

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.

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.