

Long-Range Planning Committee
October 2, 2017
4:30 p.m.–6:30 p.m.
ESC Board Room

“To review the district physical plant, program capacity, enrollment boundaries, transportation routing, and major capital equipment requirements, and determine what improvements to efficiency, sustainability, and infrastructure needs may be required during the next five to ten years.”

Attendees: Diane Doney, Betty Timmer, Ralph Dergance, Brian Bostwick, Dave Culp, Bob Colwell, Lucie Stanish, Mary Haas, Terry Davis, Karen Johnson, Brett Collins, Dana Wedlick, Lucie Stanish, Erick Hartzell, Chris Jobanputra, Bill Canterbury

Absent: Becca Damiano

Ad hoc attendees: Nicole Moyer, Mark Crisman, Donna Villamor, Mike Porter, Jessica Gould, Robyn Zagoren, Mike Hush, Kathleen Ambron (part of meeting), Diane Leiker, Clay Abla (part of meeting)

Consultant attendees: Shannon Bingham

Minutes:

1. Welcome and review minutes/agenda
 - a. Diane welcomed committee members and provided an overview of what would be discussed.
2. Discussion: committee members' impressions of open houses
 - a. Pleasantly surprised by turnout.
 - b. People who were encouraged and enthusiastic about our district having research-based options.
 - c. Some elementary parents feeling the high school students are the “tail wagging the dog” for elementary research.
 - i. Dr. Meltzer’s research supports earlier start times for elementaries because these students are already awake.
 - ii. May like additional research supporting this.
 - d. Some concern about after-school activities causing kids to be potentially walking home in the dark in late fall-winter-early spring.
 - e. “Why didn’t we do this last year” a common question.
 - f. “Do what’s most consistent with research” a common thought.

- g. Some high school students doing multiple activities would endure a hardship by starting an hour later; this would encroach upon family time.
- h. Some people thought this was a foregone conclusion.
- i. Not necessarily any set theme from one group of stakeholders (for example, coaches: some for, some against).
- j. "If we're going to make a change, go all the way!" (use option 1)
- k. Didn't hear much concern about middle school kids being unsupervised with either late-start option.
- l. Some coaches felt it would kill athletics; some coaches have already had to quit due to our PLC late start.
- m. Are we involving teachers enough? Question brought up by some community members.
- n. How was this going to be funded? Question brought up by some community members.
- o. One concern from high school parents: late start day would then be starting at 9:30.
- p. Quite a few out-of-district families attending open houses, and most of these prefer option 2.
- q. Are we turning elementary students into guinea pigs for this research process, since most of the research we've presented was geared towards secondary students? Question that was brought up.
- r. Soccer parents informal poll by Brian: supportive! If we're going to do it, go all the way. The group was all for it but didn't want to take the time to go to the forum and fill out paperwork (we suspect there is a large population like this).
- s. British parent was surprised when she came here that schools started as early as they do and was glad we're looking at moving them back. Several families from other states felt the same way.
- t. Committee member: potentially more data on website?
 - i. More detailed survey information.
 - ii. Percentages of kids doing 1, 2, 3, etc. extracurriculars?
 - iii. More statistics/data from Cherry Creek/Boulder on how this has affected their student populations.
 - 1. Shannon will bring more info from CCSD to next LRPC meeting.
- u. Some questions about what brought about our two options and what were the constraints that led to them?
- v. Some sports have already adjusted start times of games to accommodate other districts that have implemented a later start time (ex AHS volleyball)
- w. Elementary parent: excited we're doing this now because by the time their student is in middle school, we will have worked out the kinks and their child would be experiencing optimum benefit.
- x. Concern about after-school jobs.
- y. We need to keep in mind that a lot of the attendees to these open houses are the outliers: either really supportive or really against.

- z. Higher levels: are we taking a problem and moving it to the right on a timeline?
 - aa. We're somewhat limited on facilities that can accommodate later times (i.e., lighted fields).
 - bb. Might need a paradigm shift about homework: can we gain proficiency without having as much homework being assigned?
 - cc. How many kids already schedule themselves to have the first hour off for sleep, family, whatever?
 - dd. What's the push to do this right away and why not take a year to learn from what Cherry Creek is doing rather than make all the same mistakes?
 - ee. Encouraging: people couldn't find an "ulterior motive" for why we are trying to get this passed.
 - ff. Concern raised: What about family time? School is not everything.
 - gg. Scheduling:
 - i. LHS is on a traditional 8-block.
 - 1. Extended class periods alternating on Monday/Tuesday and Thursday/Friday with a condensed schedule on Wednesdays (alternating 4 classes one Wednesday, then the other four the next).
 - ii. HHS and AHS each have 7-period days.
 - iii. What are zero hours and how many students are in them?
 - 1. Zero hour classes are all optional (not required for graduation).
 - a. Similarly, LHS offers a 9th hour each day, which is an optional hour where students can choose to take additional electives, like jazz band, academic support, etc.
- 3. Presentation: Traffic and Boundaries
 - a. Shannon walked the committee through presentation and discussion.
 - 4. Adjourn