



June 2, 2026 - Board Meeting Agenda Questions & Responses

3.2 Approval of Personnel Action Items

Is there anyone listed under Separation of Employment that was recently placed on admin leave pending investigation? If so, who?

Waiting for a response from legal on what can be shared with the board.

3.16 Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement between CGCC and Higley for the Embedded Advisor Program

One thing that stands out from a FERPA perspective is the breadth of demographic and academic data listed in Section 4.4, including:

- race/ethnicity
- gender
- free/reduced lunch (FRL) status
- attendance
- ACT scores
- GPA
- ESS flags

Given the scope of access provided to a non-district employee, I have the following questions regarding safeguards, oversight, and compliance:

- What exact Synergy permissions are granted to Embedded Advisors compared to district counselors?

The access is limited to basic demographic information, student attendance, student test scores, course history, and limited access to student academic and career readiness conferences.

- Does Synergy support granular role-based access controls and least-privilege access?

Yes

- What specific "ESS flags" are visible to advisors?

A simple indicator of whether a student is on an IEP or not.

- Are advisors able to export or download bulk student data?

They can run and export reports limited to alignment with their roles and security.

- Is multi-factor authentication (MFA) required for access?

Please clarify which access you are asking about.

- How is access immediately terminated upon reassignment, resignation, or separation?

Access is locked upon separation.

The agreement states that CGCC provides the advisor with a laptop computer, meaning student data is being accessed from a device that is not district-owned or district-managed.

Given that, what district cybersecurity requirements apply before granting access to Synergy and other HUSD systems, including:

- MFA requirements
- endpoint protection
- encryption standards
- device management controls
- network access/security requirements

Advisor uses a HUSD login so all cybersecurity requirements for employees pertain.

- What cybersecurity standards apply specifically to CGCC-managed devices accessing HUSD systems and student records?

Standard employee requirements.

The agreement states that HUSD may conduct audits of advisor access and use of education records.

- Has HUSD ever exercised its audit rights under Section 6.4 of the agreement?
- If so:
 - how often are audits conducted,
 - what specifically is reviewed,
 - were any findings identified,
 - and are audit logs maintained and regularly reviewed for advisor access to student records?

We have never detected irregularities, so there has not been a need to.

- Does HUSD independently verify deletion of retained student records after the permitted retention period?

We follow FERPA requirements.

- Are advisors considered "school officials" under FERPA's outsourcing exception?

Yes

- Are parents affirmatively notified regarding the scope of student data sharing with CGCC advisors?

On a case-by-case basis.

- Is parent consent opt-in, or is consent implied through school enrollment?

Through school enrollment.

- Can CGCC use aggregate student data for recruitment analytics, institutional reporting, or other purposes beyond direct student advising?

They may only use the data as outlined in the IGA.

The agreement requires advisors to possess a valid Level 1 fingerprint clearance card.

- Is this the same clearance level required for HUSD in-house counselors?

Yes

- Beyond the fingerprint clearance card, are Embedded Advisors required to complete the same annual HUSD trainings as district counselors, including:
 - FERPA/privacy training,
 - cybersecurity training,
 - mandated reporter training,
 - student boundaries/professional conduct training,
 - and data privacy/security training?

No

- How often are FERPA and data privacy trainings conducted for advisors?

They are conducted through MCCCCD and Chandler Gilbert CC.

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

What purchases/projects specifically drove the need for the additional amounts?

- DLR Group will be creating district school maps for Student Services to support the numbering of entrance points at schools for enhanced safety.
- Pueblo Mechanical is for the continued rentals of portable units for the Cooling Towers at Williams Field High School.
- RWC International is for additional repair parts needed to work on the district school busses.

3.19 Authorization of Expenditure – (4) 77 Passenger Busses from RWC International

What is the age distribution of the remaining fleet beyond the average age of 15.2 years?

Our yellow school bus fleet age is:
25+ years: 2 buses
20-24 years: 10 buses

15-19 years: 27 buses
10-14 years: 18 buses
5-9 years: 14 buses
0-4 years: 6 buses

How many buses currently exceed recommended replacement life?

The Arizona Department of Education recommends a 12-year cycle. With Higley's boundaries being smaller we are able to keep our buses a little longer due to lower mileage. Using the Department of Ed 12-year cycle we have 50 buses beyond their life. Using a 15-year, we have 39 buses beyond their life.

What objective criteria are used to prioritize replacement?

Catastrophic failure such as engine, vehicle totaled through insurance due to accident, availability of parts. Our plan would include the disposal of the following buses:

Bus 74 (2012, 145,763 miles)- needs a new engine, major A/C repairs

Bus 75(2011, 143,020 miles)- Insurance totaled due to accident

Bus 86(2014, 117,235 miles)- MaxxFer 7 engine*

Bus 87(2014, 114,748 miles)- MaxxFer 7 engine*

Bus88(2014, 123,353 miles)- MaxxFer 7 engine*

*The MaxxFer 7 engine was discontinued. This engine plagued many school districts and trucking companies. The manufacturer extended the warranty to 10-years, 100,000 miles in good faith. We are now out of that period. These buses have extremely low power. Changing the engine out to a different manufacturer is extremely costly because it would be required to meet the current EPA requirements, which the buses electronic components do not support.

What are the maintenance costs on the buses being replaced?

Bus 74 – Parts: \$66,583.03, Labor \$6942.75, Fuel \$85,333.24

Bus 75- Parts: \$45,593.07, Labor \$7162.81, Fuel \$67,487.88

Bus 86- Parts: \$31,386.88, Labor \$6790.15, Fuel \$57061.84

Bus 87- Parts: \$28,057.47, Labor \$4303.20, Fuel \$54,899.16

Bus 88- Parts: \$23,795.85, Labor \$5710.40, Fuel \$60,825.99

Note: Buses 86-88 have a lower maintenance cost due to the extended warranty provided by the engine manufacturer.

The agenda states the district has prioritized repairs over replacement.

- At what point did repairs become no longer cost-effective?
 - It varies by vehicle; our fleet software tracks expenses, compares them to like buses and will flag a vehicle with above average operating costs. Our original fleet replacement program through prior bonds was to purchase 4-6 buses each year to maintain a fleet age near 15years. With the override and bond failures we have not been able to sustain that which has caused us to operate an older fleet which is more costly to operate.

- What were the maintenance expenditures on these four buses over the past 3–5 years?

Bus 74– Parts: \$40,562.40, Labor \$3296.69

Bus 75- Parts: \$24,982.61, Labor \$5962.28

Bus 86- Parts: \$17,698.32, Labor \$4398.42

Bus 87- Parts: \$18,911.76 Labor \$2171.82

Bus 88- Parts: \$11,167.65, Labor \$3023.97

Note: Used past 5 years for these calculations.

- Was a lifecycle cost analysis performed comparing continued repairs versus replacement?

Yes, although this can be hard to accurately quantify as we only know of future preventative maintenance costs, not breakdowns and failures.

Since this uses a cooperative contract:

- What benchmarking was performed to confirm pricing competitiveness?

These buses would be purchased using the Mohave Cooperative. There are no other bus dealers selling new 2024 model year buses so a direct comparison is difficult. These 2024 model year buses are roughly \$15,000 less than the 2025 model year was and \$30,000 less than the current 2026 model. Additionally, analysts are anticipating engine costs from all brands will be increasing sharply in the next year or two due to increased emission requirements and increased production costs and parts procurement.

- Were alternative vendors or cooperative contracts evaluated?

Yes, to the extent we were able to, being the 2024 model year which is not available. It was, however, better pricing than their 2025/2026 pricing.

- Is the district receiving any fleet or governmental volume discounts beyond the Mohave cooperative pricing?

No, just Mohave pricing for the 2024 model year. We would need to purchase 5 or more buses to receive another discount. The discount would be \$500.00 off per bus for a quantity of 5-9 and \$1000 off per bus for a quantity of 10 or more.

The quote references Volume Discount / Special Pricing Discount” but does not quantify the amount of discount received.

We would need to purchase 5 or more units for this to show the additional discount (see above for discount amounts).

How much remaining balance exists in Fund 957 after this purchase?

Approximately \$250,000

Are transportation enterprise revenues stable enough to support future fleet

replacement needs?

Yes, along with support from the capital fund 610

How much capital funding remains available after this expenditure?

\$6M before FY27 funds applied

Will these buses replace specific units that will now be retired?

Yes, buses 74, 75, 86, 87 and 88.

Will any retired buses be sold at auction or repurposed?

If approved, the retired buses would most likely go to auction. We may also see if the dealership would accept them on trade, but it is doubtful.

The quote includes extended vehicle coverage, towing coverage, and camera systems.

- What maintenance costs remain excluded? Some excluded areas are identified, but not all future maintenance obligations.

Typical wear items would be excluded from the warranty such as tires, belts, wiper blades, etc. That said, if any wear items were to fail prematurely from defect, they would be covered. I've attached the vehicle coverage sheet which will go into detail as to what is covered and what is not.

- What is the expected useful life of these buses?

With proper maintenance I would expect these buses to last 15 to 20 years.

What operational or fleet data is collected through the telematics system, who has access to it, and are there any recurring subscription costs after the included five-year period?

The OCC (On Command Connection) is a tool for the district to monitor the health of your bus, track maintenance and repair events. It will give our shop direction on completing repairs as it uses the same fault code action plans that the dealership uses. We have full control of information being shared as we are the administrator of the account. Insurance companies do not have access to the data. After the 5-year period is up, the cost is \$125/ year should we decide to continue with it.

3.20 Approval of Medical Insurance Administrator Agreement to Kairos Health Arizona

What has HUSD's large-claim history looked like over the past 5 years?

Defining large claims as claims that have exceeded \$50,000:

2021-2022: 14 claimants (prior to Kairos; provided for historical context only)

2022-2023: 16 claimants

2023–2024: 26 claimants
2024–2025: 34 claimants
2025–2026, July through April: 24 claimants

How many claims have exceeded \$400,000?

0

What trend assumptions were used in projecting FY2027 costs?

Kairos is projecting an 8.3% increase for medical and 16.7% increase for pharmacy based on national benchmarking.

What exactly is the Kairos Investment Pool?

The Kairos Investment Pool (KIP) is a structured program designed to enhance the financial efficiency of Kairos members. Self-funded members (such as HUSD) are required to maintain a claim reserve—generally equal to approximately one month of expected claims—to ensure liquidity and payment continuity. Rather than allowing these reserve funds to remain idle, KIP places them in conservatively managed, interest-bearing investments. This provides an opportunity for incremental earnings while maintaining appropriate liquidity and risk controls. The program is designed with a strong emphasis on capital preservation, liquidity, and prudent investment practices.

How financially stable is the Kairos shared-risk pool?

HUSD is self-funded and does not participate in the shared-risk pool.

What is HUSD’s current balance in the pool?

HUSD is self-funded and does not participate in the shared-risk pool but their current balance with Kairos is \$2,030,902

Is principal guaranteed?

The principal is not guaranteed.

Who governs the investment pool?

The Kairos Investment Pool (KIP) is governed by the Kairos board of directors.

3.21 Approval –Meal Price Increase FY2027

What is the current financial condition of the food service fund?

Fund 510 has a “healthy balance” allowing for continued replacement of equipment that is no longer repairable.

Is the nutrition program operating at a surplus or deficit?

Surplus

What are current net cash resource levels compared to USDA/ADE allowable thresholds?

The district continues to maintain higher levels than ADE requires and submits documentation annually to ADE regarding how funds will be spent to support the program.

Can administration provide the completed Paid Lunch Equity calculation worksheet? How was the district determined to be "behind \$0.70"?

The Paid Lunch Equity (PLE) tool recommends the price school districts should be charging. HUSD has chosen to keep the meal prices lower due to the fund balance in fund 510.

What would happen if the district chose not to increase prices?

The balance in fund 510 would decrease, making the replacement of equipment beyond repair more difficult.

Has the district analyzed whether meal price increases reduce participation among paid students?

Yes, Compass Group (Chartwells) provides monthly reports regarding district meal participation.

What has been the participation trend over the past several years?

We did increase 1% in both breakfast and lunch

How do HUSD meal prices compare to neighboring districts?

Gilbert Elementary is 1.85/3.10 Junior High 2.25/3.75, High is 2.25/4.00 Adults are 3.00/5.00

Queen Creek 1.75 for all breakfast, Elementary is 3.00, Junior and High lunch is 3.50 adults are 2.50/4.75 in 25/26 SY

Are meal costs fully covering paid meal production costs?

Under the contract type we have, the district pays Chartwells to covers related expense (food, paper, labor) and that is listed in the renewal contract.

Are adult meal prices compliant with USDA adult meal pricing requirements?

Minimum should be 4.75, currently at 4.70, based off 25/26 SY pricing

If ADE does not continue subsidizing reduced-price meals, what financial impact would that have on the district's food service fund?

If ADE cannot pay the supplement, then the cost will go back to students, breakfast at .30, Lunch at .40

3.22 Authorization of Expenditure - Food Service Management Company (FSMC) Compass Group

Guaranteed Return vs. No Loss - The guarantee can be reduced if assumptions change, including if enrollment drops below 12,288.

- What happens financially if enrollment declines below the guarantee threshold?
 - Based on the budget from the 5/5 meeting, our ADM is 11,695.

If student enrollment falls below assumed enrollment, then the guarantee can decrease percentagewise due to such decrease. The percentage decreased is based off average daily participation, not simple a direct decrease based on enrollment.

What is the district's current unpaid meal balance exposure?

Need more time to research this response.

Has Chartwells ever had to reimburse the district under the guarantee provision?

No

What are the district's current food service reserves?

\$2M

What student participation trends have occurred over the last several years?

We have seen a 1% increase in growth bring lunch to 34% and breakfast to 6%

Why was a "Guaranteed Minimum Return" selected instead of a stronger "Guaranteed No Loss" structure?

See below.

Why is Chartwells' reimbursement obligation capped at only \$25,000?

A guaranteed minimum return is a stronger guarantee, as it states we guarantee, to bring in a profit to add to the 510 account, rather than just guarantee to loss. Contract caps have been included in past renewal contracts and have not been discussed as a guaranteed return has always been met and hold little risk not being attained in the upcoming year.

What turnover rates exist among cafeteria staff?

This is managed by Compass Group (Chartwells) and not the district

Does the contract limit district flexibility regarding vending, student stores, booster sales, or campus fundraisers?

The State of Arizona and Federal Government regulate what food can be served from midnight to 30 minutes after every school dismisses. The contract with Chartwells does not limit district flexibility outside of those restrictions placed on districts by the USDA.

Have we conducted any student satisfaction surveys?

We do surveys at a minimum of once a year for both students and principals.

How often are menus reviewed for nutritional quality and participation impact?

Before all menus are published, we use a system to ensure we meet or exceed all federal requirements for all grade levels. Participation levels are closely monitored and assessed weekly to ensure menu satisfaction and ensure a positive impact on participation.

How does the district monitor food waste levels?

We do our waste tracking prepped food and unused food. We can strive to limit waste once outside the cafeteria through share bins that are provide and used at most schools (typically milk, whole/bagged fruit and crackers).

3.23 Authorization of Expenditure - HMH Collections Digital Extension

Have we adjusted the number of licenses based on our enrollment trends?

Yes, the number of licenses is aligned with our current enrollment.

3.25 Authorization of Expenditure for Contracted Physical Therapist to Westergard Physical Therapy

Are PT services provided exclusively on HUSD campuses, or are any services provided at outside facilities or private clinics?

The PT works exclusively with HUSD students on our campuses.

What supervision standards apply during therapy sessions? Are they 1:1 sessions or are they supervised?

The same standards apply to our PT as to our other related service providers (OT, SLP, VI, HI).

Are parents notified of therapy locations and settings?

Yes. All services and locations are agreed upon as part of the annual IEP meeting.

Are parents allowed to be present during therapy sessions?

Requests for parents to be present are handled in the same manner as a parent requesting to visit the classroom.

3.26 Approval of Agreement for Alternative Transportation for Private Day Students with Everdriven-Please pull

This has been moved to an action item.

Please remind me
Are cameras installed in all vehicles?

Everdriven has cameras in select vehicles.

Are rides recorded or auditable?

Yes

Is GPS tracking active on all rides?

Yes

Are parents able to monitor rides in real time?

Yes, they are able to monitor the GPS tracking route.

Are there state or federal reimbursement opportunities associated with these services?

Yes. For FY26, the district was reimbursed \$3.01 per mile.

3.27 Authorization of Expenditure – Football Field Lighting Project at Higley High

Is the \$10,300 rebate already reflected in the \$310,000 project cost, or would that offset reduce the final district expenditure?

The rebate is not already included in the project cost and is anticipated to offset the district's expenditure by that amount.

What are the projected costs after the 10-year included support period expires?

The projected cost after 10 years is the cellular access for the offsite controls (\$800/yr) and any fixtures that burn out. (fixtures and labor)

Has the district independently verified pole structural capacity?

No it is not required the Cooper Ephesus fixtures are designed and tested to go on multitude of existing poles including Musco which is what we currently have.

Was an engineering assessment performed?

No it is not required.

Could additional electrical or structural costs arise later outside this contract?

We do not anticipate any electrical or structural costs arising.

Were multiple lighting vendors evaluated? Was pricing benchmarked against alternative vendors?

Yes we had a quote from Veregy which is a Musco rep. The quote they provided was \$497,000 which didn't include the additional lighting to the practice field or the colored theme lighting.

What justified selecting the RGB/dynamic package versus a standard athletic lighting upgrade?

The RGB/dynamic lighting package was selected because it provides benefits beyond a standard athletic lighting upgrade. While standard LED sports lighting improves visibility, energy efficiency, and maintenance costs, the RGB/dynamic system enhances the functionality and community value of the facility.

The dynamic lighting package allows the district to support school spirit, special events, graduations, community gatherings, and athletic competitions with customizable colors, light shows, and themed displays. These features create a more engaging experience for students, families, and spectators while helping the facility remain competitive with modern athletic venues.

Additionally, the RGB system can be used to recognize school achievements, support awareness campaigns, celebrate holidays, and promote district branding without requiring additional equipment or temporary lighting installations. By incorporating these capabilities during the initial upgrade, the district avoids the significantly higher costs that would be associated with retrofitting dynamic lighting features in the future. The investment provides a long-term enhancement to the district's athletic and community facilities, delivering operational efficiencies of LED technology while expanding the venue's ability to host events and foster school pride.

5.3 Discussion and Possible Action regarding Policy IJJ Textbook/Supplementary Materials Selection and Adoption

I want to address the statement included in the agenda that "The District does not support the proposed changes." So instead of working together to see how we can make it work, you immediately say you don't support it? What is it that you don't support? I remember seeing email discussions with the attorney and Tiffany when she proposed changes to the dress code policy. I think it is fair to ask why the same level

of collaboration and professional courtesy was not extended here?

My intent with these proposals is to strengthen oversight, consistency, accountability, and statutory compliance surrounding supplemental instructional materials already being approved and used across the District.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss any concerns administration or legal counsel may have with the proposed language and whether there are areas where collaboration or refinement would make implementation more workable.

What specific sections does the District oppose? I would appreciate understanding those concerns before the agenda is finalized. Why didn't David reach out to discuss these concerns?

This agenda item is intended to provide an opportunity for the Governing Board, as a collective body, to discuss policy revisions proposed by an individual board member. While the district is open to considering policy revisions, it does not recommend adopting the proposed changes as presented.

Following the Board's discussion and direction, district staff will prepare a first-read draft that reflects the Board's collective input and desired revisions. This approach promotes transparency by allowing proposed policy changes to be discussed publicly by the full Board before district staff develops draft language.

The intent is to establish a consistent process for addressing future policy revision requests from individual board members. By obtaining direction from the Governing Board as a whole before preparing draft language, district staff can ensure that proposed policy revisions reflect the Board's collective priorities and guidance, resulting in a more efficient and transparent policy review process.

4.1 Presentation of FY2027 Proposed Budget

What assumptions are built into the FY2027 budget regarding kindergarten enrollment?

Over the past 4 years we have averaged a loss of 27.6596 ADM for kindergarten and this estimate was used for FY27.

Since FY2025, approximately 100 M&O positions have been eliminated. What is the districtwide student-to-staff ratio today compared to FY2025 and FY2026?

The current teacher to staff ratio at the elementary is regulated by policy IIB-RB and is followed as much as possible. The 2026 student-to-staff ratio at the secondary is regulated to approximately 28:1 at the high school level and 27:1 at the middle school level.

Since FY2025, approximately 100 M&O FTE positions have been reduced. Please remind

me how many of those reductions were classroom-based positions versus non-classroom positions?

68.80 fte instructional vs 54.70 non-instructional

5.1 Approval of FY2027 Proposed Budget

Why does transportation remain above FY2024 levels despite serving fewer students?

Fuel prices (both diesel and unleaded) continue to increase annually; repair costs continue to increase annually; beginning in FY26 the district is paying an hourly stipend to retain bus drivers. Routes must be run whether there are 50 vs. 70 students assigned to that bus. With the limitation bell times create; the routes must be coordinated to work within these timeframes.

Transportation spending increased significantly in FY2026 despite declining enrollment. What specific factors drove that increase?

The budgets for M&O program 4xx – transportation are as follows:

- FY25 \$6,163,898
- FY26 \$5,645,205
- FY27 \$6,096,395

How much of transportation spending is attributable to:

- Increase in gas prices
11%
- Regular routes
More research time is needed to break this out
- Special education transportation
has not increased to date
- EVIT transportation
More research time is needed to break this out
- Contracted transportation services
has not increased to date

What percentage of the FY2027 budget is directly supporting classroom instruction, and how does that compare to FY2026? Please provide the calculation methodology and identify which functions are included in "classroom instruction."

52% looking only at M&O object 1xxx instruction no student support included compared to 53% in FY26

Using the same methodology used by the Auditor General's District Spending Analysis, what percentage of operational spending is projected to be spent on classroom instruction in FY2027 versus FY2026? 68% for each budget year based on budgeted numbers not actual spend.

Instructional spending

- **Classroom personnel**—Salaries and benefits for teachers, teachers' aides, substitute teachers, graders, and guest lecturers.
- **General instructional supplies**—Paper, pencils, crayons, etc.
- **Instructional aids**—Textbooks, workbooks, instructional software, etc.
- **Activities**—Field trips, athletics, and co-curricular activities, such as choir or band.
- **Tuition**—Paid to out-of-State and private institutions.

The FY2027 budget reduces the General Budget Limit by approximately \$7.4 million. What percentage of those reductions came from classroom instruction versus non-classroom functions?

56% classroom instruction vs 44% non-classroom instruction.