View Charter School and halt work with Education Northwest to make the EIS Toolkit usable for schools and districts. Without accompanying grant elimination, ODE would fund important district-level tools but not support their use, potentially leading to ineffective or harmful applications of student data. Grantees expecting meaningful funds this year due to changes in ORS allowing formula funding would be unable to proceed with planned system improvements.</p> <p>Oregon has identified data transparency as a key part of its strategic priority to Reimagine Accountability. The state’s data system depends on receiving high-quality data from districts. Districts, in turn, need strong data systems and the skills to use them for internal needs assessments to identify areas of student support. High-performing states often rely on robust student data systems to provide insights at local, district, and state levels. Oregon has made progress in this area. Eliminating this fund would disrupt those efforts.</p>
DELC x-fe	GIA	ODE		DELC Transfer				10,693,540		\$	10,693,540			No	Yes	<p>Included the 2.5% reduction to DELC transfer, per LFO analyst direction, knowing they are working on reductions on their end.</p>

CNP	GIA	ODE	050	Hunger Free Schools				27,345,728		\$	27,345,728			No	Yes	<p>The purpose of the funding is to expand participation in the school breakfast and lunch programs in public schools and public Charter schools. This is accomplished in two ways; (1) serving breakfast after the bell in schools with 70% or greater free and reduced-price eligible students; (2) offering meals at no charge through either the federal Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) or the state-supported income guidelines up to 300 percent of the Federal Poverty Level. Currently the Hunger Free School Program Grants are funded at approximately \$128 million over the biennium. The largest investment of funds is in the Community Eligibility Provision Incentive (CEPI) Reimbursement Program. This Program provides additional financial support to schools operating CEP but who fall below the identified student percentage of 56.25% so that they would receive reimbursement of 90% of meals at the federal free rate CEPI. For the last biennium (2023-2025) ODE spent approximately \$100 million on these Programs. Therefore, if a cut is necessary, I feel there will be sufficient amount of funds if the amount is above \$100 million.</p> <p>Schools operating CEP have grown from 361 schools in 2020 to over 1,200 schools in the 2026 fiscal school year. This is a direct result from the CEPI funds; it makes the CEP a more financially viable option. As mentioned above, the amount spent on this program for the 2023-2025 biennium was approximately \$100 million. Therefore as long as we stay above \$100 million ODE can still meet the current need.</p> <p>A reduction of this fund to no lower than \$100 million would not adversely impact the Breakfast After the Bell nor the CEPI and EIG state funded programs.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	ESD Technical Assistance Support Grants				7,500,000		\$	7,500,000			No	Yes	<p>This aligns to the reduction level taken at the 25-27 GRB.</p> <p>Reduction or elimination of this funding would greatly impact the capacity of ESDs to provide technical assistance, support, professional learning, and coaching to school districts and grant recipients of the Student Investment Account, High School Success, and additional state and federal programs. A reduction reduces the ability of ESDs to support these recipients in working toward meeting their performance growth targets. This reduction would result in eliminating personnel at ESDs who provide direct service to students and staff in key programmatic areas including instructional improvement, student supports, CTE, and student mental and behavioral health including school safety and prevention. All 19 ESDs currently fund at least 1.0 FTE to support school districts and other grantees. Mid-size and larger ESDs fund additional positions including counselors to serve large rural areas, data systems services, and equity initiatives.</p> <p>When ESDs are unable to provide services like coaching, technical assistance, and professional learning to districts, districts must either take on these duties themselves or no longer engage in those activities. If this is compounded with other reductions to ESDs, the impact becomes exponential. ESDs braid their funding streams to support districts/grantees. Since 2019, these funds have strengthened the relationship between ESDs and school districts to work together on continuous improvement and particularly bolstered services in rural and remote areas of the state. Educators will feel this reduction in reduced services and support.</p> <p>Reducing or eliminating services has a long term impact on outcomes. It is difficult to bring back programs after elimination because of the time required to restart programs including re-hiring staff into key positions. Students in those transition years then miss out on critical services, which impact student success outcomes. The impact on ESDs serving small and rural schools is exponential because the cumulative impact is greater.</p>
ODE	GIA	ODE	050	High School Success				3,473,193		\$	3,473,193				Yes	<p>This reduction is tied to the 2.5% GF reduction of GF to OF transfers. The Dept asks that due to the EAC reduction and overall further reduction to the Dept, this reduction be removed in the final decision to not reduce High School Success.</p>
ODE	GIA	ODE	050	Interfund x-fers from GF	3,473,193					\$	3,473,193			No	Yes	HSS GF to OF Transfer
2.5% above this line										\$	106,375,945					
ODE	OPS	ODE	010	ODE Operations	1,201,472			7,321,774		\$	8,523,246	4	4.00	Yes	Yes	<p>This reduction would eliminate 4 full time permanent positions from ODE as well as reduce the Early Literacy funding by \$6.5 million.</p>
YDO	OPS	ODE	010	YDO Operations	89,721			28,874		\$	118,595			Yes	Yes	<p>The Dept intends to take savings measures such as reduction to training and travel and holding vacancies for period of time before hiring</p>
OSD	OPS	ODE	010	OSD Operations	235,906					\$	235,906			No	Yes	<p>The Dept intends to take savings measures such as reduction to training and travel and holding vacancies for period of time before hiring</p>
EAC	OPS	ODE	010	EAC Operations			554,105	885,252		\$	1,439,357	11	11.00			<p>This would reduce the remaining FTE at 5% as of Sept 1, 2026 and remaining S&amp;S.</p>

	GIA	ODE	050	STEM Regional Network Grants	3,649,575					\$	3,649,575			No	Yes	<p>Oregon currently ranks last in the nation for Computer Science education and 49th for 8th-grade Math; the STEM Hub Network is a significant way to reverse these rankings. Without these funds, many Hubs will cease to exist resulting in decreased professional learning for STEM educators and STEM programming for students. Without Hubs, many communities would lose vital, and in some cases, their only access to Science, Computer Science, and Engineering-based learning. Continued investment ensures that ODE is providing regional access to ensure equitable access to STEM learning across the state.</p> <p>Reducing funding to STEM Hubs may significantly hinder Oregon’s economic growth. Since STEM Hubs are designed to be a Collective Impact Infrastructure, Oregon would lose regional bridges to industry partnerships that sustain pathways in STEM/STEAM-related careers like AI, innovative design, the semiconductor industry, and healthcare. This dismantling would accelerate the outmigration of industries, as Oregon would continue to struggle to meet workforce demands. Students and families, especially in rural areas, will have a lack of STEM programming in their region.</p> <p>Without these grants (or reducing it to a level that would not sustain statewide coverage of Hubs) would severely limit advancing equitable access to STEM education throughout Oregon. Both rural and urban students would lose access to coordinated STEM learning that builds pathways in math, science and future-ready careers. This loss may widen existing disparities and weaken Oregon’s capacity to prepare all students for an innovation-driven economy. The STEM Investment Council has renewed its commitment to identifying mandatory impact metrics for the Hubs, focused on improving math and science outcomes.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	CTE Revitalization Grants	3,974,631					\$	3,974,631			No	Yes	<p>CTE Revitalization has been popular among suburban, rural, and isolated rural programs because of the flexibility to fund equipment and facilities. This option will exist for fewer programs. Schools that focus/self-fund CTE work will likely need to divert funds (e.g., HSS funds) and/or seek other funding sources. Families and learners will have fewer choices. Legislative elected officials who typically support CTE Revitalization may be disappointed. The CTE Revitalization was introduced to the State of Oregon within the 2011 legislative session and was sponsored by BOLI, union/trade and management of industry groups. This was conducted during the Great Recession and was identified as a priority for the state, in spite of the challenges of the economic circumstances. Phasing back the investment for the CTE Revitalization could be seen as an assault on the greater CTE efforts within the state.</p> <p>Learners involved in CTE consistently experience higher engagement and graduation rates when compared to all learners. Access and equity are part of the CTE Revitalization mission. While not all programs participate, those programs that get their start with CTE Revitalization grow in size, scope and quality. The overall trajectory of CTE growth would be slowed with the anticipated cuts to the CTE Revitalization.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	CTE Career Pathway Fund	1,920,809					\$	1,920,809				Yes	<p>Secondary Career Pathways funding is used to upgrade programs, cover the costs of credentialing for learners, and investments in program improvements. As CTE is experience rich and equipment dependent, it may be necessary to divert funding from other categories, seek funding outside of the school, or reduce the number of students who can have a CTE experience.</p> <p>Schools use Secondary Career Pathways as part of a funding mix to address program costs. Districts will need to make funding distribution changes/choices to cover certain costs. Educators may have fewer funds for equipment and materials essential to CTE programs. Learners and their families may face fewer or less robust CTE offerings. As community, family, and businesses are part of the CTE ecosystem, each group will see their needs and objectives met to a lesser degree.</p> <p>The Secondary Career Pathways was introduced to the State of Oregon within the 2015 legislative session and was sponsored by key CTE legislative advocates (Dembrow and Reardon), union/trade and industry groups. Phasing back the investment for the Secondary Career Pathways could be seen as an assault on the greater CTE efforts within the state. It is important to note that legislative action, grassroots organization (in RE: M98/HSS), and industry support are indicators for where the state wants and needs to go.</p> <p>CTE does not have categorical funding, so districts are not required to invest in CTE and learners who experience it unless it meets local objectives. An advantage of Pathway funding is that it is flexible and can be braided with other funds to achieve program objectives and drive learner success. Reducing “the pot” will require that programs/schools divert general fund monies to address CTE needs or simply not fund them.</p>

YDO	GIA	ODE	040	YDO-EMOPI& Gang Prevention and Intervention Grants	487,869					\$	487,869			No	Yes	<p>The EMOPI &amp; Gang Prevention &amp; Intervention fund supports two grant programs: the East Metro Prevention and Intervention program administered by the city of Gresham, and the competitive VGP grant. The reduction proposed would leave EMOPI fully funded, but cut the VGP grant, which has not yet been opened for applications for the 25-27 biennium. This would result in 6-8 fewer small grants to support programs that conduct outreach, mentoring and other services directed at youth who are at risk of victimization or involvement in youth community violence.</p> <p>This reduction would leave the EMOPI program intact in Gresham/East Multnomah County, but significantly reduce or eliminate resources that support other youth violence prevention and intervention programs in the Metro area and in other Oregon communities. These programs are designed to interrupt community violence, via outreach and mentoring from credible community messengers, resources for youth and families including positive youth development activities, sports, training and employment support, counseling, and academic support. Cutting this funding reduces the availability of these effective violence reduction interventions.</p> <p>Interrupting and eliminating youth violence is critical in supporting positive youth development, well-being, and avoidance of harm and justice system involvement. VGP programs have served youth and families from historically underserved communities, and the elimination of this grant would take away a valuable and impactful resource in community efforts to stop youth violence and prevent justice system involvement and community harm.</p>
ODE	GIA	ODE	050	Transition Network	792,716					\$	792,716			No	Yes	<p>A reduction in Transition Network Facilitator (TNF) supports will significantly limit Oregon’s ability to prepare students with disabilities for life after high school. TNFs guide educators in developing strong postsecondary goals and transition services. Reduced capacity will especially impact small and rural districts, leading to inconsistent practices, fewer work-based learning opportunities, and weaker connections to essential adult service systems.</p> <p>Districts rely on TNFs for technical assistance, professional learning, and support to ensure students with disabilities receive FAPE and achieve positive post-school outcomes. Reduced TNF capacity will limit coaching and slow implementation of effective practices. Collaboration among schools, agencies, and employers will weaken, families will face greater challenges navigating systems, and transition services will become increasingly inconsistent statewide.</p> <p>A reduction in TNF supports will limit Oregon’s ability to sustain effective secondary transition services for students with disabilities. TNFs provide statewide leadership in planning, building educator capacity, and aligning district practices with Oregon’s goals for inclusive education. Reduced support will widen gaps between well-resourced and under-resourced districts, most affecting students with significant disabilities who rely on coordinated services for meaningful work, education, and independent living. Over time, fewer students may access work experiences, families may lose connections to adult services, and districts may struggle to maintain inclusive pathways to employment and independence.</p>
DELC x-fe	GIA	ODE		DELC Transfer				10,693,540		\$	10,693,540			No	Yes	<p>Included the 2nd 2.5% reduction to DELC transfer, per LFO analyst direction, knowing they are working on reductions on their end.</p>
YDO	GIA	ODE	040	YDO - Youth Engagement				380,504		\$	380,504			No	Yes	<p>Reduced funding for this program impacts grants made to community based reengagement programs. This reduction would result in a reduction of award to one or more grant recipients, reducing capacity to provide youth with outreach, educational reengagement, coaching, training and support services. This reduction represents funding for 1-2 reengagement grants, and a reduction of this scale could represent 100-200 fewer youth served in a biennium. Programs whose funding is reduced would then be compelled to reduce services commensurate with budget reduction.</p> <p>This may result in reductions in the number of youth served, the comprehensiveness of services, support services (transportation, clothing, materials, tuition), and/or staffing. A potential long term outcome would be fewer youth served, or reduced program effectiveness due to diminished resources for barrier removal.</p> <p>Reengagement program provide a critical support to Oregon's youth and education system - dedicated effort to identify, reach and reconnect youth who leave high school before completion, are chronically absent, or who are at high risk of not graduating on time. Graduation outcomes have consistently shown disparities for underserved groups, and reengagement programs reach youth populations with lower on time graduation and completion rates, and serve them effectively in order to close the high school completion opportunity gap.</p>

OEII	GIA	ODE	050	Student Investment Intensive Coaching				6,000,000		\$	6,000,000			No	Yes	<p>The Intensive Program has earmarked and obligated funds to participating school districts, who are in various phases of the four+ year program. The treasury account for the program holds resources for additional districts, but SB 141 necessitates changes to the design and doesn’t come online until 2030.</p> <p>Short-term impacts of a five percent reduction are minimal given the need to adjust rules for the program. Long-term impacts of a reduction could be more substantial given the need to bring more school districts into the program and the need to have adequate grant in aid resources to support their participation.</p> <p>The reduction is modest, and the program is to go “above and beyond” other programmatic investments to meet the moment for high-need school districts. Ultimately, the impact to the program is minimal, but the stacking effect of reductions to other programs in addition to the Intensive Program will have more significant impacts over time.</p>
ORMS	GIA	ODE	050	Recovery Schools				144,646		\$	144,646				Yes	<p>Oregon’s Recovery Schools Program provides vital education and daily substance use and mental health supports. Students in these programs are 10% more likely to graduate than their peers in traditional settings and 58% more likely to abstain from substance use after high school. A reduction would force recovery schools to cap enrollment, directly limiting access for students seeking to re-engage with school while maintaining sobriety. This would necessitate staffing cuts, weakening the daily mental health and substance use recovery supports that make these schools so effective. Increasing the risk of student relapses, mental health crises, and reduced academic engagement.</p> <p>The short-term ripple effects would be an immediate increase in risks to student safety, including a sharply elevated chance of overdose and death, compounded by a rise in juvenile detention placements given that 30% of students are justice-involved. Community-wide, this reduction would strain an already-broken system by increasing demand for scarce mental health and substance use treatment beds—an expensive alternative to the \$5,500-per-month recovery school model.</p> <p>Ultimately, this funding cut compromises Oregon’s long-term educational trajectory and its ability to advance equity. With 44% of recovery school students identifying as students of color, the forced reduction in capacity would disproportionately limit opportunities for diverse youth, thus perpetuating racial disparities and opportunity gaps. Losing this proven intervention, especially as Oregon faces a catastrophic surge in youth overdose deaths, will not only lead to tragic individual outcomes but will also burden the state with higher costs for the justice, behavioral health, and adult treatment systems that will inevitably inherit these students. The reduction signals a retreat from sustaining positive outcomes, stifling the program’s ability to expand into underserved communities and severely undermining the state’s commitment to protecting its most at-risk students.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	High School Success				9,957,560		\$	9,957,560			No	Yes	<p>Statutory nature of HSS necessitates that 1.25 percent of the HSS can be applied to admin cost. This at the 5% level ODE would have to reduce staff by 1 FTE with a reduction in the interfund transfer from general fund and the reduction to the OF-SSA funding streams.</p>
OEII	GIA	ODE	050	Student Investment Program-Formula Grants (SIA)				21,940,710		\$	21,940,710			No	Yes	<p>The Student Investment Account was enacted to address academic disparities experienced by focal student populations and to support students’ mental and behavioral health needs. Reducing these funds will directly impact districts’ and grantees’ ability to provide services to meet those goals. This could lead to cuts in programs and staff funded through the SIA, including school counselors, mental health services, targeted class size reduction, and efforts to improve student safety and well-being. Currently, about 82% of SIA funds are spent on school personnel. Reducing staffing will directly affect services across core instruction, special education, student health and well-being, support for English Language learners, and roles tied to on-time graduation and community engagement.</p> <p>Cutting services has long-term consequences. Restarting eliminated programs takes time, especially re-hiring staff into key roles. This is a more acute problem in hard to staff content/speciality areas and rural communities. Students attending school when services are cut or transition years while trying to restore services will miss out on critical services. Reducing mental and behavioral health support will broadly affect students, families, and communities both immediately and over time if access to these services declines. Trust and partnerships built with families and communities will also be jeopardized if districts can’t fulfill the commitments made through their SIA planning and implementation, which was informed by authentic community engagement and voice.</p> <p>The SIA is a major investment in Oregon education, enabling support for services that had faced years of disinvestment, especially in student health and well-being. Reducing this investment will hinder ongoing efforts to close opportunity gaps and may reverse recent progress in key metrics. Additionally, Academic Excellence is named as a key pillar of Oregon’s strategic planning as measured by growth in academic content areas and closing achievement gaps.</p>
ODE	GIA	ODE	050	Interfund x-fers from GF	6,484,367					\$	6,484,367			No	Yes	HSS Transfer

OEII	GIA	ODE	050	High School Success			6,946,386			\$ 6,946,386				Yes	This reduction is tied to the GF reduction of GF to OF transfers at a 5% reduction. The Dept asks that due to the EAC reduction and overall further reduction to the Dept, this reduction be removed in the final decision to not reduce High School Success.
				TOTAL	37,674,134	-	37,686,508	114,705,720	-	\$ 190,066,362	28	28.00			

Target (5%)  
Difference

37,674,134  
(0)

-  
-

22,223,813  
15,462,695

114,705,720  
(0)

Oregon Department of Education (ODE) - State School Fund Reduction Options																
2025-27 Biennium																
2025-27 LAB			9,868,987,525	606,501,675	44,157,823	839,795,667	-	11,359,442,690								
Detail of Reductions to 2025-27 Legislatively Adopted Budget																
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	13	14	15	16	17	
Priority (ranked most to least preferred)	Agency	SCR or Activity Initials	Program Unit/Activity Description	GF	LF	OF	SSA-OF	FF	TOTAL FUNDS	Pos.	FTE	Gov. Reduction Target Yes / No	One-Time Yes / No	Describe the reduction and associated impact on services and outcomes. Please identify the source of Other Funds reductions.		
																Dept
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	EAF Carveout Reduction	26,712,824					\$ 26,712,824			No	Yes	Due to the nature of the SSF distribution formula carveouts are removed from the total SSF allocation in advance of estimates being posted. This particular line item would have no impact on the distribution amount. The impact would be the statutory transfer in support of the Educator Advancment Council through the Educator Advancement Fund - which supports programs like the RENs and staff operations. ORS 327.008 (11)(a) & ORS 327.008 (11)(b)	
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	Menstrual Products Carveout	2,595,000					\$ 2,595,000			No	Yes	Due to the nature of the SSF distribution formula carveouts are removed from the total SSF allocation in advance of estimates being posted. This particular line item would have no impact on the distribution amount. The dollars are reimbursed by contract to school districts for mentral products pursuant to HB3295. ORS 327.008(17).	
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	Speech Pathologist	150,000					\$ 150,000			No	Yes	Due to the nature of the SSF distribution formula carveouts are removed from the total SSF allocation in advance of estimates being posted. This particular line item would have no impact on the distribution amount. Purpose is to increase the number of speech/language pathologists and assistants in Oregon; Provides training stipends to speech/language pathologists and students. ORS 327.008 (15)	
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	10th Grade Assessment	968,000					\$ 968,000			No	Yes	Due to the nature of the SSF distribution formula carveouts are removed from the total SSF allocation in advance of estimates being posted. This particular line item would have no impact on the distribution amount. Purpose is to fund a contract with a non-profit entity to administer a nationally normed assessment to all students in grade 10 who are enrolled in a public school; To predict the success of students on, and provide practice for students taking, college entrance exams. Statutes set forth selection criteria for the contractor but districts can seek a waiver to enter into a contract with a different non-profit entity. Approximately 40,000 students take the PSAT annually ORS 327.008(13)	
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	Talented and Gifted Carveout	150,971					\$ 150,971			No	Yes	Due to the nature of the SSF distribution formula carveouts are removed from the total SSF allocation in advance of estimates being posted. This particular line item would have no impact on the distribution amount. Provides funds to ODE for the development of a statewide TAG program. ORS 327.008 (14)	
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	Local Option Equalization Grant	4,000,000					\$ 4,000,000					Due to the nature of the SSF distribution formula carveouts are removed from the total SSF allocation in advance of estimates being posted. This particular line item would have no impact on the distribution amount. Provided to eligible school districts levying a local option property tax. Eligible districts are those districts that levy a local option property tax and have an assessed value per student that is below the assessed value per student of the target district. The target district represents the school district that has an assessed value per student higher than all but 25 percent of Oregon's school districts. The Local Option Equalization Grant is equal to the number of students in the district, multiplied by the local option tax, multiplied by the difference between the target district assessed value per student and eligible district assessed value per student. ORS 327.339 (1)(d), ORS 327.339	
				English Language Learner transfer reduction only	7,000,000					\$ 7,000,000						

				Healthy Schools Fund transfer reduction only	6,000,000									
				EAF transfer reduction only	1,768,143									
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	.50% SSF Reduction	0	3,032,508	220,789	4,198,978		\$ 7,452,275		No	Yes	This amount represent .5% less the carveouts, based on this the impact would be as follow: Session Days Impacted: 1.2, Licensed Teacher Impacted: 341
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	1.00% SSF Reduction	49,344,938	3,032,508	220,789	4,198,978		\$ 56,797,213		No	Yes	Session Days Impacted: 2.9, Licensed Teachers Impacted: 829
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	1.5% SSF Reduction	49,344,938	3,032,508	220,789	4,198,978		\$ 56,797,213		No	Yes	Session Days Impacted: 4.3, Licensed Teachers Impacted: 1244
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	2% SSF Reduction	49,344,938	3,032,508	220,789	4,198,978		\$ 56,797,213		No	Yes	Session Days Impacted: 5.7, Licensed Teachers Impacted: 1658
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	2.5% SSF Reduction	49,344,938	3,032,508	220,789	4,198,978		\$ 56,797,213		No	Yes	Session Days Impacted: 7.2, Licensed Teachers Impacted: 2073
2.5% above this line														
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	3% SSF Reduction	49,344,938	3,032,508	220,789	4,198,978		\$ 56,797,213		No	Yes	Session Days Impacted: 8.6, Licensed Teachers Impacted: 2487
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	3.5% SSF Reduction	49,344,938	3,032,508	220,789	4,198,978		\$ 56,797,213		No	Yes	Session Days Impacted: 10.1, Licensed Teachers Impacted: 2902
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	4% SSF Reduction	49,344,938	3,032,508	220,789	4,198,978		\$ 56,797,213		No	Yes	Session Days Impacted: 11.5, Licensed Teachers Impacted: 3317
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	4.5% SSF Reduction	49,344,938	3,032,508	220,789	4,198,978		\$ 56,797,213		No	Yes	Session Days Impacted: 12.9, Licensed Teachers Impacted: 3731
OFIT	SSF	ODE	070	5% SSF Reduction	49,344,934	3,032,512	220,790	4,198,981		\$ 56,797,217		No	Yes	Session Days Impacted: 14.4, Licensed Teachers Impacted: 4146
				TOTAL	493,449,376	30,325,084	2,207,891	41,989,783	-	\$ 560,203,991	0	0.00		

Target (5%)  
Difference

493,449,376  
(0)

30,325,084  
0

2,207,891  
(0)

41,989,783  
(0)

Oregon Department of Education (ODE)															
2025-27 Biennium															
Detail of Programs in the 2025-27 Legislatively Approved Budget that have been established or expanded since 2021-23															
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Agency	SCR	Program Establishment / Expansion			Program Description	GF	LF	OF	NL-OF	FF	NL-FF	TOTAL FUNDS	Pos.	FTE	Implementation Status
		Biennium	Effective Date	Authorization											
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 103	Student Success Act-SEIA			7,159,450				\$ 7,159,450	5	4.92	EGMS /Implement SSA/LGBTQ+/Latinx
58100	050	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 103	LGBTQ+ & Latinx Student Plan-GIA			4,000,000				\$ 4,000,000			Implemented
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 105	High Quality, Safe and Effective Schools	266,512		3,233,488		474,356		\$ 3,974,356	3	2.92	Implemented
58100	090	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 105	OSCIM Capital Bonds			150,000,000				\$ 150,000,000			Bonds
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 107	Distance Learning			998,056		398,675		\$ 1,396,731	1	1.00	Implemented
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 108	Interim & Formative Assessment Tools					273,515		\$ 273,515	1	0.92	Implemented
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 109	STEM Programs for Diverse Learners	5,000,000						\$ 5,000,000			GIA
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 110	Information Technology Modernization	475,569						\$ 475,569	2	1.84	Implemented
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 111	Supporting & Expanding Instructional Standards	556,283		87,400		259,523		\$ 903,206	4	3.42	Implemented
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 112	Student Nutrition & Transportation					764,841		\$ 764,841	4	3.50	Implemented
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 113	Leadership, Accountability & Customer Service	619,669		1,315,812				\$ 1,935,481	2	1.84	Implemented
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 301	Educator Advancement Council			2,491,320				\$ 2,491,320	4	3.68	Dept Ops
58100	050	2021-23	7/1/2021	POP 301	Educator Advancement Council			11,500,000				\$ 11,500,000			GIA
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	Pkg 801	LFO Analyst Adj	98,540						\$ 98,540	7	5.97	Implemented
58100	050	2021-23	7/1/2021	Pkg 801	LFO Analyst Adj	152,800,647		117,513,307		8,321,637		\$ 278,635,591			GIA
58100	050	2021-23	7/1/2021	Pkg 803	Student Success Act			(109,100,926)				\$ (109,100,926)			GIA
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	Pkg 803	Student Success Act			283,854				\$ 283,854	1	1.00	Implemented
58100	050	2021-23	7/1/2021	Pkg 804	Grants and Technical Changes					18,640,338		\$ 18,640,338			Implemented
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	Pkg 811	Budget Reconciliation Adj	3,998,673		1,459,142				\$ 5,457,815	14	12.92	Implemented
58100	050	2021-23	7/1/2021	Pkg 811	Budget Reconciliation Adj	(27,849,006)		151,289,130				\$ 123,440,124			GIA
58100	010	2021-23	7/1/2021	Pkg 813	Policy Bills	2,160,566		0				\$ 2,160,566	7	4.75	Implemented
58100	050	2021-23	7/1/2021	Pkg 813	Policy Bills	5,276,917		2,000,000				\$ 7,276,917			GIA
58100	050	2021-23	12/1/2021	SB 5561	2021 Dec Spec Session SB5561			2,000,000				\$ 2,000,000			GIA
58100	050	2021-23	2/1/2022	HB 5202	2022 Feb Session HB5202	61,245,272		65,132,925				\$ 126,378,197			GIA
58100	010	2021-23	2/1/2022	HB 5202	2022 Feb Session HB5202	8,777,292		4,192,245				\$ 12,969,537	90	41.93	Dept Ops
58100	010	2021-23	2/1/2022	Substantive 202	2022 Feb Session Substantive	4,398,080						\$ 4,398,080	34	16.38	Dept Ops
58100	050	2021-23	2/1/2022	Substantive 202	2022 Feb Session Substantive	101,017,143		19,500,000				\$ 120,517,143			GIA
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023		GEER TA & CTE Support			4,650,000				\$ 4,650,000			Implemented
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 3198	Early Literacy			90,000,000				\$ 90,000,000			Implemented
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	Pkg 813	OTLA	2,250,000						\$ 2,250,000			Implemented
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	Pkg 813	OEDI	5,000,000						\$ 5,000,000			Implemented
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	Pkg 813	OEDI SSA Grants			2,000,000				\$ 2,000,000			Implemented
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	Pkg 813	Professional Development Plans	10,000,000						\$ 10,000,000			In progress
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	Pkg 813	Other SSA Grants			3,717,593				\$ 3,717,593			Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	POP 101	OEDI Dept Ops			543,339				\$ 543,339			Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	POP 104	OEII System Cap & Improv-GEER TA & CTE			100,515		174,436		\$ 274,951			Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	POP 109	EGMS & School Finance Staff	789,019		925,000				\$ 1,714,019			In progress
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	POP 201	YDD Enhancement			263,351				\$ 263,351			Implemented
58100	030	2023-25	7/1/2023	POP 301	EAC GIA			3,416,807				\$ 3,416,807			Implemented
58100	030	2023-25	7/1/2023	POP 301	EAC Dept Ops			551,743				\$ 551,743			Implemented
58100	030	2023-25	7/1/2023	Pkg 801	EAC GIA			27,421,087				\$ 27,421,087			Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 2656	School Surveys	488,763						\$ 488,763	2	1.76	Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 2767	Recovery Schools	2,310,694						\$ 2,310,694			Implemented
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 2767	Other SSA Grants			3,150,000				\$ 3,150,000			Implemented
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 3144	Native Hawaii Student Success Plan			2,000,000				\$ 2,000,000			Implemented

**Oregon Department of Education (ODE)**

2025-27 Biennium

Detail of Programs in the 2025-27 Legislatively Approved Budget that have been established or expanded since 2021-23					

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Agency	SCR	Program Establishment / Expansion			Program Description	GF	LF	OF	NL-OF	FF	NL-FF	TOTAL FUNDS	Pos.	FTE	Implementation Status
		Biennium	Effective Date	Authorization											
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 3198	Early Literacy Dept Ops			4,328,241				\$ 4,328,241	14	12.88	Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	SB 3	Diploma Requirements	426,367						\$ 426,367	1	0.92	Implemented
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	SB 283	OEDI State Grants	5,000,000						\$ 5,000,000			Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	SB 819	Ed Workforce Devlp	3,140,320						\$ 3,140,320			Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	SB 1002	SSEM			3,000,000				\$ 3,000,000	2	1.88	Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 5506	SSF Modernization			559,094				\$ 559,094	2	1.92	Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 5506	Multilingual Migrant Ed			748,833				\$ 748,833	8	7.68	Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 5506	Educator Advancement Council Admin			4,826,632				\$ 4,826,632	10	10.00	In progress
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 5506	OEDI Student Success Act			5,000,000				\$ 5,000,000			Implemented
58100	040	2023-25	7/1/2023	HB 5506	Gang Prevention & Intervention EMOPI	2,000,000						\$ 2,000,000			Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	2/1/2024	SB 5701	Investigations & Complaints	2,007,778						\$ 2,007,778	14	7.00	In progress
58100	010	2023-25	2/1/2024	SB 5701	District Data Dashboards	1,434,859						\$ 1,434,859	6	3.50	In progress
58100	050	2023-25	2/1/2024	SB 5701	CNP-CACFP	660,000						\$ 660,000			Implemented
58100	010	2023-25	2/1/2024	SB 5701	Asylum, Refugee, Immigrant Student Success Plan			243,802				\$ 243,802	1	0.50	In progress
58100	050	2023-25	2/1/2024	SB 5701	Asylum, Refugee, Immigrant Student Success Plan			2,000,000				\$ 2,000,000			In progress
58100	010	2023-25	2/1/2024	SB 1552	Youth Advisory Grroup	198,739						\$ 198,739	2	0.69	implemented
58100	010	2025-27	7/1/2025		State School Fund Modernization	2,116,883						\$ 2,116,883	7	4.73	In progress
58100	010	2025-27	7/1/2025		SB819 Infrastructure					1,344,720		\$ 1,344,720			In progress
58100	010	2025-27	7/1/2025		OESO-RMO Team Capacity					945,098		\$ 945,098			In progress
58100	010	2025-27	7/1/2025	POP 584	POP 584 EL Summer Learning	1,609,113						\$ 1,609,113	4	3.75	In progress
58100	010	2025-27	7/1/2025		YDD Administration							\$ -			In progress
58100	010	2025-27	7/1/2025		SB 141 Fiscal Transpearacy/ HB 2508	2,030,304		2,625,296				\$ 4,655,600	9	7.50	In progress
58100	050	2023-25	7/1/2025		Summer Learning Grants			70,000,000				\$ 70,000,000			Implemented yr 1, In progress yr 2
												\$ -			
												\$ -			
												\$ -			
												\$ -			
												\$ -			
												\$ -			
												\$ -			
				TOTAL		362,304,996	-	665,126,536	-	31,597,139	-	\$ 1,059,028,671	261	171.70	

## Instructions

Column (5) - Authorization should identify the source of the new program or program expansion, which could include enabling legislation, approved policy option package, or administrative establishment.

Column (6) - Program description should include a summary of the program and the expansion (if applicable), including any partner state agencies.

Column (16) - Current status of program implementation should be summarized, including any future budget requests anticipated upon full program implementation.