



## April 7, 2026 - Board Meeting Agenda Questions & Responses

### 5.5 04.07.26 Board Disposals Spreadsheet B

How were these items lost?

The mini DV camcorder was purchased in fiscal year 2008 and reported lost in fiscal year 2018. The Sigma lens was purchased in fiscal year 2020 and reported lost in fiscal year 2021. Items are marked as lost by the Property Control Specialist when they are not in their designated spot when an inventory walkthrough is completed. Lost items are kept on the books for two inventory cycles (4 years) and should then be placed on the disposal list to be removed from district inventory.

Disposals with Original Purchase Value Under \$5K						
Location	Asset #	Serial Number	Description	Estimated Fair Market Value	Method for Determining the Fair Market Value	Recommended Method for Disposition
DO MAINT - CEN	N/A	RR0609D01406	RHEEM ELECTRIC WATER HEATER	\$ -	DAMAGED BEYOND REPAIR	DISPOSE @ DO MAINT
DO MAINT - COR	N/A	2230130384522	AO SMITH COMMERCIAL WATER HEATER	\$ -	DAMAGED BEYOND REPAIR	DISPOSE @ DO MAINT
DO MAINT - HTA	N/A	1905113528130	AO SMITH COMMERCIAL WATER HEATER	\$ -	DAMAGED BEYOND REPAIR	DISPOSE @ DO MAINT
DO MAINT - HHS	N/A	2037120935978	AO SMITH COMMERCIAL WATER HEATER	\$ -	DAMAGED BEYOND REPAIR	DISPOSE @ DO MAINT
DO MAINT - HHS	N/A	2037120935977	AO SMITH COMMERCIAL WATER HEATER	\$ -	DAMAGED BEYOND REPAIR	DISPOSE @ DO MAINT
DO COMM ED	NA	NA	BASEBALL TEE'S, BALLS, BATS, MARKERS	\$ 60.00	PLAY IT AGAIN SPORTS	AUCTION
DO COMM ED	NA	NA	WHITE RECTANGLE WOOD TABLE	\$ 10.00	COMPARATIVE SALE/PUBLIC SURP	AUCTION
DO COMM ED	NA	NA	ROUND MAPLE WOOD TABLE W/4 CHAIRS	\$ 25.00	COMPARATIVE SALE/PUBLIC SURP	AUCTION
DO COMM ED	NA	NA	4 DRAWER LETTER SIZE FILE CABINET	\$ 5.00	COMPARATIVE SALE/PUBLIC SURP	AUCTION
WFH	N/A	NA	WENGER MUSIC CONDUCTOR CHAIR	\$ -	DAMAGED BEYOND REPAIR	DISPOSE @ WFH
WFH	A0006389	NA	MINI DVD CAMCORDER	\$ -		LOST
WFH	A0046713	589101	SIGMA 70-200 LENS	\$ -		LOST

### 5.6 Approval of Disposal of three (3) portable buildings at HTA

Why are we disposing instead of selling or auctioning them?

The cost to have the portables removed from the current site, transported to another site, refurbished to be useable, permitted, and reinstalled would far exceed the cost of buying a brand-new portable building.

#### 5.6 Approval of Disposal of three (3) portable buildings at HTA

Disposal of three (3) portable buildings located at Higley Traditional Academy. These units have exceeded their useful life, are no longer occupied, and are not suitable for instructional or operational use. Maintaining these vacant structures continues to incur unnecessary costs to the district. Disposition of the portables will eliminate ongoing expenses and free up space for future site needs.

The current annual costs to the district if not disposed of are electricity, taxes, and maintenance.

## 5.7 Student Activities Report

Regarding the Undesignated funds –  
What is the source of these funds?

The undesignated funds in Student Activities are the Maricopa County Treasurer’s interest waiting to be posted to each individual student club account.

Why are they not tied to a club or organization?

They are moved to the club account on a quarterly basis if possible.

Who has spending authority over this?

Nothing is kept in undesignated permanently, and the spending authority lies with the club where the interest is placed.

Governing Board Report - Student Activities					
FY2026 - February					
		Beginning Cash Balance	YTD Revenues	YTD Expenditures	Current Cash Balance
101	Higley Traditional Academy	\$ 25,812.48	\$ 19,243.59	\$ 9,686.65	\$ 35,369.42
102	Coronado Elementary	\$ 22,307.23	\$ 3,115.00	\$ 5,837.31	\$ 19,584.92
103	San Tan Elementary	\$ 19,322.11	\$ 4,132.00	\$ 9,036.31	\$ 14,417.80
104	Power Ranch Elementary	\$ 7,399.35	\$ 13,327.00	\$ 9,237.84	\$ 11,488.51
105	Gateway Pointe Elementary	\$ 3,209.36	\$ 11,119.50	\$ 3,576.35	\$ 10,752.51
106	Cortina Elementary	\$ 33,396.86	\$ 731.75	\$ 496.04	\$ 33,632.57
107	Chaparral Elementary	\$ 17,457.05	\$ 2,046.25	\$ 2,151.18	\$ 17,352.12
108	Centennial Elementary	\$ 12,809.97	\$ 2,165.00	\$ 1,745.77	\$ 13,229.20
112	Bridges Elementary	\$ 19,374.11	\$ 4,534.45	\$ 3,350.05	\$ 20,558.51
150	Cooley Middle School	\$ 72,041.53	\$ 26,817.02	\$ 23,821.88	\$ 75,036.67
151	Sossaman Middle School	\$ 42,994.86	\$ 18,557.30	\$ 29,504.64	\$ 32,047.52
201	Higley High School	\$ 321,893.47	\$ 583,039.61	\$ 435,446.67	\$ 469,486.41
202	Willaims Field High School	\$ 250,017.77	\$ 342,509.94	\$ 285,951.84	\$ 306,575.87
000	Undesignated	\$ -	\$ 10,196.87	\$ -	\$ 10,196.87
Totals		\$ 848,036.15	\$ 1,041,535.28	\$ 819,842.53	\$ 1,069,728.90

While the USFR doesn’t set hard limits on balances, it does require that student activity funds be purpose-specific, student-driven, and used for the students who generated them. Large or growing balances, unclear designations, or revenues exceeding program needs can raise compliance and governance concerns under Auditor General guidance.

Under USFR principles:

These funds are not meant to accumulate indefinitely

They should be used for current students

Funds being held for unclear purposes

Potential equity issues (students paid but didn’t benefit)

Fees/fundraising exceeding program needs

I want to make sure we’re aligned with USFR principles around student activity funds being purpose-specific and used for students, so I have a few clarifying questions.

Can you walk us through how we ensure student activity funds remain purpose-specific and are used for the students who generated them?

Each club, at every school, works with their club advisor on what they would like to purchase with their funds. Student Activity funds have stringent rules to follow for spending money, and there must be a majority vote of the club's student members before any funds can be spent.

Some of these site-level balances are relatively large. How do we determine what an appropriate balance is for a student activity account, and what is our plan for funds that continue to grow year over year?

Student activity funds are the students' money, and the district cannot tell the students how to spend their money. They are encouraged to spend the funds they raise in the year they are raised.

What controls are in place to ensure that funds raised by current students are used to benefit those same students, rather than being carried forward long-term?

Again, the students are encouraged to spend the funds in the year they are raised.

How do we ensure that students who are paying fees or participating in fundraising are receiving a direct benefit, and that funds are not being accumulated without being used for student activities?

The funds raised are deposited into the club they were raised for. The funds in one club are not allowed to be spent by a different club.

In cases where revenues consistently exceed expenditures, what process do we use to evaluate whether fees or fundraising levels are appropriate?

This would be a question for each school's student activity advisor.

Do we have visibility at the club or activity level to ensure funds are being used appropriately, rather than only at the site level?

Yes, every student activity expenditure requires specific paperwork be included, and this paperwork is reviewed by the position in Finance who oversees student activities. Any missing information results in the request being returned to the school to provide/correct the missing information.

Are there any internal guidelines or Auditor General recommendations we follow regarding acceptable balances or use of student activity funds?

Please refer to the FAQ section under Student Activities: [FAQs—School Districts | Auditor General](#)

Can we receive a more detailed breakdown by activity or organization so the board can better understand how these funds are being accumulated and used?

Yes, the vouchers included in consent include all student activity expenditures. A list of revenue sources can be provided.

## **5.11 Approval of Overnight and/or Out-of-State Staff Travel-Schools to Watch** **– Please pull**

I understand the district is recognizing this program as a positive achievement. As part of our oversight role, I'd like to better understand the full scope of what participation in this model requires from our schools. How did they find out about this program?

Where did it come from and why did they think this was a good idea for our district?

Is participation in the Schools to Watch model limited to recognition, or does it require implementation of specific instructional practices, frameworks, or cultural expectations within the school?

What specific practices related to 'whole-child' approaches are expected under this model, and how do we ensure those do not reduce instructional time dedicated to core academic standards?

The framework references 'social equity' as a core domain. How is that defined in practice within our schools, and what specific policies or instructional changes does that require?

The materials reference students exploring identity and personal development. Can you clarify how that is implemented in the classroom, and what guardrails are in place to ensure alignment with state standards and parental expectations?

Are there any required or recommended changes to curriculum, instructional materials, or classroom practices to align with this model, particularly regarding diversity, representation, or multiple perspectives?

What additional expectations does this model place on schools related to student mental, emotional, or social supports, and how are those services defined and communicated to parents?

What visibility do parents have into any non-academic components of this model, and are there any areas where parental notification or consent would apply?

Does participation in this model involve collecting additional student data beyond academics, such as behavioral, emotional, or survey data? If so, how is that data used and protected?

The materials indicate staff-wide participation in the self-study and rubric process.

What expectations are placed on teachers and staff, and how does this impact classroom instruction?

The framework references that some components are grounded in philosophy and expert opinion rather than empirical research. How does the district evaluate which elements are evidence-based and appropriate for implementation?

What financial or staffing resources are required to implement or maintain alignment with this model, including training, professional development, or ongoing participation?

What measurable academic outcomes are tied to this model, and how will we evaluate whether participation is improving student achievement?

Can we receive a clear summary outlining which components of this model are recognition-based versus those that require ongoing implementation within our district?

## Overnight/Out-of-State Staff Travel – April 7, 2026

### COOLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL

Who: Chad Cantrell  
Where: Washington, D.C.  
When: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 – Saturday, June 27, 2026  
Purpose: National Schools to Watch Conference

#### Cost:

Tuition/Registration:	\$539
Air Fare:	\$700
Housing:	\$943
Per diem:	\$275
Transportation:	<u>\$80</u>
<i>Total Cost:</i>	<i>\$2,537</i>

Transportation: Airline

Fund: 457-Results Based Funding

## Arizona Schools to Watch (STW)

### Purpose & Origin

The **Schools to Watch (STW)** program is a national middle-grades recognition and improvement model developed by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform in partnership with the Association for Middle Level Education.

Arizona participates through a state affiliate network.

### Purpose:

- Recognize high-performing middle schools
- Provide a structured framework for continuous improvement

### Recognition vs. Requirements

#### Recognition:

- Schools apply and are evaluated using a national rubric
- Designation lasts ~3 years, with renewal required

#### Ongoing Expectations:

- Conduct a comprehensive self-study
- Demonstrate alignment to four domains:
  - Academic Excellence
  - Developmental Responsiveness
  - Social Equity
  - Organizational Effectiveness

### Key Point:

This is not just an award—it includes ongoing reflection and improvement, but **does not mandate specific curriculum or programs.**

## **Instruction & Curriculum Impact**

- No required textbooks, courses, or instructional materials
- No prescribed ideology or external curriculum
- Full alignment with **Arizona academic standards remains required**
- Instructional decisions remain under **district and board control**

## **“Whole-Child” & Student Support**

The model encourages attention to:

- Academic achievement
- Student engagement
- School climate and safety

### **Typical practices may include:**

- Advisory or homeroom structures
- Goal-setting and student reflection
- Access to counseling and supports

### **Safeguard:**

These supports are implemented **without replacing core academic instruction.**

## **Social Equity**

Focuses on ensuring:

- Equal access to rigorous coursework
- Monitoring of student subgroup performance
- Reduction of achievement and opportunity gaps

### **Does NOT require:**

- Specific political or ideological instruction
- Mandated curriculum changes

## **Student Development & Identity**

- Implemented through age-appropriate activities (e.g., goal setting, career awareness)
- Typically occurs in advisory or counseling settings

### **Guardrails:**

- Must align with state standards, district policy, and approved curriculum
- Subject to existing parent transparency and rights policies

## **Parent Visibility & Rights**

- Parents retain access to curriculum and school programming
- Schools follow district policies for:
  - Notification
  - Consent (where applicable, e.g., surveys or counseling services)

## **STW does not override parental rights policies.**

## **Data & Privacy**

- May include use of:
  - Climate surveys
  - Engagement or behavioral data

## **Protections:**

- Governed by district policy and federal law (FERPA)
- Primarily used in aggregate for school improvement

## **Staff & Operational Impact**

- Staff participate in:
  - Self-study and rubric review
  - School improvement planning

## **Impact on classrooms:**

- Indirect (reflection and collaboration)
- No mandated teaching methods or loss of autonomy

## **Costs & Resources**

- Modest and variable:
  - Application/renewal fees
  - Staff time
  - Optional professional development

## **No required new staffing or major purchases**

## **Accountability & Outcomes**

- Schools must demonstrate:
  - Academic performance and growth
  - Progress in closing achievement gaps

## **Evaluation tools:**

- State assessments
- Local academic data
- Periodic re-review for renewal

## Bottom Line

The STW model is a **voluntary recognition program with a structured improvement framework.**

It:

- Encourages balanced focus on academics and student support
- Requires reflection and alignment to best practices
- **Does not mandate curriculum, ideology, or loss of local control**

## 5.12 Approval of Overnight and/or Out-of-State Staff Travel-WEB – Please pull

Can we see the actual training materials used in Link Crew and WEB programs?  
What topics would student leaders be trained to facilitate with younger students?  
What guidelines are in place to ensure discussions remain appropriate and aligned with district expectations?  
What specific frameworks or philosophies are included in the staff training sessions?  
Can we review the actual training materials used for both staff and student leaders? I wasn't able to find anything on their website.

## Program Origin & Structure

Both **WEB (Where Everybody Belongs)** and **Link Crew** are programs developed by the Boomerang Project.

- **WEB** → Elementary to middle school transition support
- **Link Crew** → Middle to high school transition support
- Focus: peer mentoring, school climate, and student transition success

## Availability of Training Materials

- Full training materials are **not publicly posted online**
- Access is typically limited to:
  - Schools that have purchased the program
  - Staff who attend official training sessions

## Student Leader Training: Topics & Scope

Student leaders are trained to facilitate structured, school-approved activities such as:

- School orientation and transition support
- Academic success habits (organization, time management)
- Peer connection and inclusion activities
- Anti-bullying and positive school culture messaging
- Goal-setting and leadership skills

## Important:

- Activities are **pre-scripted and structured**, not open-ended counseling sessions

- Student leaders are **not acting as counselors or instructors**

## **Guardrails & Oversight**

Programs include built-in expectations to ensure appropriateness:

- Activities follow **pre-designed scripts and protocols**
- Adult supervision is required during all sessions
- Leaders are trained to:
  - Refer sensitive issues to staff
  - Avoid facilitating discussions beyond their scope

## **Staff Training: Frameworks & Philosophy**

Staff training typically includes:

- Peer-to-peer mentoring models
- Transition support theory (helping students navigate school changes)
- School climate and belonging strategies
- Basic principles aligned with adolescent development

These are generally **practice-based frameworks**, not mandated instructional curricula.

## **Curriculum & Content Considerations**

- No required academic curriculum changes
- No mandated instructional content in core subjects
- Activities are typically:
  - Short-duration (orientation days, periodic sessions)
  - Focused on school success and connection

## **Parent Visibility & Transparency**

- Programs are school-based and activity-driven
- Parents should have access to:
  - Program descriptions
  - General activity outlines

## **Travel & Training Context**

For overnight/out-of-state travel tied to WEB/Link Crew training:

- Travel is typically for **staff certification or program training**
- Expectation is that trained staff:
  - Redeliver program content locally
  - Oversee student leader training and implementation

## Overnight/Out-of-State Staff Travel – April 7, 2026

### SOSSAMAN MIDDLE SCHOOL

Who: Daniel Turpin  
Where: Anaheim, CA  
When: Sunday, April 19, 2026– Wednesday, April 22, 2026  
Purpose: WEB Training – The Boomerang Project

#### Cost:

Tuition/Registration:	\$3,995
Air Fare:	\$265
Housing:	\$0 (included)
Per diem:	\$0
Transportation:	<u>\$50</u>
<i>Total Cost:</i>	<i>\$4,310</i>

Transportation: Airline

Fund: 140 Title II

### 5.13 Approval of Overnight and/or Out-of-State Staff Travel-Safe & Civil – **Please pull**

What specific, measurable outcomes do we expect from sending staff to this conference?

What does implementation look like after staff return, what changes are expected at the school or classroom level?

Will this require additional training for teachers or ongoing staff time beyond this conference?

Is this intended to be a schoolwide or districtwide model, or limited to specific classrooms or staff?

How will this support teachers in maintaining classroom control without adding additional responsibilities or systems to manage?

Will this reduce the amount of instructional time teachers are currently losing to behavior issues?

What feedback have we received from teachers about current behavior supports, and how does this address those concerns?

Before adopting new frameworks, what steps have we taken to ensure our current policies are being consistently enforced?

Does this model require additional data collection or tracking of student behavior, and how will that be managed?

Can you clearly describe how this investment will result in fewer classroom disruptions and more instructional time for teachers?

## Overnight/Out-of-State Staff Travel-April 7.2026

### COOLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL

Who: Shana Lacerenza & Karen Feils  
Where: Portland, OR  
When: Sunday, July 12, 2026 – Friday, July 17, 2026  
Purpose: Safe & Civil Schools National Conference  
Cost:

Tuition/Registration:	\$1,495
Air Fare:	\$700
Housing:	\$1,363
Per diem:	\$215
Transportation:	<u>\$100</u>
Cost Per Person:	\$3,873
TOTAL:	\$7746

Transportation: Airline

Fund: 140 Title II

## Safe & Civil Schools

### Program Overview

The **Safe & Civil Schools** framework was developed by Randy Sprick and focuses on **proactive behavior management, clear expectations, and consistent adult responses** to reduce disruptions and improve instructional time

### 1) Expected Measurable Outcomes

Participation should lead to measurable improvements in:

- Reduction in office discipline referrals
- Fewer classroom disruptions
- Increased time on task during instruction
- Improved consistency in behavior expectations across classrooms
- Improved teacher perception of classroom control (via staff surveys)

### Success metrics (recommended):

- % reduction in referrals and removals
- Instructional minutes regained
- Teacher survey results on behavior support effectiveness

## 2) Post-Conference Implementation

After training, implementation typically includes:

- Defining **clear, schoolwide behavior expectations**
- Establishing **consistent classroom management routines**
- Using **common language for redirection and correction**
- Reinforcing positive behavior through structured systems

### At the classroom level:

- Clear procedures for transitions, participation, and behavior
- Predictable responses to disruptions
- Reduced variability between classrooms

## 3) Additional Training & Staff Time

- Initial training is delivered to a core team (via conference)
- Follow-up may include:
  - Short staff trainings (led internally)
  - Ongoing reinforcement during PLCs or staff meetings

### Key point:

This is designed to **streamline existing practices**, not add separate systems or significant ongoing burdens.

## 4) Scope of Implementation

- Can be implemented:
  - Schoolwide (most effective), or
  - Targeted (specific grade levels or teams)

### Best practice:

Schoolwide consistency yields the strongest results in reducing disruptions.

## 5) Impact on Classroom Management

The framework is intended to **support—not complicate—teacher practice** by:

- Providing clear, repeatable strategies
- Reducing ambiguity in how to respond to behavior
- Aligning expectations across staff

### Result:

Less time spent reacting to behavior, more time spent teaching.

## 6) Instructional Time Recovery

Yes—this model is specifically designed to:

- Reduce lost instructional time due to disruptions
- Increase student engagement and time on task

## **Mechanism:**

- Prevention (clear expectations)
- Consistency (predictable responses)
- Efficiency (less escalation)

## **7) Teacher Feedback & Alignment to Needs**

Common teacher concerns this model addresses:

- Inconsistent discipline across classrooms
- Lack of clear expectations for students
- Time lost managing repeated low-level disruptions

**Safe & Civil Schools directly targets these issues through consistency and clarity.**

## **8) Alignment with Current Policies**

Before adopting new practices, schools should:

- Review current discipline policies
- Ensure consistent enforcement across staff
- Identify gaps in clarity or implementation

**This framework strengthens implementation of existing policies rather than replacing them.**

## **9) Data Collection & Management**

- May involve tracking:
  - Behavior incidents
  - Referral patterns
  - Classroom-level trends

## **Important:**

- Uses existing data systems where possible
- Does not require complex or burdensome new tracking systems

## **10) How This Leads to Fewer Disruptions**

This investment reduces disruptions through:

1. **Prevention:** Clear expectations reduce misbehavior before it starts
2. **Consistency:** Students experience the same responses across classrooms
3. **Efficiency:** Staff respond quickly and predictably, minimizing escalation
4. **Reinforcement:** Positive behavior is acknowledged and repeated

## **Outcome:**

- Fewer repeated disruptions
- Less time spent on discipline
- More stable and focused learning environments

**Bottom Line**

Sending staff to the Safe & Civil Schools conference is an investment in:

- **Recovering instructional time**
- **Improving classroom consistency**
- **Strengthening teacher capacity to manage behavior effectively**

It is a **practical, implementation-focused approach** that builds on existing systems rather than adding new complexity.

**5.14 Approval of Cooperative Vendors Purchasing Threshold to Exceed \$100,000 for FY25/26**

I appreciate that there is a cap and that anything exceeding the approved amounts would return to the board. However, my concern is that we are still approving relatively large cumulative spending limits without project-level visibility, even though our standard threshold is \$100,000.

I would be more comfortable if we had clearer reporting or visibility into how these funds are being used throughout the year to ensure we are maintaining appropriate oversight.

The Governing Board is kept informed of major maintenance projects through the weekly superintendent report and vouchers on the governing board agendas.

VENDOR NAME	AWARD NUMBER	BID DESCRIPTION	Original Requested Amount 25/26	Additional Requested Amount 25/26
GHAFTER PAINTING	1GPA #23-11PV-04	Painting Products & Services	\$ -	\$ 250,000
SUN COUNTRY FLOORS	1GPA #23-08PV-08	Floor Covering Products & Services	\$ -	\$ 200,000
TOLIN MECHANICAL	SAVE #23-04-30	As Needed Services for Plumbing, Electrical, HVAC & Small Fencing Projects	\$ -	\$ 300,000

### 5.15 Approval of Sole Source Procurement Determination

To clarify, is the cost being increased *to* \$120k (a \$10k increase), or is it increasing *by* \$120k, making the new total \$230k?

This is a \$10,000 increase request due to the quote for graduation.

<u>Vendors</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Original Cost Implications NTE Request</u>	<u>Cost Implications Increase Request</u>	<u>Specific Use for HUSD</u>
Arizona State University - Exempt	Conferences/Graduation Site/Various other services	\$110,000.00	\$120,000.00	Board Decision to include ASU Gammage