

MINUTES OF THE STUDY SESSION- AUGUST 26, 2026

The Board of Education of the Timpanogos School District met in a study session on Wednesday, August 26, 2026, at 4:00 pm. The study session was held at the Alpine School District Special Education Office in Lindon, Utah.

Board Members Present: President Jennifer Lyman, Vice President Sterling Hilton, Guy Fugal, Grace Rex, David H. Smith, Michele Sorensen, and Ada Wilson,

Also present: Superintendent Jensen & Business Administrator Sundberg and members of the administrative staff. There were approximately 39 others in attendance.

Board President Jennifer Lyman called the study session to order at **4:02 p.m.**

BOUNDARY STUDY

1. Board President Jen Lyman introduced the boundary study discussion and turned the time to Superintendent Dr. Joe Jensen and Business Administrator Jason Sundberg to review the work completed by the elementary and secondary boundary study committees and discuss recommendations being prepared for Board consideration.

Vision, Values, and Robust School Criteria

Superintendent Jensen expressed appreciation to the principals, staff members, Board members, parents, and community members who had participated in the boundary study process. He emphasized that the work was being guided by the district's recently adopted vision and values, particularly the commitment to working "together," maintaining integrity and transparency, communicating openly, and valuing the perspectives and experiences of students, educators, parents, and community members.

Dr. Jensen emphasized that consideration of school consolidation was not a reflection of the quality of any school, principal, teacher, or school community. The purpose of the study was to determine how the district could create robust educational environments for each student.

The Board reviewed the previously established Robust School Criteria. Dr. Jensen explained that foundational elements such as high-quality teaching, effective leadership, positive school culture, and school safety are essential regardless of school size. Other components, including comprehensive course offerings, adequate numbers of classes at each grade level, specialty programs, and support staff, can be affected by enrollment.

Administration reiterated that the process had not begun by asking which schools should close. Rather, the guiding question was how to create outstanding, robust schools for students throughout the new district.

Enrollment and School Size Projections

Business Administrator Sundberg reviewed current and projected enrollment data for the district's 20 elementary schools, five junior high schools, and four high schools. The

information included actual 2025–2026 enrollment and projections for October 2027 and October 2030.

The Board reviewed enrollment projections under the existing K–6, 7–9, and 10–12 configuration and compared those projections with a possible K–5, 6–8, and 9–12 configuration.

Under the current configuration, a significant number of elementary schools were projected to fall below the enrollment range identified in the Robust School Criteria. Administration explained that changing the grade configuration would also change the target enrollment ranges because elementary schools would serve six grade levels rather than seven.

President Lyman emphasized that the goal was not to fill every available classroom. Maintaining some building capacity would provide flexibility for school choice, specialized programs, potential preschool programming, TSSA-funded opportunities, and other instructional needs.

Boundary Mapping and Enrollment Analysis

Mr. Sundberg demonstrated the GIS mapping tool being used by the boundary study committees. The tool allows staff to examine school and municipal boundaries, identify where students currently reside and attend school, and model possible boundary adjustments.

Using the tool, administration can select geographic areas and estimate the number of students affected by potential changes. Because the mapping tool primarily uses 2025–2026 enrollment data, administration is also using Alpine School District projections and spreadsheets to estimate the impact of potential changes for 2027 and 2030.

Mr. Sundberg demonstrated the process using portions of Lindon and the former Valley View Elementary boundary. The Board discussed how the tool allows the committees to evaluate possible boundary changes while considering enrollment, geography, feeder patterns, and future projections.

Boundary Study Process and Timeline

Superintendent Jensen reviewed the work completed since the district formally opened the boundary study in April. The process has included development and refinement of the Robust School Criteria, principal input, community cluster meetings, elementary and secondary boundary study committees, community focus groups, parent surveys, and a specific Dual Language Immersion focus group.

Administration described the process in three general phases, with the district currently in the "conceptualize and optimize" phase. Dr. Jensen stressed that the Board had not reached a final decision regarding individual school closures, consolidations, or boundaries. Numerous scenarios have been considered and continued to evolve as additional information and community input were received.

The Board had previously directed administration to use a moderately sized list of schools for formal study rather than naming every school or identifying only the minimum number of schools necessary. Administration explained that this approach would provide flexibility while giving communities a clearer understanding of which schools could be substantially affected.

Future steps discussed included additional boundary committee work, public hearings, focus groups, cluster/community meetings, surveys, and transition planning. Formal action regarding grade configuration was anticipated in October, with decisions regarding consolidation, school closures, boundaries, and programs anticipated in December.

The Board also discussed required public notification. Mr. Sundberg explained that postcards would be mailed as required, with additional communication occurring through email, social media, cities, and other District communication channels.

Community Engagement and Transparency

Board members discussed the importance of providing opportunities for communities directly affected by possible consolidation to participate in the process. Board Member David H. Smith suggested holding community meetings at individual schools being considered rather than relying exclusively on high school cluster meetings. Administration agreed that the suggestion should be considered as the public-engagement schedule was refined.

The Board also discussed when preliminary maps should be released publicly. Administration explained that maps had intentionally not been presented during this study session because the scenarios continued to change significantly and premature publication could create confusion or misinformation.

Several Board members expressed support for sharing viable options with the community as soon as reasonably possible so patrons could understand the possibilities and provide meaningful feedback. The Board acknowledged the need to balance transparency by ensuring that publicly presented scenarios represent realistic alternatives.

Programs and Special Education

The Board discussed the need to consider specialized programs as part of the boundary process, including Dual Language Immersion (DLI), gifted and talented/ALL programming, and special education classrooms and programs.

Administration explained that formal programs located at schools under study were being identified to preserve the Board's flexibility to determine whether programs should remain at their current locations or move as part of the overall boundary and consolidation process. Vice President Sterling Hilton emphasized that special education classrooms and programs should receive the same deliberate consideration as other District programs. The Board

discussed the importance of ensuring adequate space for specialized programs rather than maximizing enrollment in every available classroom.

Administration agreed that program placement, student needs, staffing, and transition planning would need to be incorporated into the continuing study.

Implementation and Transition Considerations

The Board discussed whether potential grade configuration, boundary, and consolidation changes should be implemented for the 2027–2028 school year or delayed an additional year.

Superintendent Jensen reported that the boundary study committees had discussed this issue and that there was strong sentiment among participating principals, staff, and Board members to move forward in 2027 rather than prolong uncertainty for schools, employees, students, and families.

Board members acknowledged that significant transition planning would be required. Issues discussed included staffing, sixth-grade students transitioning to middle schools, ninth-grade students transitioning to high schools, PTA and SCC organization, school communities, programs, and other operational considerations.

Administration emphasized that implementation planning would focus on caring for employees, students, and families throughout the transition. The possibility of establishing separate implementation committees following final Board decisions was also discussed.

Preliminary Boundary and Consolidation Scenarios

Mr. Sundberg presented preliminary conceptual scenarios based on a possible K–5, 6–8, and 9–12 configuration. He emphasized that the scenarios represented current study concepts only and were not recommendations or final maps.

A major objective was to create as many "pure feeder" patterns as reasonably possible, allowing elementary schools to feed into a single middle school and middle schools to feed into a single high school.

Administration presented two general secondary concepts identified as Options A and B. Option A generally maintained existing high school boundaries with relatively minor adjustments, while Option B contemplated more substantial changes to high school boundaries.

The preliminary scenarios also modeled the possible consolidation of four, five, or six elementary schools. Administration explained that consolidation would not necessarily mean combining the entire existing boundaries of two schools. Boundaries throughout a feeder area could be adjusted to create more balanced enrollments and cleaner feeder patterns.

Committee feedback generally favored minimizing unnecessary high school boundary changes because of the established identity, culture, and community relationships associated with high schools.

The Board reviewed projected enrollment impacts under the different concepts and discussed the number of schools that could remain below optimal enrollment ranges in 2027 and 2030. Administration explained that considering additional elementary consolidations could reduce the number of schools projected to fall below the Robust School Criteria, but enrollment was only one factor that would ultimately inform the Board's decisions. The Board also discussed facility capacity, socioeconomic considerations, transportation, school location, building condition, and future growth.

Administration repeatedly emphasized that the concepts remained preliminary and would continue to evolve through committee analysis and public input.

Schools and Programs Recommended for Further Study

Administration summarized the recommendations developed through the committee process. Three junior high schools, **Canyon View, Oak Canyon, and Orem Junior** were identified for further study, with the possibility that one could ultimately be consolidated.

The following elementary schools were identified for further study because they could be significantly affected either as a school considered for consolidation or as a receiving school:

Aspen Elementary, Bonneville Elementary, Foothill Elementary, Lindon Elementary, Northridge Elementary, Orchard Elementary, Orem Elementary, Parkside Elementary, Rocky Mountain Elementary, and Windsor Elementary.

Administration explained that current scenarios contemplated approximately **four to six elementary consolidations**, although no final number or individual school determination had been made. Identification of a school for further study did not mean that the school had been selected for closure or consolidation.

Programs located within affected schools were also identified for study to preserve flexibility regarding future program placement. Additionally, boundary changes were recommended for study throughout the district because adjustments could ultimately affect most schools.

Board Member Smith asked what criteria would be used when choosing between schools that could each support a robust program. Board members and administration identified factors that would need to be weighed, including enrollment, building age, size and condition, geographic centrality, transportation and bus routes, safety, facility suitability, and community input.

President Lyman emphasized that quantitative information alone would not determine the outcome. Input from principals, teachers, parents, students, and community members

would be important in understanding characteristics and needs that may not be apparent through enrollment and facility data alone.

The Board reiterated that the study remained preliminary and that identifying a school for further study did not constitute a decision to close or consolidate that school.

2. DISCUSSION REGARDING EAST SHORE/ADULT EDUCATION MOU WITH ASPEN PEAKS

Due to the length of the boundary study discussion, President Lyman stated that the discussion regarding East Shore/Adult Education and the MOU with Aspen Peaks would be moved to the regular Board meeting, where the item was also included on the agenda. No substantive discussion of the MOU occurred during the study session.

ADJOURNMENT

With no additional study session business, President Lyman concluded the study session so the Board could proceed to the regular Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:33 PM.