LINDON • PLEASANT GROVE • OREM • VINEYARD

TIMPANOGOS

SCHOOL DISTRICT

Board Meeting Documents

October 21, 2026

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION- SEPTEMBER 30, 2026

The Board of Education of the Timpanogos School District met in a study session on Wednesday, September 30, 2026, at 2:30 pm. The work 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, Ada Wilson

Also present: Superintendent Jensen & Business Administrator Sundberg and members of the administrative staff. There were approximately 25 others in attendance.

Board President Jennifer Lyman called the study session to order at 2:34 PM. The Work Session focused on continued review of elementary and secondary boundary options as part of the district's comprehensive boundary study.

Board member David H. Smith arrived at 2:41PM

---

1. BOUNDARY STUDY – ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY BOUNDARY OPTIONS

Process and Purpose

Superintendent Jensen expressed appreciation for the collaborative process and emphasized that virtually every student, employee, family, school, and community within Timpanogos School District would experience some degree of change through the boundary and configuration work. He encouraged the Board and community to continue approaching the process from the perspective of **our students, our schools, and our district**, recognizing that individual communities may not receive everything they prefer but that the collective goal is to strengthen the district as a whole.

He emphasized continued use of the District's **Robust School Criteria** as the common lens for evaluating options. The maps presented represented the district's current best thinking rather than final recommendations. The purpose of the Work Session was to challenge assumptions, identify concerns and potential blind spots, and further refine options before upcoming focus groups and community cluster meetings.

Enrollment and Financial Considerations

Business Administrator Sundberg reviewed enrollment projections and the financial impact associated with operating schools below robust enrollment levels. Under current boundaries and grade configurations, 15 of the district's 20 elementary schools were projected to fall below the enrollment range identified in the Robust School Criteria by 2030.

He explained that Timpanogos-area elementary schools currently receive approximately 30 additional FTEs to support smaller schools and programs. Bringing more schools into robust enrollment ranges could potentially reduce the need for approximately 18 of those additional FTEs, representing roughly **$2.3 million annually**. Each elementary school consolidation was estimated to reduce duplicated administrative, operational, and facility costs by approximately **$1.1 million annually**, excluding classroom teachers who would follow students.

DRAFT

Secondary Boundary Follow-Up

The Board briefly revisited the secondary boundary options reviewed during the September 23 Work Session. Administration reported that the secondary boundary committees had expressed strong interest in removing **Secondary Option B** from further consideration and continuing to refine **Secondary Option A**.

A modified **Secondary A Alternate** was presented. The primary adjustment involved the Pleasant Grove/Lindon area and would move additional students toward Pleasant Grove High School and Pleasant Grove Junior High School. Staff explained that this could better reflect geographic proximity, reduce projected enrollment pressure at Timpanogos High School, and provide additional enrollment to Pleasant Grove High School as its enrollment is projected to decline over time.

President Lyman requested additional study of whether the boundary could extend farther south, potentially using a more natural roadway or geographic boundary. Staff agreed to continue refining the option and reviewing the resulting enrollment at Pleasant Grove High School, Timpanogos High School, Pleasant Grove Junior High School, and Oak Canyon Junior High School.

The Board also revisited projected middle-school enrollment under both 6–8 and 7–8 configurations. A four-school 7–8 model would leave several schools with relatively low enrollment, while a three-school 7–8 model would produce stronger enrollment numbers but require more complicated split feeder patterns. No final secondary boundary or configuration decision was made.

Elementary Boundary Options

Business Administrator Sundberg presented five elementary scenarios for Board review:

- **E4.1** – four potential elementary school consolidations
- **E5.1** – five potential consolidations
- **E5.2** – five potential consolidations with alternate boundaries
- **E6.1** – six potential consolidations
- **E6.2** – six potential consolidations with alternate boundaries

Staff emphasized that the maps did not necessarily contemplate moving an entire school population together into another building. In many cases, existing school boundaries would be divided among multiple receiving schools to create stronger enrollment and more sustainable schools across the district.

DLI, Advanced Learning, and Special Programs

Board Member Sorensen asked how Dual Language Immersion (DLI), advanced learning programs, and special education programs were being considered within the scenarios.

Superintendent Jensen explained that the current maps were designed first around creating robust and thriving neighborhood schools. The maps did **not yet determine the future location of DLI, advanced learning, or special education programs**. Those programs would be considered separately once greater direction existed regarding school boundaries and consolidations. A future Work Session is planned to specifically address those programs.

The Board emphasized that specialized programs should be supported by robust schools rather than used primarily to increase enrollment at an otherwise non-robust school.

E4.1 – Four Consolidations

Administration reviewed E4.1, under which four elementary schools would potentially be consolidated. The scenario would require boundary adjustments at nearly all elementary schools, with Cascade and Centennial remaining substantially unchanged.

Projected enrollment showed that several schools would remain below the Robust School Criteria both initially and by 2030.

During Board discussion, members expressed concern that closing four schools would require significant disruption while still leaving several schools substantially below desired enrollment levels. Vice President Hilton noted a distinction between a school slightly below the 495-student benchmark and a school projected well below 450 students. Board Member Smith questioned whether the district should undertake significant consolidation and boundary changes if it would need to revisit the same issue within only a few years.

Board Members Sorensen and Rex referenced feedback from elementary principals who expressed a preference for creating sustainable schools now rather than undergoing another significant consolidation process in the near future. President Lyman similarly noted that she had initially viewed four consolidations as a potential "sweet spot" but was concerned that the projected enrollment did not sufficiently resolve the underlying issue.

The discussion reflected general agreement that **four elementary consolidations did not appear sufficient to accomplish the long-term objectives of the boundary study**, although no formal decision was made.

Members also emphasized that the goal was **not to fill schools to maximum building capacity**. Remaining capacity would provide flexibility for class organization, programs, enrollment changes, and future growth.

E5.1 and E5.2 – Five Consolidations

The Board compared the two scenarios involving five elementary consolidations.

Members discussed differences in the Lindon, Orem, Bonneville, Parkside, Northridge, Rocky Mountain, Windsor, Foothill, and Orchard areas. Considerations included:

- projected enrollment and long-term sustainability;
- maintaining reasonable geographic boundaries;
- socioeconomic balance;
- avoiding unnecessary disruption to schools already meeting Robust School Criteria;
- preserving friend groups where possible;
- transportation and major roadway considerations;
- municipal boundaries; and
- creating sustainable receiving schools.

Vice President Hilton expressed concern with scenarios that would substantially restructure Orem Elementary, noting that it was already considered robust and projected to remain so. He distinguished between ordinary boundary adjustments affecting a robust school and a consolidation that fundamentally restructures that school's existing population.

Board Member Wilson noted the significance of Center Street as a natural community divider. **Board Member Sorensen** reported that principals participating in the elementary boundary committee did not express significant concern regarding the northern boundary structure reflected in E5.2. Board members also noted that E5.2 appeared to provide opportunities for greater socioeconomic balance.

President Lyman requested additional refinement of E5.2, particularly in the Lindon area, to determine whether boundaries could be adjusted to preserve larger groups of students and avoid unnecessarily separating small pockets of students from their existing peers. Administration noted that modifications to the Secondary A Alternate could also affect opportunities to improve elementary alignment.

E6.1 and E6.2 – Six Consolidations

Administration then reviewed E6.1 and E6.2. These options would consolidate six elementary schools and generally produce higher enrollment across the remaining schools.

The Board discussed whether closing a sixth elementary school created enough additional benefit compared with the five-school scenarios. **Vice President Hilton** noted that the number of schools falling meaningfully below robust enrollment did not appear dramatically different between some five- and six-school options. He cautioned against treating every school below 495 students as equally problematic, noting a significant difference between a school slightly below the benchmark and one substantially below it.

Board Member Fugal favored giving serious consideration to six consolidations, reasoning that the district was already undertaking difficult work and should seek a solution that would provide the greatest long-term stability. **Board Member Sorensen** reported that principals in her committee had responded positively to **E6.1** and indicated that she was leaning toward that scenario.

Other members questioned whether the additional community impact of closing a sixth school was justified if the resulting enrollment improvement was relatively modest. The Board noted that moving from five to six consolidations would increase average elementary enrollment by approximately 40 students per school.

No consensus was reached between the five- and six-school approaches, and the Board requested continued evaluation and community feedback.

Robust Enrollment Threshold

The Board discussed how far below the Robust School Criteria enrollment target a school could reasonably fall before significant concern should arise.

Members generally distinguished between schools slightly below the **495-student benchmark** and schools approaching or falling below approximately **450 students**. Individual Board members expressed different levels of concern, generally ranging from approximately 400 to 500 students depending upon the school, enrollment trajectory, socioeconomic circumstances, and programs housed at the school.

Katie Bowman an elementary administrator, explained that enrollment below the robust range increases the likelihood of split-grade classrooms and can make it more difficult to maintain three sections per grade, collaborative teacher teams, specialty offerings, and other elements of the Robust School Criteria. Schools housing programs such as DLI may require higher enrollment to maintain viable neighborhood and program sections.

Superintendent Jensen emphasized that the 495 benchmark already represents the lower end of the desired range and assumes enrollment is distributed relatively evenly across grade levels, which rarely occurs. A school slightly below that level for a short period may be manageable, particularly if enrollment is projected to recover, but intentionally creating schools substantially below the benchmark would raise concerns.

The Board also discussed the importance of considering each school's **trajectory**, not simply a single projected enrollment number.

Socioeconomic Balance and Title I

The Board discussed socioeconomic balance among proposed boundaries and the relationship to Title I funding. Staff clarified that the total amount of Title I funding available to the district is based on eligible students and would not increase or decrease simply because school boundaries changed. The district would ultimately determine how those resources would be targeted among qualifying schools.

Members emphasized that socioeconomic balance should continue to be considered as boundaries are refined and noted that some proposed scenarios appeared to create a broader socioeconomic mix than others.

Continued Refinement and Community Input

The Board emphasized that the elementary scenarios were **working concepts for continued study and were not final recommendations or decisions**. Members requested continued refinement of boundaries, including closer examination of natural geographic divisions, transportation, socioeconomic balance, existing student relationships, enrollment trajectories, school programs, and the relative benefits of five versus six elementary consolidations.

Superintendent Jensen acknowledged the complexity of the work and reiterated that the process would continue to evolve through additional review and stakeholder input.

President Lyman announced that school-based focus groups would be held the following week, followed by cluster community meetings beginning the week of October 12. Feedback from families, educators, principals, and community members would be used to further refine the proposed maps before the Board considered final action.

The Work Session concluded following the discussion.

BASIC SUMMARY FOR EACH BOARD MEMBER

At the conclusion of the discussion, Board members summarized their individual perspectives regarding the elementary options and the enrollment levels they believed warranted concern. Members emphasized that these comments reflected their thinking at this stage of the study and were **not final decisions**.

- **Vice President Sterling Hilton** expressed concern when elementary enrollment approaches **450 students or below**, explaining that the further enrollment falls below the Robust School Criteria benchmark of 495, the greater the effect on classroom size, staffing, and the ability to provide robust programming. He indicated that enrollment in the 470–490 range was less concerning to him than enrollment approaching or falling below 450. In comparing five versus six consolidations, he leaned toward **five**, stating that he did not see enough additional improvement in the six-school scenarios to justify the additional community impact: **"I don't see closing five and closing six that my high alert doesn't change between the two, so I'm inclined to go more with five instead of the six because that's less of an impact on community."**
- **Board Member Ada Wilson** focused less on a single enrollment number and more on whether a school could maintain approximately **three classes per grade level**. She identified approximately **400 students** as a point at which she would become particularly concerned, while acknowledging that the impact of elementary school consolidation would be significant for communities. She stated, **"I'm more inclined to look at how many classes per grade are we able to offer?"**
- **Board Member Guy Fugal** favored seriously considering **six elementary consolidations**, emphasizing the importance of addressing the enrollment challenge comprehensively rather than repeating the process again in the near future. He stated, **"Let's take pain now. Let's close six,"** explaining that an

additional consolidation would increase enrollment at the remaining schools and reduce the number of facilities the district would need to operate. When asked about an enrollment threshold, he indicated a preference for approximately **500 students**.

- **Board Member Michele Sorensen** indicated that approximately **425–450 students** would raise significant concern for her and stated that even 400 students seemed too small. She reported that principals participating in the committee discussion had responded positively to **E6.1**, stating, **"They really liked E6.1, so I am leaning towards that."**
- **Board Member Grace Rex** expressed concern about undertaking significant consolidation work only to leave several schools below robust enrollment levels. Earlier in the discussion, she noted feedback from principals indicating that they would rather address the issue comprehensively now than repeat the process in the near future. Regarding enrollment, she indicated that approximately **450 students or below** would begin to concern her, while recognizing that individual school circumstances and enrollment trends should also be considered.
- **Board Member David H. Smith** questioned whether the district should undertake the disruption associated with consolidation without creating a sufficiently long-term solution. Regarding the four-school option, he stated, **"Why are we going to go through a lot of pain, but not the final pain?"** and expressed concern that the district could otherwise find itself revisiting the issue within only a few years. Later, when comparing five and six consolidations, he noted that one additional closure would increase average elementary enrollment by approximately **40 students per school**.
- **President Jennifer Lyman** expressed concern that four consolidations did not appear to sufficiently address the district's long-term enrollment challenges. She noted that she had initially considered four a possible "sweet spot," but the projected numbers caused her to reconsider. In discussing enrollment thresholds, she indicated concern around **450 students**, while emphasizing that she would also consider each school's enrollment trajectory, socioeconomic circumstances, and specialized programs. She stated, **"I would want to see kind of the trajectory a little bit."** She also emphasized the importance of preserving friend groups and refining boundaries at a more granular level through upcoming focus groups and community input.

Overall Board Direction

The discussion indicated general agreement that **four elementary consolidations did not appear sufficient** to accomplish the district's long-term objectives. Board members remained divided between five and six consolidations, with some favoring the additional stability that could result from six and others questioning whether the incremental benefit justified the additional impact on another school community.

Members also emphasized that **495 students should not be treated as an absolute dividing line**. Enrollment trajectory, the ability to maintain three sections per grade, socioeconomic considerations, DLI and other specialized programs, facility capacity, geography, transportation, and community impact should all be considered when evaluating whether a school would meet the District's Robust School Criteria.

No final boundary or consolidation decisions were made. The Board directed continued refinement of the options and emphasized that feedback from principals, staff, focus groups, and upcoming cluster community meetings would be important before the Board moved toward final decisions.

ADJOURNMENT

With no additional study session business, President Lyman concluded the study session.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:35 PM.

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE STUDY SESSION- OCTOBER 7, 2026

The Board of Education of the Timpanogos School District met in a study session on Wednesday, October 7, 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, Grace Rex, David H. Smith, Michele Sorensen, and Ada Wilson

Absent: Board Member Guy Fugal

Also present: Superintendent Jensen & Business Administrator Sundberg and members of the administrative staff. There were approximately 23 others in attendance.

President Jennifer Lyman called the meeting to order at **4:01 p.m**. Board Member Guy Fugal was excused due to family travel.

President Lyman announced that the agenda order would be reversed to accommodate the junior high principals' schedules. The Board considered updated boundary maps first, followed by the middle school model discussion.

1. BOUNDARY STUDY- UPDATED MAP OPTIONS

Enrollment Projections and Study Process

Superintendent Jensen emphasized that the boundary study continued to be guided by the district's vision, values, and Robust School Criteria. He acknowledged the significant impact proposed changes could have on students, families, employees, and communities. Recent focus groups had provided additional feedback, and cluster meetings were scheduled for the following week. **Business Administrator Sundberg** reviewed historical and projected enrollment declines across elementary, junior high, and high schools. He noted that without boundary changes or consolidations, approximately 15 elementary schools would fall below the district's 495-student robust enrollment threshold by 2030 under a K–5 configuration. The Board was reminded that the updated maps represented current working options rather than final recommendations.

Secondary Boundary Options – A2 and A3

Business Administrator Sundberg reviewed Secondary A2, previously identified as the A Alternate, and introduced Secondary A3, which made additional adjustments in the western Lindon area. A3 would assign additional portions of Lindon to Pleasant Grove High School, helping balance enrollment between Pleasant Grove and Timpanogos High Schools. Staff explained that Pleasant Grove High School has greater building capacity but is experiencing a more significant enrollment decline. The proposed changes also reflected existing patterns of families choosing between the two high schools. **Board Member Ada Wilson** asked how increased enrollment at Pleasant Grove High School might affect plans to rebuild the school. President Lyman discussed possible temporary facility arrangements during reconstruction, including potential use of nearby facilities. No construction plan was established. **Vice President Sterling Hilton** questioned how A3 would affect Oak Canyon Junior High School enrollment, noting that the projected numbers could fall below the previously discussed target range. **Business Administrator Sundberg** explained that enrollment expectations may differ under a 6–8 middle school model. **Principal Kate Ross** expressed concern about enrollment continuing to decline beyond 2030. **Vice President Hilton** emphasized the difficulty of making decisions based on unknown conditions beyond available projections.

DRAFT

President Lyman agreed that the Board should use the best available information without allowing uncertainty to prevent decisions. Updated projections incorporating October 1 enrollment counts were expected in November. The Board also discussed supplemental staffing allocations and building-capacity calculations. **Board Member Grace Rex** questioned whether high school capacity estimates adequately accounted for teacher preparation periods and classrooms that would not be occupied every period. Administration acknowledged that additional refinement was necessary and that high schools might require portable classrooms or shared classroom arrangements to accommodate increased enrollment.

Elementary Boundary Options – E5.3, E6.3, and E6.4

Business Administrator Sundberg presented three updated elementary scenarios. The five- and six-school designations reflected the number of potential consolidations contemplated under each option.

E5.3 – Five Consolidations

E5.3 included additional boundary adjustments in western Lindon and surrounding elementary attendance areas. Staff reviewed proposed changes involving Aspen, Bonneville, Mount Mahogany, Grovecrest, Manila, Lindon, Rocky Mountain, Windsor, Foothill, Orchard, Parkside, Orem, and other affected schools. Under this option, four elementary schools were projected to remain below the 495-student threshold in both 2027 and 2030. **Vice President Hilton** expressed concern that the proposed Aspen/Bonneville enrollment would fall substantially below robust levels. Administration explained that the adjustment was intended in part to preserve neighborhood groups and reduce split elementary-to-secondary feeder patterns, rather than solely maximize enrollment. **Board Member Wilson** appreciated aspects of the map that placed schools centrally within the neighborhoods they would serve. The Board discussed building capacity and the need to preserve space for special education, resource classrooms, specialty instruction, and student support. Vice **President Hilton** cautioned against treating maximum building capacity as the desired enrollment level.

E6.3 – Six Consolidations

Administration reviewed E6.3, which included an additional consolidation and boundary adjustments intended to strengthen enrollment at several receiving schools. The scenario improved projected enrollment at Aspen/Bonneville and Cherry Hill, with only Centennial projected below the 495-student threshold in 2030. The Board discussed the effects of redistributing students among Westmore, Cherry Hill, Parkside, Orem, and surrounding schools. **Vice President Hilton** expressed reservations about aspects of the proposed boundaries.

E6.4 – Six Consolidations

Business Administrator Sundberg introduced E6.4 as a new alternative incorporating feedback from recent focus groups. The option retained more of the existing Mount Mahogany community together and reconsidered portions of the former Geneva and Suncrest attendance areas, which had previously been consolidated into Parkside Elementary. **Vice President Hilton** clarified that the scenario would effectively redistribute portions of those former attendance areas among other schools. Administration confirmed that this was the intent of the proposed adjustments. E6.4 also reduced split feeder patterns, with the Foothill/Orchard area identified as the remaining elementary attendance area that would feed more than one high school.

DRAFT

Board members discussed geographic boundaries, neighborhood continuity, school capacity, and the implications of dividing existing school communities. **Board Member Michele Sorensen** noted that both Vineyard and Lindon already have students attending multiple elementary schools.

Boundary Study Discussion Summary

The Board continued evaluating the tradeoffs among enrollment balance, school capacity, neighborhood identity, transportation, and feeder alignment. Members recognized that improvements in one area could create challenges elsewhere. Administration emphasized that the maps would continue to change as additional information and community feedback became available. No boundary option or school consolidation was selected during the Study Session.

2. MIDDLE SCHOOL MODEL DISCUSSION

Purpose and Guiding Framework

Superintendent Jensen invited the junior high principals to participate in a discussion about developing a potential 6–8 middle school model. He emphasized that the discussion was not a criticism of existing junior highs or their educators, but an opportunity to consider how the district could intentionally create an exceptional experience for sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade students.

President Lyman explained that the Board wanted to identify the elements that should be consistent across all middle schools while allowing principals flexibility in implementation. **Vice President Hilton** stated that he would not be comfortable supporting a 6–8 configuration if it simply continued the existing junior high structure without meaningful changes. He emphasized the need for a broad framework before the anticipated October 21 vote, while recognizing that a complete implementation plan could not reasonably be developed within two weeks**. Superintendent Jensen** acknowledged the significant work involved and emphasized that some elements would need to be established before the first school year, while others could be developed over time.

Developmentally Appropriate Learning and Gradual Independence

Principal Jamie Dawson identified developmentally appropriate instruction and school structures as foundational considerations. These could include course offerings, daily schedules, student support, and preparation for high school. **Principal Kate Ross** suggested a gradual release of responsibility, with sixth graders receiving greater structure and support, seventh graders gaining additional independence, and eighth graders assuming greater responsibility as they prepare for high school. **Principal Jeff Schoonover** noted that parents had raised questions about technology expectations and the transition from elementary school. He emphasized learning from elementary principals and sixth-grade teachers to avoid unnecessary disruption. **Principal Ross** also discussed common structural expectations, interdisciplinary teaming, student well-being, instructional practices, and maintaining strong parent and community involvement.

Interdisciplinary Teacher Teams and Student Belonging

Vice President Hilton identified interdisciplinary teaming as an element he believed should be consistent across middle schools. He described teams of teachers sharing responsibility for a defined group of students, allowing educators to collaborate not only around curriculum but also around individual student needs. **President Lyman** emphasized that this approach could address one of the most frequently expressed parent concerns: sixth graders becoming lost or overlooked in a larger school.

Board Member Sorensen asked whether teaming would primarily involve core academic subjects or extend to electives. **Vice President Hilton** suggested that core subjects would be a logical starting

DRAFT

point, while leaving the detailed structure to principals and educators. **Principal Ross** described existing student-support structures at Oak Canyon and discussed how interdisciplinary teams, student pods, advisory periods, and counseling support could be organized. **Principal Derek Elison** emphasized that middle schools should intentionally ensure students are known, supported, and connected. He also encouraged consideration of how eighth graders would be prepared for high school, including academic expectations and graduation readiness.

Dual Language Immersion

Board Member Sorensen raised concerns expressed during the public hearings regarding continuity of Dual Language Immersion (DLI) instruction if sixth graders moved to middle school. The Board and principals discussed differences between the elementary DLI model and the current junior high language and culture courses. Possibilities included additional target-language instruction, offering a content course such as science in the target language, and coordinating staffing with elementary DLI teachers. **President Lyman** shared feedback suggesting that a well-designed middle school model could potentially strengthen DLI opportunities through eighth grade. The Board acknowledged that additional study would be necessary to determine how sixth-grade DLI students could continue receiving meaningful language instruction. No specific DLI structure was established.

Academic Scheduling, Intervention, and Class Size

Vice President Hilton proposed that sixth graders receive daily mathematics and English/literacy instruction, regardless of the overall bell schedule. He also identified dedicated intervention time and appropriate class sizes as important considerations. **President Lyman** questioned how daily instruction would function within an A/B block schedule. **Board Member David H. Smith** asked whether daily instruction should be required immediately or developed over time. **Vice President Hilton** expressed a preference for implementing it from the beginning while allowing principals flexibility in determining the schedule. **Board Member Wilson** agreed with the importance of daily instruction but emphasized flexibility in how instructional time could be organized. The Board did not establish a required schedule, number of periods, instructional minutes, or class-size standard.

Principal Perspectives and Implementation Considerations

Board Member Rex asked each principal to identify what they believed the Board should establish as consistent expectations. **Principal Schoonover** emphasized the importance of compatible bell schedules and common collaboration time to support professional learning communities and allow teachers, particularly those in specialized subjects, to collaborate across schools. **Principal Ross** discussed teacher workload and compensation, expressing concern about the number of teachers selling preparation periods. She encouraged consideration of schedules and staffing structures that would support teachers without creating additional financial pressure. **Principal Grant Cotterell** emphasized the magnitude and pace of the proposed changes. He cautioned against introducing too many unfamiliar practices simultaneously and stressed the importance of teachers feeling prepared and confident when welcoming students into a new configuration. **Principal Elison** similarly emphasized the importance of understanding why proposed changes would benefit students before implementing them. He identified professional learning, teacher participation, staffing, and sufficient preparation time as essential to successful implementation. **Principal Dawson** noted that elementary and secondary educators would bring different instructional experiences and scheduling practices to the new model. He encouraged collaboration to determine which practices should continue and which should be modified.

DRAFT

The principals emphasized that staffing assignments would significantly affect their ability to finalize schedules, teams, and instructional structures. **Superintendent Jensen** acknowledged that schools could potentially lose approximately one grade level of staff to high schools while gaining sixth-grade educators from elementary schools, creating substantial staffing and cultural transitions.

Common Expectations and Local Flexibility

The Board discussed a "tight and loose" framework, establishing certain District-wide expectations while allowing principals and school teams flexibility in designing schedules, student-support systems, and instructional practices.

Potential common elements discussed included:

- A developmentally appropriate and supportive sixth-grade transition.
- Interdisciplinary teacher teams and structures that ensure students are known and supported.
- Intentional academic, behavioral, and social-emotional support.
- Appropriate preparation for high school.
- Consistent opportunities for teacher collaboration.
- Clear expectations for instruction, intervention, and student well-being.

These were discussed as potential expectations; the Board did not formally adopt a framework during the Study Session.

Readiness for the October 21 Configuration Vote

Board members and principals discussed whether enough information could be developed before the anticipated October 21 vote. **Vice President Hilton** emphasized that he needed confidence in the general structure and expectations of a 6–8 model before supporting the configuration. He did not expect principals to have every implementation detail finalized. **Board Member Rex** expressed concern that the model remained insufficiently defined for her to confidently explain it to constituents. She emphasized learning from districts with established middle school models and wanted greater clarity before deciding. **Board Member Wilson** expressed confidence in the principal's leadership and ability to develop a strong model, while encouraging open communication about challenges and needed support. **Board Member Smith** emphasized that educational improvement involves testing approaches, learning from experience, and adjusting. He supported ensuring student care and belonging while cautioning against committing prematurely to detailed instructional requirements. **Principal Ross** suggested that the model could require a multi-year rollout, with common expectations established initially and implementation refined over subsequent years. **Superintendent Jensen** expressed confidence in the principals' ability to collaborate and develop a successful model. He acknowledged that the district would need to balance meaningful change with realistic expectations for the first year. The principals indicated that additional collaborative meetings were being scheduled to study options and develop a clearer framework. The Board discussed receiving further information before or at the October 21 meeting.

BOARD DICUSSION SUMMARY

Board members expressed the following perspectives during the Study Session:

President Jennifer Lyman emphasized the need to use available enrollment data while continuing to refine boundary maps. Regarding middle schools, she supported identifying consistent expectations for student care and collaboration while allowing principals flexibility in implementation.

DRAFT

Vice President Sterling Hilton expressed concern about the long-term enrollment effects of Secondary A3 and certain elementary boundary adjustments. He supported interdisciplinary teaming and a deliberately designed middle school model, stating that he would need confidence in its basic structure before supporting a 6–8 configuration.

Board Member Grace Rex emphasized realistic building-capacity calculations and expressed concern that the middle school framework was not yet sufficiently defined. She wanted additional information about successful models and clearer expectations before the configuration vote.

Board Member Michele Sorensen sought clarification about elementary boundary impacts, DLI continuity, and the instructional structure for sixth graders. She emphasized the need to move beyond possible approaches toward greater clarity about what would be implemented.

Board Member David H. Smith raised questions about building capacity and implementation timelines. He emphasized that schools should protect student well-being while allowing educators to test, evaluate, and improve instructional practices rather than committing prematurely to every detail.

Board Member Ada Wilson emphasized maintaining neighborhood connections in elementary boundaries and expressed confidence in the principals' ability to develop an effective middle school model. She encouraged communication, collaboration, and flexibility throughout implementation.

Board Member Guy Fugal was excused and did not participate in the discussion.

Overall Direction and Next Steps

The Board acknowledged that additional work was needed to refine boundary maps and develop a clearer middle school framework. Administration and principals would continue studying successful models, identifying potential common expectations, and considering implementation requirements. The Board anticipated further discussion before or during the October 21 grade-configuration meeting. Upcoming cluster meetings would provide additional opportunities for community input on the boundary study. No formal votes or final decisions regarding boundaries, consolidations, grade configuration, or the middle school model 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 5:44 PM.

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER POSSIBLE CONSOLIDATIONS, CLOSURE, AND BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS OF SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS- SEPTEMBER 9, 2026

The Board of Education of the Timpanogos School District held a public hearing on Wednesday, September 9, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. Six separate public hearings regarding possible school consolidations, closures, and boundary adjustments of schools and programs for the 2027–2028 school year was held at the Alpine School District Special Education Office in Lindon, Utah.

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

Also Present: Superintendent Joseph Jensen, Business Administrator Jason Sundberg, members of the administrative staff, and approximately 40 members of the public.

Board President Jennifer Lyman welcomed attendees and explained the district's approach to the boundary and consolidation studies. She emphasized transparency, community involvement, and the importance of supporting students, families, and employees through potential changes.

President Lyman noted that three junior high schools and ten elementary schools had been identified for study, with the possibility of closing one junior high and four to six elementary schools. She explained that the district had intentionally sought input beyond the legally required hearings through committee meetings, focus groups, and community discussions.

The hearings are documented separately below, with public comments summarized in the order presented.

PUBLIC HEARING #1 – LINDON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

President Lyman declared the public hearing open to receive public comment on the proposed for Consolidations, Closure, and Boundary Adjustment of Schools and Programs at 6:07 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Kim Boyd – Manila Elementary Boundaries

Ms. Boyd shared that two of her children attend the ALL program at Lindon Elementary, although her family resides within the Manila Elementary boundaries. She expressed strong support for the ALL program, explaining that her children had performed well academically before entering the program but had experienced additional growth and motivation in the accelerated learning environment. She particularly appreciated the positive school culture at Lindon Elementary and expressed hope that the school would remain open.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Board President Lyman thanked everyone who provided comments regarding Consolidations, Closure, and Boundary Adjustment of Schools and Programs.

Board President Lyman formally closed the public hearing. No action was taken, and the meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

DRAFT

PUBLIC HEARING #2 – ROCKY MOUNTAIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

President Lyman declared the public hearing open to receive public comment on the proposed for Consolidations, Closure, and Boundary Adjustment of Schools and Programs at 6:10 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Paul O'Neil – Anderson Farms

Mr. O'Neil expressed concerns about proposed boundary changes affecting the Anderson Farms community. He explained that families in Anderson Farms have historically attended Lindon, Rocky Mountain, and Aspen Elementary Schools, creating strong connections and identities within those school communities. He questioned why the proposed boundaries appeared to divide Lindon neighborhoods and redirect Anderson Farms students toward Pleasant Grove schools. Mr. O'Neil expressed concern that socioeconomic considerations may be influencing the proposed boundary adjustments and emphasized the importance of preserving established school communities.

2. Alicia Alba – Lindon Elementary Boundaries

Ms. Alba expressed concerns about the accuracy and consistency of building capacity figures being used in the boundary studies. She cited varying capacity figures presented for Rocky Mountain Elementary, including 952, 770, and 825 students, and questioned how the district was determining appropriate enrollment levels. She referenced a 1997 article describing overcrowding at Rocky Mountain Elementary shortly after its opening, when approximately 715 students attended.

Ms. Alba emphasized concerns regarding:

- Building capacity and available classroom space.
- Increasing elementary class sizes.
- Enrollment projections and declining student enrollment.
- The potential for consolidation decisions to contribute to further enrollment declines.

She encouraged the Board to reconsider assumptions regarding appropriate elementary school sizes.

3. Tim Dugovic – Former Oak Canyon Junior High Teacher

Mr. Dugovic spoke in support of Dual Language Immersion programs, particularly the Portuguese DLI program at Rocky Mountain Elementary. Drawing on his experience as an educator and his wife's involvement in French dual language immersion, he emphasized the academic and developmental opportunities provided through language learning. He encouraged the Board to carefully consider the value and long-term benefits of DLI programs when evaluating potential school closures and program changes.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Board President Lyman thanked everyone who provided comments regarding Consolidations, Closure, and Boundary Adjustment of Schools and Programs.

Board President Lyman formally closed the public hearing. No action was taken, and the meeting adjourned at 6:19 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING #3 – ASPEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

President Lyman declared the public hearing open to receive public comment on the proposed for Consolidations, Closure, and Boundary Adjustment of Schools and Programs at 6:19 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Bethany Taylor – Anderson Farms

Ms. Taylor shared that all of her children have attended Aspen Elementary School. She expressed concerns about the potential effects of closing multiple elementary schools simultaneously, particularly regarding increased class sizes. She explained that classrooms with approximately 25–30 students can become difficult to manage, even with parent volunteers assisting teachers. Ms. Taylor recommended a phased approach to school consolidations, allowing the district to close fewer schools initially and evaluate actual enrollment patterns before considering additional closures. She also encouraged consideration of how grade configuration changes and family decisions to attend other schools could affect future enrollment. Ms. Taylor suggested exploring whether expanding or constructing a larger school could be an alternative.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Board President Lyman thanked everyone who provided comments regarding Consolidations, Closure, and Boundary Adjustment of Schools and Programs.

Board President Lyman formally closed the public hearing. No action was taken, and the meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING #4 – BONNEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

President Lyman officially opened the Bonneville Elementary public hearing at 6:22 PM.

She explained that the hearing was intended to receive public input regarding possible changes affecting Bonneville Elementary School for the 2027–2028 school year.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No individuals signed up to provide public comments.

CLOSING COMMENTS

With no public comments, President Lyman closed the public comment portion and concluded the Bonneville Elementary public hearing.

Board President Lyman formally closed the public hearing. No action was taken, and the meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING #5 – OAK CANYON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

President Lyman officially opened the Oak Canyon public hearing at 6:24PM and explained the two-minute public comment procedure and invited speakers to address the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Melissa Quilter– Lindon

Ms. Quilter expressed opposition to the possible closure of Oak Canyon Junior High School. She emphasized the school's proximity to the Lindon Utah Temple and its importance to families who value having their children attend school near the temple. She described the temple as an important part of the community's identity and expressed her belief that keeping Oak Canyon open would strengthen families and community connections. Ms. Welter shared that two of her eight children currently attend Oak Canyon and that she hopes her younger children will have the same opportunity. She also presented signatures collected from students and their friends in support of keeping Oak Canyon Junior High open.

2. Tim Dugovic – Pleasant Grove

Mr. Dugovic, a retired science teacher who taught at Oak Canyon for 29 years, spoke in support of keeping the school open. He provided historical context regarding the school's opening in 1993, its enrollment fluctuations, and its ability to accommodate significant student populations over the years. Mr. Dugovic emphasized that Oak Canyon is the newest junior high school in the district and questioned the rationale for potentially closing a newer facility. He also expressed concerns about where Oak Canyon students would attend school if it closed and the potential for students to be divided among several junior high schools. He encouraged the Board to preserve Oak Canyon because of its location, facilities, reputation, and importance to the surrounding community.

3. Aaron Webb – North Orem

Mr. Webb shared that several of his children have attended Oak Canyon Junior High. He questioned the possibility of closing Oak Canyon when it is newer than other junior high schools being considered. He compared Oak Canyon's construction date of 1993 with Pleasant Grove Junior High's construction date of 1977. Mr. Webb encouraged the Board to consider the age and condition of school facilities when making closure decisions and expressed support for keeping Oak Canyon open.

4. Aaron Dickerson – Lindon

Mr. Dickerson explained that his family moved to Lindon seven years ago, in part because of the proximity and educational opportunities offered by local schools. He expressed concern that the possible closure of both Lindon Elementary and Oak Canyon Junior High could significantly affect Lindon's identity and educational community. He emphasized that schools contribute to the character and stability of a city and questioned the limited public involvement he had observed from city leadership regarding these issues. Mr. Dickerson also expressed concern that school closures, larger class sizes, and reduced access to programs could discourage families from moving into the community, potentially contributing to further enrollment declines. He encouraged the Board to keep Oak Canyon open and consider the broader community impacts of school closures.

5. Lyrae Dixon – Orem

Ms. Dixon shared that she has been involved with Oak Canyon Junior High as a parent for approximately 21 years, with six children having attended the school. She praised Oak Canyon's positive school culture, emphasizing the welcoming environment and opportunities for students to develop friendships, confidence, and individual interests. She also expressed appreciation for the school's accelerated learning opportunities and the academic community created among students participating in those programs. Ms. Dixon emphasized that Oak Canyon provides a wide variety of educational and extracurricular opportunities during important developmental years. She encouraged the Board to preserve the school and its established culture of acceptance, academic achievement, and student engagement.

CLOSING COMMENTS

After the five public comments, President Lyman closed the public comment portion and the hearing regarding possible consolidation, closure, and boundary adjustments involving Oak Canyon Junior High School at 6.35 PM.

PUBLIC HEARING #6 – HIGH SCHOOL BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS

President Lyman announced the time as 6:35 PM and opened the public hearing regarding possible boundary adjustments involving Mountain View, Orem, Pleasant Grove, and Timpanogos High Schools.

Schools Included:

- Mountain View High School
- Orem High School
- Pleasant Grove High School
- Timpanogos High School

Purpose: To receive public input regarding possible boundary adjustments affecting the four high schools for the 2027–2028 school year.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No individuals signed up to provide public comments.

CLOSING COMMENTS

With no public comments, President Lyman closed the public comment portion at 6:36 and concluded the high school boundary adjustment hearing. She thanked those in attendance and indicated that the public hearing portion of the meeting was concluded.

MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING- OCTOBER 7, 2026

The Board of Education of the Timpanogos School District met in a scheduled board meeting on Wednesday, October 7, 2026, at 6:30 PM. The board meeting took place in the meeting room of the Alpine School District Special Education Office in Lindon, Utah.

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

Also present: Superintendent Joseph Jensen, Business Administrator Jason Sundberg, members of the administrative staff, and approximately 26 others were in attendance.

President Jennifer Lyman called the meeting to order at 6:37 PM. President Lyman welcomed those in attendance

President Lyman noted that **Board Member Guy Fugal** was excused because he was traveling and unable to participate virtually. She indicated that he would be able to review the proceedings through the District's YouTube channel.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by **Dave Mower**. Board members, district administration, staff, and members of the public joined in reciting the pledge.

INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT

Katie Bowman shared the inspirational thought, focusing on the phrase "Together We" from the district's vision and its significance in building Timpanogos School District.

Ms. Bowman reflected on the lasting influence educators have on students, sharing a personal experience with a former science teacher who inspired her continued interest in science. She emphasized the importance of the relationships and sense of community developed within schools.

She also discussed the value of engaging families, educators, and community members throughout the district's ongoing studies. Although participants bring different perspectives and opinions, she noted that the common purpose is to create the best possible educational experiences for students.

Ms. Bowman expressed appreciation for the Board, administration, educators, and community members participating in the process and emphasized that building the new district requires collaboration and shared commitment.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS

President Lyman opened the community comment period, reviewed the procedures for public participation, and reminded speakers to state their names and cities. Four individuals addressed the Board.

Trisha Schuetzler – Vineyard

Trisha Schuetzler expressed concerns regarding the proposed transition of sixth-grade students into middle school. Although she indicated general support for moving sixth grade, she was concerned that the discussion during the earlier Study Session focused heavily on teachers rather than the specific experiences and needs of students.

DRAFT

She emphasized that the proposed middle school model should be meaningfully different from the existing junior high model, particularly during the first years of implementation. She encouraged the district to establish additional transition supports rather than relying primarily on introductory orientation days. Ms. Schutzler recommended preparing sixth graders to manage multiple classes and teacher expectations, coordinating classroom procedures and homework among teachers, increasing communication with parents, and ensuring students develop meaningful connections with counselors. She encouraged the Board to prioritize the student experience from the beginning rather than delaying important improvements until future years.

Alicia Alba – Lindon

Alicia Alba raised concerns regarding the number of out-of-boundary enrollment applications denied at schools experiencing declining enrollment. She stated that approximately 750 applications had been denied in the previous year and expressed concern that the number had increased. She identified several schools being studied for low enrollment, including Windsor, Orchard, Rocky Mountain, Lindon, and Northridge, as schools where applications had reportedly been denied. Ms. Alba questioned why families willing to provide transportation and make a commitment to those schools were being turned away. She encouraged the district to review its open-enrollment practices and ensure that established procedures are being followed consistently. She also expressed concerns regarding elementary class sizes and teacher compensation. Referring to a previous decision to discontinue extended-day elementary programming, she questioned whether compensation structures had been adjusted accordingly and whether that affected the district's ability to reduce class sizes. Ms. Alba acknowledged the importance of fairly compensating teachers and the valuable contributions of instructional aides but encouraged further examination of class-size practices and available resources.

Lyrae Dixon – Northeast Orem

Lyrae Dixon thanked the Board for its diligent work and expressed appreciation for the thoughtful process being used to evaluate school boundaries and possible consolidations. She emphasized the importance of smaller class sizes, strong neighborhood schools, and maintaining a sense of community for students and families. Ms. Dixon expressed a willingness to help support local schools and encouraged the district to consider how community members might contribute to maintaining high-quality educational opportunities. She noted that positive relationships, supportive teachers, and manageable class sizes are important to students' sense of belonging and educational experiences.

Craig Christiansen – Lindon

Craig Christiansen spoke regarding the possible closure of Aspen Elementary, where his wife teaches. He expressed appreciation for the Board's willingness to make difficult decisions and acknowledged the challenge of balancing the needs of individual schools with those of the district as a whole. Mr. Christensen questioned whether the district's robust school criteria adequately recognize the strengths of smaller schools. He explained that Aspen Elementary was designed with a maximum capacity of approximately three classrooms per grade, making it difficult to meet enrollment targets associated with larger school buildings. He described Aspen as a successful, well-managed school with a positive culture and strong relationships between students, families, and school leadership. He expressed concern that relying too heavily on enrollment size could result in closing a school that is already providing an exceptional educational experience. Mr. Christensen encouraged the Board to consider school culture, educational quality, and community

DRAFT

relationships when evaluating robust schools. He also suggested proceeding cautiously with possible closures, potentially closing fewer schools initially and evaluating the results before making additional changes.

President Lyman thanked the speakers for their participation and reminded community members that additional written comments could be submitted to the Board.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

President Lyman stated that Board members had previously received minutes from the previous meeting for review:

Motion: Board Member David H. Smith moved to approve of the minutes as presented.

Second: Board Member Grace Rex

Board Member Discussion

Board Member Ada Wilson expressed appreciation for Karen Carter's work preparing the minutes. **President Lyman** noted that the minutes were thorough and available through the District's Board documents. She also indicated that Superintendent Jensen reviews the minutes before distribution.

With no further discussion, the motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously 6/0.

Recognition – Orem High School Culinary Program

President Lyman expressed appreciation to the Orem High School culinary students for providing dinner to the Board between meetings. **Board Member Grace Rex** shared information about the school's participation in the national ProStart culinary program and its accomplishments in competition. **President Lyman** thanked the students and their teacher, Ms. Milburn, for their service and contributions

---

ROUTINE BUSINESS

1. Expenditure Report/Claims

Superintendent Dr. Joseph Jensen presented the Expenditure Report and Claims, noting that the information had been provided to Board members for review. He recommended approval.

Motion: Vice President Hilton moved to approve of the minutes as presented.

Second: Board Member David H. Smith

Board Discussion

Business Administrator Jason Sundberg reported that approximately 19% of the general fund budget had been expended during the first three months of the fiscal year, compared with approximately 25% of the year having elapsed. He indicated that expenditures were tracking favorably against the budget. He also reported that capital funds remained in a favorable position, with additional projects expected to begin. **Board Member David H. Smith** referenced the funding Timpanogos School District receives from Alpine School District for startup operations, noting that the district is currently operating with limited transitional funding.

DRAFT

President Lyman acknowledged that the district's financial operations and expenditure reports will continue to expand as TSD approaches full implementation and moved a motion to approve the Expenditure Report and Claims passed unanimously.

With no further discussion, the motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously 6/0.

2. Membership Report

Superintendent Jensen introduced the Membership Report, explaining that the information reflected enrollment as of September 30, 2026, rather than the official October 1 enrollment count. He noted that the report compared current enrollment with previously established projections and was provided for the Board's information.

Board Discussion

Board Member Grace Rex asked how closely actual enrollment typically aligns with projections. **Business Administrator Sundberg** explained that he had prepared a report specifically for the schools that will become part of Timpanogos School District. He reported that enrollment was approximately 186 students below projections, representing a difference of approximately 0.8%. He noted that TSD's projections were the closest of the three districts resulting from the Alpine School District reorganization. **Board Member Rex** confirmed that the difference was within 1% of projected enrollment. **President Lyman** asked whether the report would be available to the public. Mr. Sundberg confirmed that the report could be made available through the District's Board documents. **Board Member Michele Sorensen** noted that she had received the report by email but did not initially see it in the digital Board materials. The Board discussed ensuring that the report was accessible with the meeting documents. The Membership Report was presented for information only. No Board action was required or taken.

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

1. Resolution #2026-022 – ASD 2016 RAM ProMaster Mail Delivery Van for Surplus

Superintendent Jensen introduced Resolution #2026-022, authorizing the surplus disposition of an Alpine School District 2016 RAM ProMaster mail delivery van. He explained that approval was required as part of the process involving the districts created through the Alpine School District reorganization. He recommended approval of the resolution.

Motion: Board Member Michele Sorensen moved to approve Resolution #2026-022, authorizing the disposition of the 2016 RAM ProMaster mail delivery van.

Second: Vice President Sterling Hilton seconded the motion.

Board Discussion

Board Member Grace Rex noted that the vehicle had approximately 85,000 miles, which initially seemed relatively low for a vehicle being surplused. However, after reviewing the documentation, she observed that the van had experienced recurring mechanical and

maintenance problems. President Lyman acknowledged that there comes a point when the cost of continued repairs may no longer justify retaining a vehicle. She expressed confidence in the recommendation to surplus the van.

With no further discussion, the motion to approved Resolution 2026-022 passed unanimously 6/0.

---

2. Middle School Model Discussion

Superintendent Jensen introduced the Middle School Model Discussion as a continuation of the earlier Study Session with the District's five junior high principals. He emphasized that a proposed 6–8 middle school should not simply replicate the current junior high model with younger students added. Instead, the District has an opportunity to create an intentional educational experience that addresses the developmental, academic, and social needs of middle school students. He noted that concerns about the readiness of sixth graders have been expressed consistently during focus groups and cluster meetings. He said Board members should have confidence in the proposed model before making a grade configuration decision. Superintendent Jensen also reported that District representatives had consulted with Canyons School District and Cache County School District to learn from their experiences implementing 6–8 middle school configurations. **President Lyman** suggested summarizing the conversations with canyons and Cache County for the benefit of Board members who had not participated. She emphasized the value of learning from districts that have already implemented similar changes, including understanding which practices were successful and what those districts might do differently. **Vice President Hilton** shared several takeaways from the discussion with Canyons School District. He emphasized that Canyons strongly recommended a teaming model, in which a consistent group of teachers works with the same group of students and collaborates regarding their academic and individual needs. He explained that this approach provides continuity and allows teachers to develop a deeper understanding of students, similar to the collaboration that occurs among elementary grade-level teams. He also noted that Canyons cautioned against overlooking ninth graders when transitioning to a 9–12 high school configuration. **Board President Jennifer Lyman** discussed the scheduling models used by Canyons School District. She explained that Canyons operates middle schools using different schedules and does not require all schools to follow one uniform schedule. She noted that Canyon's representatives did not identify a particular schedule as essential to the success of their middle school model.

President Lyman said one recommendation was to consider retaining TSD's existing A/B block schedule during the initial transition to provide greater consistency for teachers and students. She also clarified that Canyons' three-year implementation timeline was influenced by the need to complete additional school construction, rather than a determination that three years were required to develop the educational model. She expressed appreciation for Canyons' willingness to share resources and collaborate with TSD. **Vice President Hilton** reiterated that the teaming model could operate successfully under different scheduling structures. He emphasized that the district could establish teaming as an essential component while allowing flexibility in how individual schools organize their schedules. **Board Member Rex** asked about the impact of

DRAFT

teaming and scheduling on elective opportunities. She shared feedback from a teacher who had experienced the Canyons transition and expressed concern that the initial model had limited opportunities for elective teachers and students. **President Lyman** acknowledged that elective opportunities had presented challenges in some Canyons schools, particularly for students participating in Dual Language Immersion (DLI), whose language courses occupied part of their elective schedule. She noted that retaining an eight-period schedule could provide additional flexibility for electives. **President Lyman** also discussed the importance of movement and physical activity for sixth graders. She suggested that movement could be incorporated into instruction and that physical education opportunities should be considered as part of the middle school model. **Vice President Hilton** agreed that movement is important but cautioned against requiring overly specific instructional practices. He suggested that the district could encourage movement and developmentally appropriate teaching strategies while allowing teachers flexibility in classroom implementation. **Superintendent Jensen** summarized conversations with Cache County School District, which had recently transitioned to a 6–8 middle school configuration. He reported that Cache County representatives expressed strong support for their new model and emphasized the importance of intentionally designing a middle school experience rather than simply adding sixth graders to existing junior high practices. He also noted that representatives from both districts reported that many initial concerns diminished as families and students experienced the new configurations. **Superintendent Jensen** discussed approaches to organizing sixth-grade students within middle school buildings, including keeping core classes in a general area while allowing appropriate interaction with other grades during electives and other activities. **President Lyman** invited Board members to identify the elements they considered essential, or "tight," in a TSD middle school model, as well as areas where schools should have flexibility. She acknowledged the challenge of asking principals to develop a model before the Board formally approved the configuration. She expressed confidence that the principals understand the importance of caring for students while also recognizing the significant demands being placed on educators during the transition. **President Lyman** emphasized that the Board should provide appropriate guidance and support while allowing principals time to work collaboratively with their teachers. **Board Member Sorensen** expressed confidence in the district's junior high principals and encouraged families with concerns to speak with them directly. She noted that the principals had already begun collaborating on possibilities for a middle school model and were enthusiastic about creating a positive experience for students. She acknowledged that the model may not include every desired feature during its first year but said it should begin with a strong foundation and improve over time. **Board Member Sorensen** identified two areas where she would like additional information from principals:

- How an A/B block schedule could be structured to better accommodate sixth graders, particularly regarding lengthy class periods.
- How DLI could be extended or strengthened in middle school, so students do not lose the educational benefits of their sixth-grade immersion experience.

DRAFT

Board Member Smith identified several elements he considered essential to the middle school model. He emphasized the importance of teachers collaborating around individual students, establishing a sense of belonging and a recognizable home base for students, ensuring parents know their children are being cared for, and providing dedicated time for intervention. He expressed support for teaming but questioned whether requiring a fully developed teaming model throughout all three grades during the first year would be realistic. Drawing on his experience as a teacher and school administrator, he explained that supporting teachers is an important part of ensuring students receive appropriate care. He said principals who focus on preparing and supporting teachers are ultimately working to improve student experience. **Board Member Smith** also noted that removing ninth-grade credit and accreditation requirements from junior highs could allow middle schools greater flexibility to focus on student needs. He cautioned against establishing too many detailed requirements and favored identifying broad principles that schools could implement appropriately. **Board Member Wilson** reviewed the potential advantages of moving sixth grade into middle school. She identified more efficient use of junior high facilities, additional elementary space for preschool and specialized programs, greater flexibility in program placement, and expanded curricular opportunities for middle school students. She also shared that sixth-grade teachers with whom she had spoken were supportive of the potential transition and believed many sixth graders were developmentally ready for additional opportunities. **Board Member Wilson** emphasized the importance of the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process, including scheduled teacher collaboration and opportunities for students to receive academic intervention. She identified PLC structures as an essential component of the proposed model. She also encouraged principals to identify the district-level support they would need, including assistance from student and employee well-being professionals. **Board Member Wilson** said middle schools should intentionally prepare students for high school by helping them develop self-management, study skills, and social skills. **Board Member Rex** expressed concern that the earlier discussion with principals had not provided sufficient assurance that sixth graders would experience a consistent and supportive transition. She said establishing several clear expectations could help principals focus their planning efforts rather than leaving them to develop entirely different models independently. She expressed strong support for requiring a teaming model, noting that the district could learn from established practices in Canyons and other school districts rather than developing everything from the beginning. **President Lyman** suggested a possible compromise: requiring teaming for sixth-grade students initially without necessarily requiring the same structure for seventh and eighth grades during the first year. She noted that many incoming sixth-grade teachers would already have experience working collaboratively in elementary schools, potentially making sixth grade teaming a practical starting point. She suggested that the model could later expand to other grades as schools gain experience. **Board Member Rex** indicated that she could support beginning with sixth-grade teaming, although she believed a broader model could also be implemented. She encouraged consideration of house systems or similar structures to strengthen school culture, relationships, and student belonging. She also discussed the possibility of establishing consistent expectations regarding student electronics and technology.

DRAFT

Board Member Rex suggested that maintaining the existing block schedule initially might help reduce the number of simultaneous changes required of teachers. President Lyman emphasized that the district must balance expectations for principals with the resources and support needed to implement them. She noted that principals had identified needs such as consistent school start and end times and suggested working with transportation and other departments to determine what accommodations could be provided. She reiterated the importance of learning from other districts while recognizing the short implementation timeline. **Vice President Hilton** agreed that the model should prioritize an excellent student experience, including a supportive transition, strong relationships, and a sense of belonging. He expressed support for making teaming an essential component, particularly for sixth grade. He also discussed the possibility of establishing District-wide technology expectations through policy rather than treating every technology decision as a requirement specific to the middle school model. He asked principals to consider how the existing A/B schedule might be adapted for sixth graders, including the use of homerooms, intervention periods, and opportunities for more frequent engagement with core subjects such as English and mathematics. **Board Member Smith** reiterated that his priority was ensuring teachers collaborate about individual students. He noted that teaming is one way to accomplish that goal but said meaningful collaboration might also be achieved through other structures. He also referenced previous scheduling practices at Orem Junior High that provided daily mathematics instruction within a block schedule. **Vice President Hilton** reiterated his support for a teaming model and emphasized that every student should be recognized, connected, and supported. He identified student belonging and structured collaboration among teachers as essential elements of a successful middle school experience. **Peter Glahn** shared additional observations from the conversations with other districts. He emphasized the importance of protecting elective opportunities, particularly for DLI students whose schedules may already include required language courses. He also discussed approaches to providing sixth graders with opportunities for movement, recreation, and appropriate social interaction during lunch and other parts of the school day. **Mr. Glahn** cautioned against interpreting the principals' reluctance to commit immediately to specific structures as resistance to change. He explained that effective school leaders must involve teachers in developing and implementing new practices. He emphasized that principals need time to build understanding and commitment among staff so that the new model can be implemented successfully. **President Lyman** expressed confidence in the district's five junior high principals and their ability to lead the transition.

Mr. Sundberg emphasized the value of involving principals in developing the model rather than having the Board or District administration prescribe every detail. He said principals need opportunities to develop ideas collaboratively and then work with their teachers to build understanding and support. **President Lyman** suggested providing opportunities for principals and their leadership teams to visit schools operating successful middle school models. She said observing these practices firsthand could help educators develop ideas and address concerns.

Vice President Hilton clarified that the Board was not asking principals to finalize every operational detail within the next two weeks. Rather, the immediate goal was to determine whether the proposed essential elements were feasible and to obtain examples of how they

DRAFT

might be implemented. He also noted that representatives from Canyons believed the proposed transition could be accomplished within TSD's timeline, although significant work would be required. **Dave Mower** emphasized that school culture and relationships are just as important as organizational structures. He said the district's principals have demonstrated strong abilities to build positive school cultures and connect with students. He encouraged the Board to recognize that a successful middle school model will depend not only on schedules and organizational systems but also on the relationships between students and the adults serving them. **Board Member Sorensen** emphasized the experience and strengths of the district's junior high principals. She noted that some had previously served as elementary principals and understood the developmental needs of younger students. She expressed confidence that the principals' varied experiences would contribute to a strong middle school model. **Board Member Smith** added that some principals also have experience in high schools, providing valuable insight into preparing middle school students for the next stage of their education. **President Lyman** noted that the principals' different professional experiences would strengthen their collaboration and help them develop a model that supports students from elementary school through high school.

Kim Jones emphasized that principals would have support from District and school-level student well-being professionals. She identified social workers, school psychologists, counselors, and District staff as resources available to help create a safe and supportive transition for sixth graders. She said the district's student well-being team would welcome opportunities to collaborate with principals on student connection, safety, belonging, and support**. Board Member Wilson** emphasized that professional development opportunities should be considered an essential component of the transition. She encouraged the district to provide training and opportunities for educators to learn from successful middle school models and from professionals with expertise in student development and well-being.

Conclusion of Middle School Model Discussion

Superintendent Jensen and President Lyman thanked Board members and staff for the discussion. The Board identified several priorities for further consideration, including student belonging, teaming, teacher collaboration, intervention, scheduling, DLI opportunities, professional development, and student well-being. These items represented discussion and potential expectations for further planning, not a formally adopted middle school model.

No action was taken on the Middle School Model Discussion.

---

3. Boundary Study – Board Discussion on Today's Hearings

Superintendent Jensen introduced the Boundary Study Discussion as a continuation of the earlier Study Session and public hearings. He noted that secondary boundary maps had been released previously, followed by elementary maps, and that the maps were continuing to evolve as the district received additional information and community feedback. He invited Board members to share their observations regarding the latest proposed maps and the district's current best thinking. **Board Member Grace Rex** asked about the rationale for adjustments in

DRAFT

Secondary Map A3 that would place more Lindon students within the Pleasant Grove feeder area. She asked whether the proposed changes had been driven primarily by community input. **Board President Jennifer Lyman** explained that community feedback contributed to the discussion, but declining enrollment projections and available capacity at Pleasant Grove High School also influenced the proposal. She said the revised boundaries could provide a better enrollment balance while addressing concerns expressed by community members. **Business Administrator Jason Sundberg** explained that the district had been evaluating options based on enrollment projections and feedback received during the study process. He noted that the revised proposal would place approximately 60% of Lindon students in the Pleasant Grove cluster and 40% in the Timpanogos cluster, representing a more balanced distribution than earlier proposals. **President Jennifer Lyman** emphasized that the district is attempting to balance enrollment based on the relative capacities of schools rather than making every school's enrollment equal. She noted that Pleasant Grove High School's available capacity should be considered when determining appropriate feeder boundaries. **Superintendent Jensen** asked whether the revised proposal provided a better balance between Pleasant Grove and Timpanogos high schools. **Business Administrator Sundberg** confirmed that the proposed adjustment is better aligned enrollment with available building capacity. He explained that the district hopes to minimize the need for portable classrooms while recognizing that some temporary classroom space may still be necessary. **Board Sorensen** discussed changes reflected in **Elementary Map E6.4**, particularly adjustments affecting Lindon and Mount Mahogany Elementary. She explained that earlier proposals had left some neighbors feeling isolated from the broader Lindon community. The revised map included additional Lindon neighborhoods within the proposed boundaries. She noted that the changes appeared to respond positively to community feedback. **President Lyman** referenced a recent community meeting with residents of Anderson Farms and discussed the potential for future residential development in portions of Lindon. She emphasized the importance of considering long-term growth while making decisions based on the information currently available. She also noted that future enrollment patterns could change as housing types and family demographics evolve. **Board Member Sorensen** explained that feedback from Mount Mahogany families had influenced additional changes between proposed elementary maps. She said some families expressed a desire to remain together rather than having portions of their neighborhoods reassigned to other elementary schools. **Board Member Wilson** expressed appreciation for the enrollment improvements reflected in Map E6.4 but raised concerns about the proposed changes affecting the former Suncrest and Geneva communities. She noted that those communities had been combined into a school boundary several years earlier and expressed hesitation about reversing that work. She emphasized the importance of preserving established school communities and avoiding unnecessary disruption. B**oard Member Sorensen** asked Board Member Wilson to compare the trade-offs among the proposed maps, particularly regarding Orem, Westmore, and Parkside. **Board Member Wilson** explained that she preferred aspects of **Map E5**, particularly its treatment of Parkside and Orem Elementary. She expressed concern about creating school communities across busy portions of Center Street and questioned whether such boundaries

DRAFT

would support strong neighborhood connections. She emphasized that she had not reached a final conclusion but wanted those considerations included in the study. **Board Member Rex** asked whether establishing a pure-feeder pattern for the Parkside community might help offset some concerns by allowing students to remain together as they progress through secondary schools. **Board Member Wilson a**cknowledged that a pure feeder pattern was an important consideration but said she would want to hear directly from affected families before determining how to weigh that benefit against other concerns.

Continued Board Discussion – Elementary Boundaries and Community Impact

Board members continued examining the trade-offs associated with proposed boundaries affecting Orem, Westmore, Cherry Hill, Parkside, and surrounding neighborhoods. **Board Member Wilson** expressed concern about making changes that might need to be reversed within a few years. She emphasized the importance of preserving healthy neighborhood schools and avoiding unnecessary disruption when future enrollment projections and program placement decisions remain uncertain. **Vice President Hilton** asked for clarification regarding which specific boundary changes she believed could create future problems. **Board Member Wilson** explained that she was particularly concerned about moving families from established school communities into configurations that might later require additional adjustments. **Board Member Sorensen** acknowledged the difficulty of balancing those competing considerations and the importance of continuing to examine the available options. **Mr. Sundberg** provided updated enrollment information for Orem Elementary. He explained that Orem Elementary had previously been projected to experience enrollment growth but that the September 30 membership numbers showed enrollment approximately **57 students below projection**. He noted that revised projections could therefore show less growth or a possible decline, affecting how the Board evaluates future boundaries. **Board President Lyman** emphasized that updated enrollment projections would be important to the Board's continued work. She noted that Board members were still identifying concerns, reviewing information, and considering community feedback rather than reaching final conclusions. **Board Member Wilson** reiterated that boundary changes should strengthen communities rather than create unnecessary instability. She expressed concern that repeated, or poorly aligned boundary changes could cause families to leave schools or seek other educational options. **Board Member Rex** asked for clarification regarding the district's robust school enrollment criteria. She noted her understanding that the goal was generally to support approximately **three classrooms per grade**, with additional considerations for schools housing specialized programs such as DLI and Advanced Learning Lab (ALL). She emphasized that the district was not necessarily attempting to fill every school to its maximum capacity. **Vice President Hilton** agreed that an elementary school with approximately **470 students** could be considered appropriately sized if it supported the desired number of classrooms per grade and did not require additional capacity for specialized programs. **Business Administrator Sundberg** participated in clarifying how enrollment targets and program placement affect the evaluation of school capacity. **Board Member Rex** suggested that school capacities should be reconsidered after the district determines where specialized

DRAFT

programs will be located. **Board Member Smith** added that space for specialists and related educational services must also be considered. **Board President Lyman a**greed that program placement, specialist needs, and updated enrollment information remain important factors in the Boundary Study. She noted that the upcoming presentation regarding DLI and other programs would help inform the Board's continued consideration of school capacities and boundaries. B**oard Member Rex r**equested additional information regarding out-of-boundary enrollment policies, particularly for families with children participating in DLI programs. Referring to concerns raised during community comments, she asked why some families may be unable to enroll siblings at the same school and requested clarification regarding the policies and procedures governing those decisions. **Board President Lyman** acknowledged the request and noted that the issue could be examined further through appropriate staff and policy discussions.

Vice President Hilton emphasized the significant role neighborhood schools play in building and sustaining communities. He acknowledged that school closures may sometimes be necessary for the benefit of the district but cautioned against overlooking their impact on neighborhoods. He specifically discussed the importance of avoiding **educational deserts**, where school closures could leave communities without reasonable access to nearby schools and make it more difficult to attract and retain families. He noted that school proximity, neighborhood development, and community identity should remain part of the Board's evaluation alongside enrollment and financial considerations. **Superintendent Jensen** expressed appreciation for the Board's approach to the Boundary Study. He noted that the district is genuinely studying multiple possibilities rather than beginning with predetermined outcomes. He emphasized that the required study period provides meaningful time to consider community input, enrollment data, program placement, and other factors before making final decisions. He said the proposed maps would continue to evolve as additional information became available. **Board Member Sorensen** asked whether the upcoming review of specialized programs was expected to result in a complete revision of the proposed boundaries. The discussion clarified that program placement could require additional adjustments, but a wholesale redesign of the current maps was not anticipated.

Continued Discussion – Program Placement and Communication

Board members discussed the opportunities that could become available as enrollment is balanced and more robust schools are developed, including the potential to provide programs and services in locations where they have not previously been available. **Board Member Sorensen** then raised concerns about how the public accesses proposed boundary maps on the district website. She suggested that the maps should be easy to locate, clearly labeled, and dated so families can distinguish current proposals from earlier versions. **Business Administrator Sundberg** explained that updated PDF maps had been provided to the communications team and were being posted with identifying information and dates. **President Lyman** emphasized the district's commitment to making information available and encouraged community members to notify staff if information was difficult to find.

Conclusion of Boundary Study Discussion

DRAFT

President Lyman thanked Board members and staff for the discussion. The Board emphasized that proposed maps remain under consideration and will continue to be refined through updated enrollment projections, program analysis, and community input.

No action was taken on the Boundary Study Discussion.

SUPERINTENDENT & BOARD MEMBER REPORTS, INFORMATION ITEMS & COMMENTS

Board Member Ada Wilson

Board Member Wilson encouraged community members to attend the upcoming high school cluster meetings and provided the following schedule:

- Orem High School: Monday, October 12, 2026, at 4:00 PM
- Mountain View High School: Monday, October 12, 2026, at 6:00 PM
- Timpanogos High School: Tuesday, October 13, 2026, at 4:00 PM
- Pleasant Grove High School: Tuesday, October 13, 2026, at 6:00 PM

She noted that the meetings would be held in the respective high school media centers and encouraged families to participate. President Lyman clarified that the meetings would be publicly noticed and that Board members could attend any cluster meeting, regardless of the area they represent.

Board Member Grace Rex

Board Member Rex expressed appreciation to the parents, community members, and staff who participated in focus groups and provided feedback throughout the Boundary Study. She also thanked those who spoke during the public hearings and acknowledged the thoughtful perspectives shared regarding individual schools and communities.

Superintendent Dr. Joseph Jensen

Superintendent Jensen expressed appreciation for the collaborative relationship between Board members and District leadership. He noted that Board members have consistently emphasized the importance of discussing significant decisions together and hearing different perspectives before reaching conclusions. He said the discussions during the meeting demonstrated genuine collaboration and thoughtful consideration rather than predetermined positions.

Board President Jennifer Lyman

President Lyman expressed appreciation for the opportunity to continue substantive Board discussions during regular meetings rather than limiting those conversations to Study Sessions. She said the discussion helped Board members better understand one another's perspectives and work collaboratively through difficult decisions. President Lyman also clarified the origins of the district's robust school criteria. She emphasized that the criteria were developed through

DRAFT

community engagement, including cluster meetings and focus groups, rather than being created solely by the Board. She noted that community members identified priorities such as additional student support, school counselors, and administrative assistance. President Lyman said the criteria could serve as an important guide not only for the Boundary Study but also for future conversations with state legislators regarding the resource's communities believe schools need. She expressed appreciation for the community's role in shaping the district's vision for robust schools.

Vice President Sterling Hilton

Vice President Hilton expressed appreciation for the open and productive discussions held during the meeting. He said he valued the opportunity to share perspectives candidly in a public setting and believed the Board was making meaningful progress. He also thanked fellow Board members, District staff, and community members for their collaboration and commitment to the district's work.

Board Member David H. Smith

Board Member Smith thanked parents, employees, principals, teachers, and community members for the extensive feedback provided through meetings, written submissions, and other communication channels. He expressed appreciation to Superintendent Jensen and Business Administrator Sundberg for the significant work involved in the district's transition and Boundary Study. He also thanked President Lyman and Vice President Hilton for their leadership and ongoing responsibilities.

Board Member Michele Sorensen

Board Member Sorensen expressed appreciation for the continued discussion and the opportunity for Board members to better understand one another's perspectives. She reported on attending a meeting involving the Student and Staff Well-Being Committee and the People and Culture Committee. She emphasized that the district recognizes the significant amount of change facing employees, students, and families, regardless of which configuration and boundary decisions are ultimately made. She said the district is proactively considering ways to support employees and families throughout the transition.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board and no need to convene a Closed Session pursuant to Utah Code § 52-4-205, President Lyman entertained a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Vice President Hilton moved to adjourn the meeting.
Second: Board Member Rex seconded the motion.

The board voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously, 6/0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:37 PM

DRAFT

BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY

SECTION: **[Section Name / Policy Number]**
POLICY TITLE: **Policy Development and Adoption**
BOARD APPROVAL: **[Date, 2026]**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. STATEMENT OF POLICY
2. PURPOSE AND PHILOSOPHY
3. POLICY STRUCTURE
4. POLICY COMMITTEE
5. POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY INPUT
6. POLICY IMPLEMENTATION
7. REVIEW CYCLE

1. STATEMENT OF POLICY

The Board considers Policy to be one of its most important responsibilities, and strives to create Policy that is aligned with the District's Vision and Values. Because Policy development should be a collaborative process, the Board welcomes input from students, parents, employees, and residents. The Board commits to regularly update and review Policy, and ensure that Policy is maintained in a standardized and easily-accessible format.

2. PURPOSE AND PHILOSOPHY

2.1. Under Utah Law, the Board is responsible to develop and enforce Policy. The Board considers this responsibility to be among its highest duties. For that reason, the Board retains full authority over Policy creation, ensuring clear public accountability and a unified vision for the District. *[Utah Code Ann. § 53G-4-402]*

2.2. Policies will reflect the vision and objectives of the Board. To ensure that Policies serve the District's entire community and are aligned with the Vision and Values, the Board will consider input from all stakeholders, including students, parents, employees, and local residents.

2.3. The Board does not create Policies for every topic or scenario. When existing Law provides clear and sufficient instruction, the Board expects employees to adhere to and apply that Law without the need for an additional Policy.

2.4. The Board empowers the Superintendent and those designated by the Superintendent to develop Administrative Practices that are consistent with Law and Policy.

3. POLICY STRUCTURE

3.1. Each Policy will be given a unique title and number consistent with the organizational system used by the District.

3.2. Each Policy will be limited to one subject.

3.3. To effectively guide employees and inform the District community, all Policies will be logically organized and written in straightforward, accessible language.

3.4. To ensure consistency, a standardized set of definitions applies to capitalized terms throughout all Policies. Defined terms are hyperlinked to a master list of definitions throughout each Policy.

3.5. Each Policy will be adopted at a Board Meeting and published online.

3.6. The District's legal counsel shall be responsible to maintain a master copy and a running history of each Policy.

4. POLICY COMMITTEE

4.1. Policy Committee Membership

4.1.1. The Board shall designate no more than three Board members to serve on the Policy Committee.

4.1.2. The Superintendent shall designate District employees to serve on the Policy Committee, including members of the District's cabinet-level leadership team and the District's legal counsel.

4.2. Policy Committee Responsibilities

4.2.1. Prepare Policy drafts;

4.2.2. Meet regularly to review and discuss proposals for new policies or revisions to existing policies;

4.2.3. Collect and review relevant data, solicit staff recommendations, and consider stakeholder input to inform policy development;

4.2.4. Recommend appropriate placement of new or revised policies on Board meeting agendas; and

4.2.5. Advise the Board on Policy development and revision.

4.3. The Policy Committee is authorized to make minor edits to Policies that do not change the substance of the Policy. Examples of appropriate edits include: updating citations, fixing hyperlinks, correcting spelling, typographical, or grammatical errors, and adjusting job titles or department names to reflect current District structures.

5. POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY INPUT

5.1. Although Policy is primarily a Board responsibility, students, parents, employees, and local residents may also participate in the Policy process by sharing their input with the Policy Committee.

5.1.1. Input should be directed to the Policy Committee through the Policy Feedback Form.

5.1.2. Input should identify specific concerns, and may include specific draft language.

5.2. The Policy Committee will review all stakeholder input received through the Policy Feedback Form.

5.3. In response to input, the Policy Committee may collect and review relevant data, collect additional stakeholder input, discuss and consider the Policy Feedback Form input, and, if the Policy Committee determines that action is advisable, prepare a related Policy draft.

5.4. Policy drafts will be submitted to the Board for discussion and action at a Board Meeting when either of the following occurs:

5.4.1. A majority of both Board members and employee members of the Policy Committee approve the Policy draft; or

5.4.2. The Superintendent directs that the Policy draft be submitted.

5.5. During Board Meetings, a Board member or designated member of the Policy Committee will present to the Board any Policy draft that has been submitted for discussion and action by the Policy Committee.

5.5.1. At least one Policy Committee employee will be present at each Board meeting at which a Policy draft has been submitted, to answer questions and provide data as requested by the Board.

5.6. The Board may take the following actions on a submitted Policy draft:

5.6.1. Discussion and / or action;

5.6.2. Return to the Policy Committee;

5.6.3. Table for discussion and / or action at a future date.

5.7. The Board may take action on a submitted Policy draft regardless of whether the Policy draft has previously been submitted to the Board for discussion and / or action. This approach is intended to allow the Board to act decisively in emergencies, non-controversial situations, or instances where conclusive data or stakeholder input have already been collected, while also encouraging careful deliberation and meaningful public input.

6. POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

6.1. Policies are binding upon students, employees, parents, and others under the authority of the District.

6.2. Administrators and supervisors are responsible for ensuring students, employees, and community members are aware of all relevant Policies and Administrative Practices.

6.2.1. Each District employee is responsible to know the Policies and Administrative Practices that apply to their specific role, whether or not formal training has been provided.

6.3. Students or employees who do not follow Policies or Administrative Practices may be subject to disciplinary action.

7. REVIEW CYCLE

7.1. The Board intends for the Policy Committee to review each Policy every five years, unless Law requires that a particular Policy be more frequently reviewed. Following a Policy's review, the Policy Committee shall submit the Policy to the Board, along with a recommendation for that Policy's revision, retirement, renewal, or consolidation with another Policy.

DEFINITIONS:	Master List of Definitions
EXHIBITS:	None
REFERENCES:	Utah Code Ann. § 53G-4-402
FORMS:	Policy Feedback Form
HISTORY:	Board Approved: [Date], 2026