HIGLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
2935 South Recker Road, Gilbert, Arizona 85295
(480) 279–7000 • www.husd.org

November 17, 2026 - Board Meeting Agenda Questions & Responses

6.1 HUSD 2025-2026 A-F Letter Grades

1. Slide 10 states that 12 of 13 schools experienced declining scores. However, Chaparral also declined by 1.24 points, from 90.29 in 2025 to 89.05 in 2026, meaning all 13 schools experienced declining scores. Can administration clarify this discrepancy? Which specific accountability indicators contributed most to these declines?

All 13 schools earned lower overall scores. The "12 of 13" statement refers to schools maintaining an A rating. Lower growth points were the largest overall contributor among K–8 schools. At Higley High, English learner and bonus points contributed most; at Williams Field, proficiency and English learner points contributed most.

2. Cooley declined 8.39 points, from 84.73 to 76.34, losing its A rating. What specifically caused this decline, and what corrective measures are being implemented?

Cooley's 8.39-point decline consisted of growth (−3.22), acceleration/readiness (−1.50), bonus points (−1.50), proficiency (−1.17), and English learner points (−1.00). Its improvement plan focuses on identifying priority standards and strengthening instruction around those standards. Implementation and student progress are monitored through quarterly data dialogues.

3. Growth component points declined at 10 of 11 K–8 schools. What were the actual growth scores for each school in 2025 and 2026, and which student populations experienced the largest declines?

School	2025 Growth Points	2026 Growth Points
Bridges Elementary School	49.07	46.74
Centennial Elementary School	47.15	42.16
Chaparral Elementary School	44.38	43.45
Cooley Middle School	40.94	37.72
Coronado Elementary School	50	48.03
Cortina Elementary School	46.86	43.5
Gateway Pointe Elementary School	43.55	41.01
Higley Traditional Academy	43.42	39.8
Power Ranch Elementary School	46.7	47.06
San Tan Elementary School	47.13	46.15
Sossaman Middle School	41.75	39.2

The table shows growth accountability points out of 50. School-level totals do not identify which student populations experienced the largest declines; that requires a separate analysis of student-level growth results.

4. What were the actual CCRI points awarded to Higley High and Williams Field in 2025 and 2026? How much of each school's overall score came from CCRI compared with academic proficiency?

School	2025 CCRI	2026 CCRI	2025 Proficiency	2026 Proficiency
Higley High School	19	17.8	24.54	23.76
Williams Field High School	19	18.6	24.58	22.51

CCRI provides up to 20 points and academic proficiency provides up to 30 points before bonus points.

5. How did ELA, math, and science proficiency impact the overall letter grades?

ELA and math proficiency together provide up to 30 points in both accountability models. ELA and math growth provide another 50 points in K–8 and 20 points in high school. Science performance can add up to three bonus points.

6. What measurable academic improvement targets have been established for 2026–2027, particularly at schools experiencing the largest declines?

The district target is a two-percentage-point increase in ELA and math proficiency in spring 2027. School improvement plans identify site-specific targets and actions, with progress monitored through benchmark assessments and quarterly data dialogues.

6.2 27-28 Course Guide GB

1. What criteria are used to evaluate course additions, modifications, and eliminations, including enrollment trends, student demand, academic outcomes, staffing, and costs? Is this evaluation conducted annually for all existing courses?

Factors including current enrollment trends, student demand, academic outcomes, staffing, costs, funding, course pathways, graduation requirements, program effectiveness, and other relevant factors are considered and discussed by the committees and staff involved in the course guide process to evaluate request and changes. The Course Guide is reviewed annually; however, this does not mean that every individual course undergoes an equally comprehensive evaluation each year. The annual review provides an opportunity to examine course offerings, identify emerging needs, consider proposed additions or modifications, and identify courses that may warrant further review due to declining enrollment, changing student interests, staffing challenges, or shifts in academic priorities.

2. What is the rationale for eliminating the Software Development Program Pathway and Sports Medicine Practicum? Were these decisions based on enrollment, student demand, staffing, costs, or other factors?

The Software Development Program Pathway is suggested for elimination due to low student enrollment numbers and the lack of qualified instructor applicants leading to inability to fill teaching positions. The Sports Medicine Practicum Lab was utilized during COVID as the third-year course in Sports Medicine and has been replaced with the existing CTE Internship Sports Medicine as the third-year course in Sports Medicine.

3. The 2027–2028 Course Guide retains the Honors Multicultural Literature description despite concerns previously raised about its academic expectations and dual enrollment designation. Why was the description not revised to clarify how the course differs from AP English and the requirements for earning college credit?

The course descriptions for Honors Multicultural Literature and AP English describe the individual courses and designate the possibility to earn dual enrollment credit and/or AP credit.

4. The proposed guide removes numerous dual enrollment offerings, including AP English 12, College Prep English, AP Chemistry, and several world language courses. What prompted these changes, and how will they affect students' opportunities to earn college credit?

The dual enrollment offering list was updated to accurately reflect the current opportunities for dual enrollment due to instructor qualifications, site availability, and courses offered through our educational partners.

6.3 ECD & Comm Ed-

Questions related to the ECDC and Community Education programs will be addressed during the November 17, 2026, Governing Board Meeting.

The presentation states that ECDC and Community Education are intended to be self-sustaining. However, Cooley and Sossaman reported combined losses of $327,431 in FY2026, while Community Education reported a surplus of $234,035.

Before approving these increases, I would like to see a complete financial breakdown for each program, including revenues, expenditures, fund balances, and break-even enrollment. I also want to know how the ECDC losses were covered, whether Community Education or M&O funds were used, and what the actual preschool capacity and utilization are, excluding satellite enrollment.

1. What were the total FY2026 revenues, expenditures, and ending fund balances for Cooley ECDC, Sossaman ECDC, and Community Education separately?

2. What specifically caused the $118,494 loss at Cooley and $208,937 loss at Sossaman?

3. How were the $327,431 in combined FY2026 ECDC losses covered? Were they offset by Community Education's $234,035 surplus, existing Fund 520 balances, M&O funds, or another funding source? Please provide the amounts from each source.

4. What is the break-even enrollment and tuition rate for each ECDC, and how will the proposed increases affect the FY2027 and FY2028 budgets?

5. Slide 22 includes satellite enrollment in the Cooley and Sossaman totals. What is the actual physical enrollment, capacity, and utilization at each ECDC, excluding satellite students?

6. How many available seats exist at each ECDC by age group and classroom, and are there waiting lists?

7. Given the available capacity and operating losses, what is the financial justification for additional preschool satellite locations?
8. What is the projected annual revenue increase from each proposed tuition adjustment, based on current enrollment?

9. Why are part-time preschool rates increasing between 19.6% and 66.7%, while full-time, five-day tuition increases only 6.3%?

10. Will these increases eliminate the ECDC operating deficits, or are additional subsidies anticipated?

11. What is the projected enrollment impact of the increases, particularly for families currently attending two or three days per week?

12. Does the proposed $100 Lunch Bunch fee cover the actual cost of providing the service?

13. What portion of the $192,000 in annual processing fees is attributable to ECDC versus Community Education?

14. How was the 3.5% processing fee established? Is that the actual contracted processing rate, and does the district receive any portion of the fee?

15. Will families have a fee-free payment option, such as ACH, cash, or check?

16. How much of the $192,000 annual expense is expected to be eliminated through the new fee structure?

17. Why does the afternoon program show a $4 weekly increase rather than $5? Is the program operating only four afternoons per week, or is the calculation incorrect?

18. What additional annual revenue is projected from the proposed Higley Hangout increases?

19. Given the $234,035 FY2026 Community Education surplus, what additional expenses or operational needs justify these rate increases?

20. Will the additional electronic processing fees apply on top of the proposed daily rate increases?

21. How many FTE positions are assigned to each ECDC, satellite preschool, and Community Education program, and what are their total salary and benefit costs?

22. Slide 22 states that most staff salaries and benefits are paid through program revenues. Which positions, salaries, benefits, or other expenses are funded through M&O or other district funds, and what is the annual amount for each funding source?

23. Are all direct and indirect operating expenses, including utilities, maintenance, administrative support, and facility costs, included in the reported profit/loss figures?

24. How are Fund 520 revenues, expenditures, and balances tracked separately for each site and program?

25. Is Conscious Discipline used in preschool classrooms, or is it limited to optional workshops for families and staff?

26. What are the annual costs of Conscious Discipline training, materials, and implementation?

6.4 M&O

Is there supposed to be an attachment? The agenda item references a budget timeline, but no timeline or supporting financial analysis was included.

No, the idea is for each board member to share their priorities to build into the budget plan that will be presented at the December meeting.

1. At the October 27 meeting, the FY2028 recurring deficit was projected at approximately $14–15M, with $10.4M in carryforward reserved for FY2028 and beyond. What is the updated deficit projection, how much of the carryforward will be needed, and what recurring reductions are planned to balance the budget without relying on reserves?

FY28 is currently projected to have an M&O budget of $101,000,000 which includes a $3M reduction transfer to capital for the Middle School leases and budget balance carryforward of $15.5M from FY27. Until we know the priorities of the governing board and develop plans, we will not know how much we will reduce the BBCF. If we do no cuts, we would be $13M over our RCL.

2. Can administration provide a breakdown of FY2027 reductions implemented to date, comparing projected savings with actual recurring savings? The actual savings will not be known until the FY27 budget is finalized in October of 2027.

3. What additional savings have been identified through vacancies, attrition, contracted services, administrative expenses, travel, discretionary spending, and operational efficiencies before eliminating more filled positions? This will be provided in an upcoming status report and will be part of the options provided for board members at the December governing board meeting.

4. What do the 40-day enrollment numbers show? Can we receive updated physical capacity, utilization rates, operating costs per student, and potential facility efficiencies for every campus? Estimated 40-day enrollment down additional (171.3074) from projected loss of (311.9039). The December budget revision will account for additional losses as well as the additional one-time funding from the state. Other items will be provided in status once available as we are still working through these requests.

5. Beyond FY2028, what is the District's financial plan to address continued enrollment declines and prevent future structural deficits? The goal is to have a financial plan where the RCL and spending are aligned so that we can keep a BBCF and still meet the needs of our community. To do this, we will continue to adjust staffing needs to student enrollment; continue to try and secure grants for energy efficiency upgrades; continue to utilize cash funds until they are depleted.

7.1 ECDC & Comm Ed Rate Increases

Questions related to the ECDC and Community Education programs will be addressed during the November 17, 2026, Governing Board Meeting.

How do the proposed preschool and Higley Hangout rates compare with neighboring school districts and private providers, and was that comparison used to determine the proposed increases?

I also question why Community Education rates are increasing when that program reported a $234,035 surplus. Has the district evaluated the potential impact on enrollment, and will these increases actually resolve the preschool operating deficits?