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.

APPROVED

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.

APPROVED

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

APPROVED

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.

APPROVED

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.

APPROVED

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.

APPROVED