The Board of Education of Jordan School District met in study, special business, and closed sessions on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, beginning at 5:22 p.m. at JATC South (Board Conference Room), 12723 S. Park Avenue (2080 West), Riverton, Utah. The sessions were also provided electronically as allowed by Utah Executive Order 2020-1. The Order was issued by the Governor's Office as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions on public gatherings.

STUDY SESSION

Those recognized or signed-in as present:
  Bryce Dunford, Board President
  Tracy J. Miller, Board Vice President
  Matthew Young, Board Secretary
  Jen Atwood, Board Member (via electronic connection)
  Marilyn Richards, Board Member
  Darrell Robinson, Board Member (via electronic connection)
  Janice L. Voorhies, Board Member (via electronic connection)
  Anthony A. Godfrey, Superintendent
  Michael Anderson, Administrator of Schools
  John Larsen, Business Administrator
  Paul Van Komen, Burbidge & White (via electronic connection)
  Cody Curtis, Administrator of Schools
  Rebecca Gerber, Administrator of Schools
  June M. LeMaster, Administrator of Human Resources
  Shelley Nordick, Administrator of Teaching and Learning
  Lisa Robinson, Administrator of Schools
  Brad Sorensen, Administrator of Schools
  Doree Strauss, Administrator of Schools
  Scott Thomas, Administrator of Auxiliary Services
  Travis Hamblin, Director, Student Services
  Doug Flagler, Manager, Communications
  Scott Festin, Consultant, Student Services
  Rebecca Smith, Consultant, ALPS/Gifted/Mentors
  Jeri Clayton, Administrative Assistant
  Robert Conder, AV Department
  Mike Maughan, AV Department
  Vicki Olsen, President, Jordan Education Association
  Kelly Giffin, President-elect, Jordan Education Association
  Dawn Ramsey, Mayor, South Jordan City
  Mike Haynes, Board Member, Utah State Board of Education
  Jeff Van Hulten, Director of Public Affairs, Utah State Board of Education

President Dunford presided and conducted. He welcomed those present. The Board of Education met in a study session to discuss the following:

A. Discussion on Long-term Plans for East South Jordan Elementary Schools

President Dunford stated that the Board is committed to having all Jordan District elementary schools on a traditional calendar and the only remaining school in the State on a year-round calendar is South Jordan Elementary. At the meeting on May 26 the Board looked at proposals that would make it possible for South Jordan Elementary to transition to a traditional schedule beginning with the 2021-22 school year. Ms. Miller proposed using the Lease Revenue Bond funds ear-marked for a new school in Herriman to construct a new school on the Burgon property. President Dunford invited Mr. Anderson,
associate superintendent, to present long-term growth and enrollment figures for both the east South Jordan and Herriman areas.

Mr. Anderson reviewed projected enrollments for the following elementary schools: Bastian, Blackridge, Butterfield Canyon, Foothills, Herriman, Jordan Ridge, Silver Crest, and South Jordan. He provided the same information for Sunset Ridge and Copper Mountain Middle Schools. The projections indicated that while both areas are growing, the Herriman area is outpacing growth in east South Jordan.

President Dunford reviewed the option to move the ALPS program from Jordan Ridge and do a boundary change to move approximately 200 students from South Jordan Elementary to Jordan Ridge Elementary. These changes would allow South Jordan Elementary to transition to a traditional schedule in the fall of 2021 and remain on a traditional schedule thereafter. He invited Ms. Miller to present two alternate options referred to as options B and C, with option A being the option just described.

Ms. Miller said during the past few weeks South Jordan and Jordan Ridge patrons have sent many emails and provided feedback about how to transition South Jordan to a traditional schedule. She said she and Ms. Richards discussed the feedback and both agree that it is important to disrupt as few students as possible while still providing a long-term sustainable plan. She presented the following two options:

Option B. Leave the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge, revoke permits of students attending South Jordan Elementary on permit, do a boundary change to move approximately 100 students from South Jordan to Jordan Ridge, and find room at South Jordan for about 100 students by adding portables and/or converting rooms used for other purposes to classrooms. This option may result in South Jordan Elementary having between eight and eleven portables.

Option C. Phase out the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge starting with the first grade in 2021-22 and allow students already in the ALPS program to remain at Jordan Ridge through sixth grade. Do a boundary change to move approximately 125 students from South Jordan to Jordan Ridge. Establish a new ALPS program in 2021-22 at another school for grades one through six to accommodate incoming first grade students as well as other students. Future growth areas may be able to be included in the Jordan Ridge boundaries.

Ms. Miller made a request that if the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge is removed or phased out, that ALPS families be accommodated at the school closest to their home, e.g., ALPS students currently attending Jordan Ridge but living closer to Riverton or Westland Elementary would be able to attend the ALPS program closest to their home.

Mr. Robinson stated that he researched ALPS programs in other districts and found that there are other ALPS options that the District could explore such as providing ALPS cluster programs which combines an ALPS classroom with regular education students or pulling ALPS students together during the day to provide specialized instruction. He suggested keeping some type of Gifted Talented program at Jordan Ridge to serve boundary students and to provide these same services to all schools rather than having magnet programs.

Mr. Robinson proposed creating an option D using option C, but with a commitment that boundary students in the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge continue to have an ALPS program available to them via a cluster program or other means.

President Dunford summarized the four options for Board members and stated that during the special Board meeting the Board will be voting to approve one of the options.

B. Preparation for Re-opening Plan
Mr. Bryce Dunford stated that the District is in the preliminary stages of developing a plan for reopening school in the fall and invited Mr. Mike Haynes, member of the Utah State Board of Education, to explain the document and process USBE has developed to guide the reopening efforts statewide.

Mr. Haynes thanked the Board for the opportunity to present them with reopening information. He explained that USBE created a draft document that outlines recommendations for reopening schools. The purpose of the document is to insure the safety of students and school personnel and promote collaboration between the State Department of Health, USBE, and LEAs in establishing a framework for reopening schools. He invited Board members to provide any recommendations they may have about the document. Mr. Haynes introduced Mr. Jeff Van Hulten, director of Public Affairs for USBE, to provide additional information.

Mr. Van Hulten said the document entitled *Return to 2020-2021 School Year Version 1.0* dated June 3, 2020, is available on the USBE website under the June 4 USBE meeting agenda date. He noted that the document will evolve and change as new information is gathered from many sources. Its purpose is to define roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders and provide guidance for delivering education during the pandemic era. He noted that USBE’s role is to provide guidance for the reopening of schools, but decisions regarding reopening will be in the hands of the local boards of education.

President Dunford invited Superintendent Godfrey to review his efforts towards establishing a reopening plan.

Dr. Godfrey reported that the administration has been working to gather information in preparation for creating a reopening plan that adheres to requirements of the different reopening phases. He said he is in the process of setting up focus groups that include parents, students, administrators, teachers and ESP employees and the purpose of the focus groups will be to gather input about concerns of reopening, potential impacts, and suggestions. Dr. Godfrey said the administration is also looking at various ways to deliver instruction and will seek input from the focus group participants with the ultimate decision to be made by the Board. The administration is also looking at equipment needs for the delivery of instruction, how teachers may be able to broadcast what is taking place in the classroom for students whose parents choose not to send them to school or if they become ill and have to quarantine at home. Along with this, online courses for students in grades K-8 are being created and parents will be notified that online classes will be available. He said the administration is also looking at policies and procedures for protecting employees and students. He reiterated that the goal is to be prepared with a range of options so the District can be responsive to the plan the Board would like to see implemented and the plan required by the local Health Department.

President Dunford asked for Board input about how involved members would like to be in the areas of input, decision, approval, and implementation. Board members expressed that any plan created needs to be flexible and meet the needs of the communities they represent, and that they would like to be involved in the creation of a plan.

President Dunford asked each Board member to create a list of reopening plan priorities and to submit them to Mr. Young so he can organize the priorities into one document in preparation for additional discussion at the June 23 study session.

At 7:06 p.m., the meeting adjourned. The Board convened in a Special Board meeting.

**SPECIAL BOARD MEETING**

Those recognized or signed-in as present:
- Bryce Dunford, Board President
- Tracy J. Miller, Board Vice President
- Matthew Young, Board Secretary
- Jen Atwood, Board Member (via electronic connection)
- Marilyn Richards, Board Member
President Dunford presided and conducted. He welcomed those present.

I. **Special Business**

A. **Consideration to Approve Long-term Solutions for East South Jordan Elementary Schools**

President Dunford stated that the Board has for some time been discussing how to transition South Jordan Elementary from a year-round calendar to a traditional calendar. He noted that there were four proposals discussed in study session and summarized each as follows:

**Option A.** Move the ALPS program from Jordan Ridge and do a boundary change to move approximately 200 students from South Jordan Elementary to Jordan Ridge Elementary. These changes would allow South Jordan Elementary to transition to a traditional schedule in the fall of 2021 and remain on a traditional schedule thereafter.

**Option B.** Leave the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge, revoke permits of students attending South Jordan Elementary, do a boundary change to move approximately 100 students from South Jordan to Jordan Ridge, and find room at South Jordan for about 100 students by adding
portables and/or converting rooms used for other purposes to classrooms. This option may result in South Jordan Elementary having between eight and eleven portables and will allow it to move to a traditional schedule.

Option C. Phase out the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge starting with the first grade in 2021-22 and allow students already in the ALPS program to remain at Jordan Ridge through sixth grade. Do a boundary change to move approximately 125 students from South Jordan to Jordan Ridge. Establish a new ALPS program in 2021-22 at another school for grades one through six to accommodate incoming first grade students as well as other students. Future growth areas may be able to be included in the Jordan Ridge boundaries.

Option D. Same as option C, but with a commitment that boundary students in the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge will continue to have an ALPS program available to them via a cluster program or other means.

Board Discussion

President Dunford invited each Board member to discuss the options and state their preference. A majority of Board members expressed support for option C as their first choice. Ms. Miller expressed a desire to hear the public comment prior to stating her preference.

President Dunford called for a motion.

MOTION: It was moved by Matt Young and seconded by Marilyn Richards to approve option C and direct staff to begin the transition of South Jordan Elementary to a traditional calendar for the 2021-22 academic year. This includes phasing out the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge Elementary, beginning the boundary change process between South Jordan Elementary and Jordan Ridge Elementary to move approximately 125 students to Jordan Ridge, revoking permits at South Jordan Elementary, and steps necessary to accommodate populations at both schools.

Public Comment

President Dunford instructed Mr. Larsen to read the written comments from patrons in the order received and as per Board policy, each submitted comment was given a total of three minutes with a total time allotted of 45 minutes. Mr. Larsen read comments received from the following individuals:

Shelleen Warner  Breinne Roberds  Bryson & Angela
David Vollmer  Mindy Dye  Duncan
Laura Ladle  Cherie Musick  Phoenix Le
Casey Toyama  Tyler Hill  Annie Kartchner
Rachel Wilson  Cynthia Cox  Carol Liska
Nicole Kerr  Eve Brown  Lauren Hoyt
Erik Simper  Julia Gunther-Kirkland  Katie & Richard Irion
Desiree & Adam  Stephanie Dalton  Lisa Molen
Van Dyke  Amy Kerksiek  Jamilah Decker
Diana Rees  Brianne Britton  Laurie Ashdown
Becky Smith

Copies of the written comments are attached at the conclusion of these minutes. (Attachment 1) Written comments received but not read were forwarded to Board members.

Following the reading of the submitted comments, President Dunford invited the following members of the public in attendance and who signed up to speak to address the Board:
Tanisha Collins asked to have the ALPS program remain at Jordan Ridge and to alleviate overcrowding at South Jordan she suggested leaving South Jordan Elementary on a year-round schedule until a new school can be built, adding portables to Jordan Ridge or other nearby schools, or doing a boundary change to send South Jordan students to Rosamond.

Kyle Anderson said he and other parents are advocating for option A as the quickest and most logical solution to solve the overcrowding at South Jordan Elementary.

Heather Van Leeuwen advocated for a two-step approach by approving option A and then building a new school to alleviate overcrowding at South Jordan Elementary.

Carlie Barrus expressed concern about overcrowding at South Jordan Elementary and asked the Board to approve option A.

Megan Stohl expressed support for moving South Jordan Elementary to a traditional schedule. She expressed hope that in the future a school can be built to help with overcrowding. She stated that option A is the best option now.

Lynel Miller stated that option B impacts the fewest number of children and suggested the Board build a new school to solve the overcrowding at South Jordan Elementary.

Sheri Mattle said while she doesn’t have children currently attending South Jordan Elementary, she supports the Board choosing option A.

Chase Nielsen stated that he understands this is a hard decision but of the available options, he supports option A.

Adrianne Clifford asked the Board to consider building a new school to alleviate overcrowding at South Jordan Elementary and to keep the school on a year-round schedule until it is completed. Of the options, she expressed her preference for option A.

Kristin Park said overcrowding will only get worse at South Jordan Elementary and she is in favor of option A.

Megan Hall stated that she would like South Jordan Elementary to move to a traditional schedule and expressed support for option A so this matter doesn’t have to be revisited again.

Nicole Bott said option A is the best option and that the good of 1,100 students should outweigh what is best for 176 students.

Jennie Cowan said she is advocating for her three children that attend South Jordan Elementary and asked the Board to approve Option A. She also asked the Board to consider building a new school.

Madison Irwin said she is in favor of option A and does not want her children to have to continue attending a school that is overcrowded.

Emily Evershed said she is representing a group of 46 ALPS families who are concerned for what will happen to their children. She asked the Board to leave the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge and to choose option B.

Katie Irion stated that her husband’s comments were read earlier in the meeting and she wanted to add that option A is needed now to solve the overcrowding problem. She said she favors this option even though her children will likely have to attend Jordan Ridge when the boundary change is done. She also expressed support for providing accelerated programs at all schools.
Board Discussion

President Dunford invited Board discussion.

Mr. Young made the following substitute motion.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION**

It was moved by Matt Young and seconded by Tracy Miller to approve option A to transfer the ALPS program from Jordan Ridge to another school by the 2021-22 school year, to direct staff to begin preparations for a boundary change to move approximately 200 students from South Jordan Elementary to Jordan Ridge Elementary, and to transition South Jordan Elementary to a traditional calendar, effective for the 2021-22 school year.

In response to a question from Mr. Robinson about why he is now in favor of option A, Mr. Young stated that while the decision is painful and disruptive for some, what he heard from South Jordan parents is that they want option A. He also expressed concern that a gradual phase-out of the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge will forestall the ability of the Jordan Ridge community to come together in creating a cohesive culture.

Ms. Richards said she wanted to point out that the target is to move 200 students from South Jordan Elementary but under option C that target would not be met for the first few years.

Mr. Robinson said he is not in favor of option A because it doesn’t make sense to move ALPS and then design a plan later to bring it back.

Ms. Miller said Option C was suggested by a South Jordan Elementary patron and apologized if some community members felt she was not representing them. She said she has had children in the ALPS program and has a strong desire to insure the program remains successful and to also expand it to give opportunities to more students. She also stated that the east South Jordan area is seeing an increase in enrollment and moving ALPS is the most fiscally responsible way to address overcrowding at South Jordan Elementary. She expressed confidence that the ALPS program, if moved to a different school, can remain as strong as the programs at Westland and Riverton Elementary Schools. She added that as she has stated before, she wants to insure that ALPS families are able to attend whichever program is closest to them. She also said she has a desire to see a Gifted and Talented program continue at Jordan Ridge. Ms. Miller said based on the community input, she is in favor of option A. She also stated that she will continue to advocate for a new school in east South Jordan.

**Vote on the Motion.** President Dunford called for a vote on Mr. Young’s substitute motion to approve option A to transfer the ALPS program from Jordan Ridge to another school by the 2021-22 school year and to direct staff to begin preparations for a boundary change to move approximately 200 students from South Jordan Elementary to Jordan Ridge Elementary, also effective for the 2021-22 school year. The motion passed with a vote of four to three as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryce Dunford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Miller</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Young</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Atwood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Richards</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Robinson</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Voorhies</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Miller asked to have added to a future study session agenda a continuation of the discussion regarding the long-term plan for the Gifted and Talented program and to discuss the transition of the ALPS program out of Jordan Ridge to address concerns expressed by parents.
Mr. Young stated that the last couple of weeks the state and nation have been experiencing turmoil with regard to race relations. He suggested that the Board have a discussion in a study session regarding how to invite input from the District’s African-American community members about what it is like to be African-American in the Jordan District community.

Board members agreed to Mr. Young’s recommendation and President Dunford asked to have this matter placed on an upcoming study session agenda.

At 9:40 p.m., the meeting adjourned.

**MOTION:** At 9:40 p.m., it was moved by Marilyn Richards and seconded by Jen Atwood to go into closed session. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

**CLOSED SESSION**

Those recognized or signed-in as present:
- Bryce Dunford, Board President
- Tracy J. Miller, Board Vice President
- Matthew Young, Board Secretary
- Jen Atwood, Board Member (via electronic connection)
- Marilyn Richards, Board Member
- Darrell Robinson, Board Member (via electronic connection)
- Janice L. Voorhies, Board Member (via electronic connection)
- Anthony A. Godfrey, Superintendent
- Michael Anderson, Associate Superintendent
- John Larsen, Business Administrator
- Paul Van Komen, Burbidge & White (via electronic connection)

President Dunford presided and conducted. The Board of Education met in a closed session to discuss personnel, potential litigation, and negotiations. The closed session discussion was recorded and archived.

**MOTION:** At 10:16 p.m., it was moved by Tracy Miller and seconded by Marilyn Richards to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

JL/jc
Members of the School Board,

Thank you, Board Members, for allowing public comment on this important issue and not just voting during a study session. This decision will profoundly impact my family and I do appreciate the opportunity to voice concerns. I also hope that this is not a similar situation to what Ms. Jen Atwood said where the members of the board have already made their decision before public comment was received. I have signed my name to the letter sent in by other ALPS parents begging for consideration of other options for moving South Jordan Elementary to traditional schedule besides removing the ALPS program from Jordan Ridge Elementary. I echo their suggestions for other alternatives. I also want to add my additional perspective as an ALPS parent who resides within the boundaries of Jordan Ridge.

According to the numbers read in the Study session on May 12, South Jordan needs to place 200 students. There are only 182 ALPS students at Jordan Ridge. There are also 39 ALPS students living in Jordan Ridge boundaries. I have spoken to many boundary ALPS parents and even though they feel conflicted, they said they would keep their children at Jordan Ridge and not follow the program, no matter which school it gets placed. So if 80% of Jordan Ridge boundary ALPS students choose to stay that is 30 children. That means only 150 seats would be freed up. Arrangements would still need to be made to accommodate another 50 students somewhere. Since other arrangements would still have to be made to accommodate those needs, why not consider and address other options that would not rip out a successful program that has become the fabric of the school?

In that same study session Mr. Darrell Robinson said, “A magnet program should be able to be moved.” That is only true if you want the program to remain an entity unto itself. However, in order for a program to be truly successful, it has to be able to fully integrate into all aspects of the school. The Advanced Learning Program has done that at Jordan Ridge. That is why the program is so successful at our school! It has been woven and incorporated into every aspect of the school itself from the students, to the employees, to the volunteers, and to the many extra-curricular programs offered at Jordan Ridge that cater to talented and gifted minds. Programs like band, coding club, Lego club, and chess club to name a few. Advanced Learning has become part of the “fabric of the school.” To rip it away would leave a hole that may cause other sections to unravel. I do not want that to happen at my school.

As examples, I am the current PTA president this year. I see first hand the number of hours ALPs parents volunteer. I am also the chess club coach. The majority of our participants are ALPS students. I cannot foresee the ability to continue with the club if all those inquisitive minds were taken away.

Another question I would like to put forth. I appreciate that all the board is desirous that the ALPS program does continue its success but it also seems like everyone also acknowledges that it will take time for it to do so. Integration does take time. Growth is happening rapidly in the northwest part of the district. As the population swells in that area, if the program is moved to that area, will the board have to once again address moving the program right at the time it is trying to put down new roots and start new traditions?

In conclusion, please look at some other alternatives, like the ones listed in the other letter from us ALPS parents. Please do not just vote on what you have already decided because it seems like the easiest option. The numbers already indicate it is not going to be the only change you would have to make to accommodate the South Jordan Elementary students so please do not rip the fabric of our school to shreds in the process.

Thank you,
Shelleen Warner
Jordan Ridge Boundary Parent and ALPS parent,
PTA president, and SCC member

****

From: David <dvollmer@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 12:05 PM
Subject: Alps at JRE
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

I strongly oppose moving the ALPs program from JRE. It was one of the main reasons we moved into this school boundary.

We have had all of our kids go to JRE and we would like to keep the program.

David Vollmer

****

From: Laura Ladle <lladle@hotmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 12:15 PM
Subject: SJE Schedule change
To: boardcomments@jordandistrict.org <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

I personally prefer the year round schedule. My child thrives with the breaks afforded by this schedule. I would prefer not to have more portables. I would rather the ALP program be moved in order to allow kids to go to the school closest to them and associate with their neighbors.

****

From: Casey Gowon <casey.gowon@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 12:19 PM
Subject: ALPS Relocation
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

My son will be in 2nd grade at Jordan Ridge Elementary School in the Fall. He is an ALPS student. The biggest issue we would have with relocating the program to another location is that because he is on the Autism Spectrum; he has a very hard time with change. Changing schools would be a huge change, and I see it affecting him in a very negative way. I know that this is not the case with all ALPS students, but this is a very real challenge for us.

Thank you
Casey Toyama

****

From: Rachel Wilson <racheldwilson@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 1:34 PM
Subject: ALPS Moving
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

I would hate it if ALPS moved! We applied to alps because it was already in our boundary but it's been so good for my daughter. If it moved she wouldn't be at school with any of her other friends and neighbors. Carpools would be out the window. She's been wanting to ride her bike to school when she's older and that would no longer be an option. Jordan Ridge would have a lower rating and our house value might go down! I know a lot of people who moved to be closer to Jordan Ridge and ALPS and if it moves they're screwed! There are already more kids that need the ALPS program than can be accommodated. Can't we just add more ALPS programs throughout the district? Also Jordan Ridge is the farthest West school that has it even though there's a large population further west than it. If you're going to move I'd say put it closer to the daybreak people where I know a lot of my daughter's classmates are located.

But please don't move it!

****

From: Nicole Kerr <npkerr26@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 1:47 PM
Subject: Comment on Jordan Ridge
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

While this does seem like an option, it still doesn't seem to discuss the real issue, it just moves the problem elsewhere. You will still have to cut attendance for another school and move those students to another school and ultimately creating the same issue elsewhere. It seems smarter to have a new elementary school built, though, expensive, it would ultimately remedy the situation better. Especially with the rapid growth of homes being built and how much South Jordan is already growing, it seems like an inevitable option. I personally would rather my kids school not have the ALPS program moved.

****

From: Erik Simper <eriksimper@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 3:17 PM
Subject: SJE Boundary Discussion
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

(Please consider sharing this in the June 9th Board Meeting)

Dear School Board Members,

We live in South Jordan Elementary boundaries north of Shields Lane and east of 1300 W -- an area subject to multiple boundary change discussions in recent years. We have three students at South Jordan Elementary and a fourth starting soon. The decisions you make will affect our family for the better part of the next decade. Thank you for taking these decisions so seriously.

I support South Jordan Elementary staying on a year-round schedule with a modified calendar that shortens off-track times and lengthens summers to a minimum of 6-7 weeks per track. This calendar would better align with a traditional schedule.
Should the Board decide that Year-round school is no longer an option, I support relocating the ALPS program from Jordan Ridge Elementary to be in a position to appropriately address capacity issues. Additionally, I support the following:

Build a new elementary school on the Mabey Lane property.
Add on to the existing South Jordan Elementary to create enough capacity to accommodate long-term growth.
Modify school boundaries. Either relocate our neighborhood to Jordan Ridge Elementary or relocate the students on the south end to another school.

I do not support options that remove computer labs from South Jordan Elementary or cram too many students into a traditional schedule.

Any boundary change is disruptive to students and families, whether it be my kids, ALPS kids, or others, so please consider solutions that can withstand long-term growth to minimize future disruption. I strongly support options that keep logical feeder school alignment.

Thank you for your consideration as you make these important decisions.

Sincerely,
Erik Simper

From: desireegvd@yahoo.com <desireegvd@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 6:15 PM
Subject: Boundary Change Comment
To: boardcomments@jordandistrict.org <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>
Cc: marilynrichards4jordan@gmail.com <marilynrichards4jordan@gmail.com>, tracymiller.ut@gmail.com <tracymiller.ut@gmail.com>, bryce@dunford.com <bryce@dunford.com>

Thank you for taking the time to ensure that all families were notified about the proposed boundary change. You have difficult jobs and your work is appreciated.

I am writing in support of the boundary changes and removal of ALPS from Jordan Ridge. I submitted a comment and it was not read at the board meeting last week. I know many Jordan Ridge parents, that do not have ALPS students, contacted the board and, it is unfortunate that more of our comments were not read. Input from South Jordan Elementary and non ALPS families need to be heard.

It is time for South Jordan Elementary families to be allowed to go traditional. No magnet program should have priority over the entire population of one school. It is unnecessary when a reasonable boundary change is available. As great as it would be to have a new school, as discussed, these are tough economic times. I don't see how the investment could be reasonable by 2021-2022 and why South Jordan Elementary families should have to wait any longer.

I oppose all magnet programs. In my opinion they take the focus off the larger population of students that deserve the same attention. My biggest complaint about having high achieving students in an ALPS school, is that, rather than get the extra attention they need, they are encouraged to participate in ALPS. It's like there is a ceiling. It would be amazing if JSD took all of the funding and effort put into its magnet programs and transferred its resources to create curriculums to accommodate all high level learners in each and every school. Our entire community would be better served. If families need something more than that, they could consider charter or private. This is public school. Keep the focus on the larger pool of students rather than the few.

I have two high level learners in Jordan Ridge and one honor student at South Jordan Middle. We chose not to participate in ALPS for social reasons. Our children are qualified but there is a clear divide among the students and many times my kids have been made to feel "less than". The last two years of boundary changes have now created a divide among the parents. I want our school to be united, not split this way. I serve on the PTA, I am always a room mom, and I volunteer every chance I get. I love our school. I want the parents to be cohesive and end the undertcurrents caused by this program. They divert energy that could, and should, be better spent elsewhere.

My heart goes out to all of the ALPS parents who are doing and fighting for what they feel is best for their children. As I hear individual family stories, I empathize and understand their struggle. It is not fair for them to have to be unsure of their children's path. Please cater to ALL high level students at EVERY school and end this ongoing issue. Boundary changes would be much easier. It will be difficult to move ALPS now, it will be every bit as difficult in 2 years. Get it done so people can plan, and so South Jordan Middle does not have to continue waiting.

Best Regards,
Desiree and Adam Van Dyke

From: Diana Rees <dianarees3@msn.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 2, 2020 at 2:00 PM
Subject: South Jordan Elementary
To: boardcomments@jordandistrict.org <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>
I listened to the last board meeting and I am very pro new school for South Jordan... I feel like South Jordan Schools are only going to see more growth in the future and why not prepare now. However, if that is not an option, I would really love to see the ALPS program moved to another school so South Jordan can accommodate its residents. My family and neighbors on the South side of 114th South feel like we just fought this battle with the District Boundary changes, only to have to stress about this again. My family and several others in my Neighborhood did our research when we purchased our homes in South Jordan, we would like to ensure we stay in South Jordan Elementary especially since this change will not affect changes us out of South Jordan Middle School or Bingham High School. I appreciate your hard work in trying to make the best decisions for the future.

****

From: Becky Smith <1beckyjsmith@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 2, 2020 at 7:05 PM
Subject: moving the ALPS program
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

I think this is a wonderful idea! There is no reason any school should have to be on a year-round calendar system when there are viable options to make it so that wouldn’t have to be the case. Having had children in both year-round and traditional elementary schools while having other kids in middle and high school, I know from experience that when all children of a household are on the same schedule, life is so much easier. I fully support moving the ALPS program from Jordan Ridge Elementary.

Becky Smith

****

From: Breinne Roberds <breburk10@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 2, 2020 at 9:54 PM
Subject: Alps moving
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

The number of Alps students does not even come close to the number Of students at SJE!!!! Please let the 1100 kids move to traditional and move the Alps program, if nothing else than looking at the number of kids that will be affected. The Alps kids are already attending outside their current school boundaries by their own choice. They are choosing the Alps program. SJE wants a choice and we choose traditional! Please don’t cater to the few and let the majority have a voice.

****

From: Mindy Kay <mkdye@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 3, 2020 at 11:34 PM
Subject: Jordan Ridge ALPS program
To: boardcomments@jordandistrict.org <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

To Whom It May Concern:

I live in the Jordan Ridge boundaries. While I don't have anything against the ALPS program being at our school, I don't feel that the ALPS program should continue at Jordan Ridge when South Jordan Elementary School is looking to go traditional and they are willing to bus students (as I understand it) to Jordan Ridge to alleviate their over population needs. It just makes sense to move ALPS to another school in the Jordan District that has the lower student numbers and can easily host the program so that we can focus on the schools in South Jordan having what they need.

The other benefit that I feel most affects me would be having less cars dropping off kids at Jordan Ridge if the program is moved. There is so much traffic at the school in the morning and after school and it has become dangerous at some places for the kids walking home. I would love to have less cars at our school and not have the craziness of before and after school traffic and I think moving the ALPS program would alleviate a lot of the cars.

Thank you for your time!
Mindy Dye

****

From: Cherie Musick <ccmusick@msn.com>
Date: Fri, Jun 5, 2020 at 8:13 AM
Subject: South Jordan Elementary and ALPS
To: boardcomments@jordandistrict.org <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear Board Members,

First of all, I want to thank you for shelving this vote for a couple of weeks as it has given South Jordan Elementary parents a chance to comment. I listened to the entire board meeting last week and while I empathize with the ALPS parents, their views didn’t address the
bigger problem. I’m not privy to exact numbers, but I know if you look at the percentage of families that moving ALPS affects it is significantly smaller than the number of families affected by an entire school being on a year round schedule and overcrowded. It sounds like from listening to the meeting that all other immediate options have been exhausted. If there is no budget to build a new school and it was voted down last time, then that can’t be the best alternative solution.

I know the ALPS parents are concerned for their children. We all are concerned for our children’s education. I have two children that qualify for the ALPS program, but we have chosen to keep them at South Jordan Elementary to be with their friends from the neighborhood and to continue strengthening our community. There are highly motivated students in each school and I think if you chose to still have your child attend their neighborhood school, you would find that. Ideally, I think it could help all ALPS kids to have ALPS teachers/programs in every elementary school in the district. I would be interested to know the monetary difference between doing that and adding a new school if that’s the only other option. However, in the meantime, the problems we face at South Jordan Elementary are getting worse every year with overcrowding and the elementary students being on a different schedule than the older children in their families. It really doesn’t make sense to have just one school in the State of Utah on a year round schedule and I appreciate the opportunity for discussion to remedy this problem.

We all have to make choices when it comes to our children’s education and it seems like this scenario is one that has to address the bigger picture over the needs of a few. Of course the ALPS kids are important, but so are the other students in the district. In a public education within the same district, every child and family should be supported equally. Thank you for time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Cherie Musick

From: tyehill08@gmail.com <tyehill08@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jun 5, 2020 at 4:34 PM
Subject: Comment to be read at the 6/9/20 board meeting regarding JRE/SJE boundary realignment and removal of ALPS
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

I enjoyed hearing the compassion and concern, the South Jordan Elementary parents shared about the special needs students that attend their school. How those students are part of the community and schools fabric that make South Jordan Elementary what it is today. As I listened I heard so many parallels with the NEEDS of the Special Education students and the NEEDS of ALPS students. ALPS (and comparable gifted and talented programs) are not an extra incentive, it like special education, is a NEED and should be viewed as such by the board and the district. We can’t chose which students needs are greater or which needs hold merit for funding and consideration.

All these students matter and all of the parents in east South Jordan want a fair solution. Both sets of parents want the same solution, to stay in their South Jordan feeder system and have their elementary aged students needs met. The environment that has been created is a devisive one. One where it is the South Jordan Elementary parents vs. the Jordan Ridge ALPS parents. This has been created because instead of moving forward with a new elementary school, which is the number one choice by both South Jordan Elementary and Jordan Ridge Elementary parents. The other solutions presented are ones designed in which one of these groups has to LOSE. The public and board all recognize we will need a new school in the next couple years, in east South Jordan, regardless of the decision made for the 2021-22 school year. The removal of ALPS and new boundary is a reactive, short term solution that lacks any future long term planning to address growth on the east side of South Jordan nor does it address the implementation of the ALPS committees recommendation to extend gifted and talented resources to more of the district's elementary aged students.

We need leadership! We need proactive planning! We need long term solutions with clearly laid out plans, with implementation steps to address growth in east South Jordan and the long term strategies for the ALPS/Gifted & Talented. In a recent board meeting the board acknowledged year round schooling could be reintroduced in the next few years to address the overcrowding in our area, despite all of this conflict and disruption to get SJE off of a year round calendar. This is unacceptable to continue to do this to the students in South Jordan. Land availability in east South Jordan is dwindling and its scarcity is only outmatched by the difficulty the district has faced when trying to acquire said land. The Burgon property is owned by the district and needs to be the site of the new elementary school. Anything else being built on this property would be highly irresponsible. The suggestion of a secondary location of the Kauri Sue Hamilton school on this property is thoughtless. This would clusters that resource all in one area of the district versus adding that secondary option in the west or north area and better serving the district as a whole and where land acquisitions can be made.

The only objective being met with moving ALPS and a boundary adjustment between SJE and JRE is a subpar solution that speaks to the lack of planning when boundary lines were originally redrawn. The plan should have forecasted for South Jordan Elementary to get off a year round schedule. The problem cannot be summed up with just lack of planning but also encompasses the NEED for a new elementary school on the east side of the district that has been put off for far too long. Yes, South Jordan Elementary is one of the most crowded schools in the district, by design South Jordan Elementary would have an extra class per grade. The board and the district knew they were one of two school still on a year round schedule when they drew the boundary lines and did not address or solve for it. The elementary schools on the east side of South Jordan are all crowded. Jordan Ridge, South Jordan and Monte Vista. Monte Vista has been operating with 12 portable classrooms and is finally getting a much needed addition to the school, this was planned for. Again the year round calendar and overcrowding at SJE were known factors that were not proactively planned for. How has the district responded to the overcrowding on the west side of the district? Many new schools have been constructed elsewhere in the district, in Herriman, Daybreak and even Bluffdale and West Jordan. We have built new schools that allow for BOTH the new schools and the existing schools to operate on a traditional calendar. South Jordan Elementary has been referred to as being “one of the most overcrowded” again this was known and stating otherwise ignorance. We all recognize this was a pain point in the
Canyons/Jordan district split, because resources were being dedicated to the west bench while the rest of the district suffered. Yet we still continue to operate similarly in a very reactive and not proactive way.

A lot of the discussion refers back to timelines and speed to implement a solution. But if Covid-19 has taught us anything it has shown we are capable of much more than we realize and can do so in a short time. You work with highly intelligent people in the field of education. Let us be an example to the students we serve and show we can do hard things despite tight timelines and build the school over the next year to two year and end the year round calendar. We can accomplish this, as well as keep ALPS at Jordan Ridge with Elk Ridge as its feeder ALPS middle school until the board has district wide strategy can be implemented. Trying to move and establish the program at a new school without a ALPS feeder middle school creates disruption and another hole in the education path of our students and it does not compliment the long term strategy for our gifted and talented/high achieving students district wide.

Tyler Hill
Parent of 2 ALPS students, currently at Jordan Ridge
Monte Vista Boundary

****

From: Cynthia Cox <soxandco5@yahoo.com>
Date: Sun, Jun 7, 2020 at 5:24 PM
Subject: SJE schedule and ALPS
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear board members,

Thank you for your hard work during these last few months.

I do feel I have a unique perspective. I am a district employee. I reside in the SJE boundary and I have had two children who attended JRE for ALPS. In one of those years, I had one child at JRE and another at SJE on different tracks, because that is what was best for each of my children. I love both schools. Both have helped my children immensely.

While I don’t have a creative solution that would move SJE to a traditional schedule, I do NOT want to see ALPS moved either, the schools has an incredible environment and I feel it would be a disservice to the ALPS students to move them. I would rather stay on a year round schedule until a creative solution is found rather than disrupt the gifted and talented program.

Thank you

****

From: eve-marie Brown <iaoranatiare@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, Jun 7, 2020 at 7:53 PM
Subject: Comment for the June 9th meeting about South Jordan Elementary boundary changes
To: boardcomments@jordandistrict.org <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

I am a parent of three children in the South Jordan Elementary School boundaries.

We have loved South Jordan Elementary School and the teachers there. We would be very sad to leave it to go to another school. This being said, if the switch to traditional schedule means that there will more students per class and we loose some playground area, our computer lab and the drop off/pick up area and cafeteria are even more congested than they are currently, then we would rather change school than have that. As long as changing schools allows our children to have smaller classes and a less congested school then that's what we would prefer.

Thank you for taking my comment and for everything you for a children's education.

Eve Brown

****

From: Julia Gunther Kirkland <juliakelsey@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 11:15 AM
Subject:
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear Board Members,

I am a mother of 4 South Jordan Elementary attendees and anticipate another 3 of mine attending in the future.

I am VERY concerned with the negative impact of adding additional portables to SJE due to overcrowding. My oldest daughter was in a portable this past year, and I believe it negatively impacted her learning this year. Furthermore, with the uncertainty of COVID-19,
having an increase in children in portables, places an unreasonable and very dangerous risk of infection due to overcrowding within a small, poorly ventilated space. Please do not place our children in this environment. As a physician and mother, I am deeply concerned about this.

Please do not hesitate to call me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Dr. Julia Gunther Kirkland

****

From: Stephanie Dalton <stephwatts@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 11:27 AM
Subject: South Jordan Elementary school options for 2021-2022
To: <Boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Hello!

I am a parent of 3 South Jordan Elementary School students for the upcoming school year. I have reviewed the options that were made available and wanted to share my opinion for which you should choose.

Obviously we need to build a new school, option F, whether it is on the Burgon property or not, but since that option will not be available for the next school year, that is not applicable. It should be discussed as an option for the 2022-2023 school year since it cannot be built in time for the 2021-2022 or further school year.

I am against option A because it seems like the school will be filled to capacity and the students will suffer as well as the faculty because the school is not big enough, it doesn't matter how many portable classrooms you add, what about the inside facilities? The lunch room, the computer rooms, the gym etc. I don't think it's a good fit because the other options make more sense and would help alleviate the crowding. This is the same reason I am opposed to option E. The addition to the school seems silly if we're just going to build another school. Option E is also hard because it takes away from the outside property for the kids to play.

I am for any of the boundary changes, option B, C or D. From the pictures I have seen of the proposed boundary changes, it seems as if it makes the students in those areas more able to attend the school that is closer to them, especially options B, and C. Option D is my least favorite, but it allows the students not to have to cross 11400 S to go to school.

I agree with many of the board members that option C is the best. I think the ALPS program should be moved. The boundary change helps the kids go to the school that is closer to them and it keeps them in the same feeder school.

Thanks for your time,
Stephanie

****

From: Amy Kerksiek <teamkerksiek@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 1:46 PM
Subject: ALPS relocation comment
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear Members of the Jordan School Board,

I am the proud parent of three ALPS students in the Jordan School District. In January of 2016, my husband accepted a new job in Salt Lake City, which relocated our family from Washington state. My husband's one request is that we live in South Jordan as he is a Utah native and a graduate of Bingham High School. My oldest child at the time was in 2nd grade and had been tested by the local school district and qualified for the highly capable program there (comparable to the ALPS program here). So in looking for a house, my focus was narrowed to the city of South Jordan and a house in the boundaries of an ALPS school as the education of my children has always been my first priority. As you can guess, my internet search led me to Jordan Ridge. As a family we made a sacrifice to wait for a house in the Jordan Ridge boundaries. My husband found temporary housing in Utah, as I stayed back in Washington state with three young children while also expecting our fourth baby. It all paid off, or so we thought, when we were finally able to locate a house in the Jordan Ridge boundaries that met our family's needs. In January 2017, one year after my husband started his job in Salt Lake, our children began school at Jordan Ridge. Our oldest child was placed in a wonderful ALPS class there. Since then our two other school age children have tested and been placed in the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge. It was to our great discouragement to learn of the Jordan School District's possible plan to relocate the ALPS program from Jordan Ridge. I am a former elementary school teacher in the Alpine School District and this past year I came back into the workforce as a substitute teacher for the Jordan School District. It worked out perfectly since my kids could walk home from Jordan Ridge if I was substituting at a different school in the district. If the ALPS program is relocated to West Jordan and my kids attend, I will no longer have that luxury and will most likely be unable to continue to work as a substitute for the Jordan School District. Therefore, I am left deciding between giving my kids an educational opportunity at an ALPS school that will challenge them or keeping a job to help support my family. Sure, there is the other option to place them in a general education class at Jordan Ridge. I would like to share a couple of personal reasons why this is less than desirable for my children. My daughter just finished her 3rd grade ALPS year at Jordan Ridge. In December of this last school year, she completed the Lexia
program which is equivalent to the end of 5th grade curriculum. When school was dismissed to home in mid-March, my daughter was still the only student in her 3rd grade ALPS class to have completed this educational program. Another example is my son that just completed kindergarten. In March of this year, I subbed in a general education 3rd grade class at Jordan Ridge where I was instructed to have the students work on their Lexia learning. Of those 3rd graders, seven of them were at the same level or lower than my kindergarten son. He is now on level 12, or the equivalent of the end of 2nd grade learning when he just barely finished kindergarten. I was informed that there are 150 children living in the city of South Jordan just like my children that qualify for ALPS and need the extra challenge from being in an ALPS classroom with a trained ALPS teacher. Relocating ALPS from Jordan Ridge will not only negatively impact the ALPS students, but will be a hardship for their entire families, not to mention the current ALPS teachers at Jordan Ridge.

For those board members that see this email, I am including a picture of my children so you can see some of the faces of actual South Jordan ALPS students whose lives will be forever impacted by your decision. Thank you for your time. It is my greatest hope that the best decision is made for the ALPS students and families residing in South Jordan by keeping an ALPS program at Jordan Ridge Elementary.

Sincerely,
Amy Kerksiek

From: Brianne Britton <brianne.britton@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 3:11 PM
Subject: South Jordan Elementary Boundary Discussion
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear Board,

I am a parent at South Jordan Elementary. I respectfully ask that you consider moving the ALPs program to a less-crowded area to allow for boundary changes with Jordan Ridge to ensure kids currently at SJE would be able to stay in the current feeder system for middle and high schools and to ease the overcrowding at SJE. Boundary changes with Riverside do not provide a safe walking path and do not provide busing. My oldest child attended ALPs at Jordan Ridge, so I understand the appeal of this magnet program and of having it in this area. However, it is an optional choice. An optional program should not take precedence over an overcrowded school. There are roughly 180 students in the ALPs program. This small minority should not be more important than the approximately 1100 students at SJE. Lack of planning for the growth in the eastern part of South Jordan has created an issue where hard choices now have to be made. I would love for a new school to be built in our area and believe the school district could be creative in building a school on the property already owned, but since that seems to be years off, the best suggestion is a boundary alignment, as was done last year to the benefit of all schools in the district, except it seems South Jordan. This decision should have been made last year. I'm not against adding a few more portables to help ease some of the overcrowding. IF the change also includes some boundary changes. 12-15 portables doesn't make sense, especially if this means reduced playground space, rotation experiences, and overcrowding our cafeteria. The ALPs families are a small but vocal group that is already choosing to attend a school that may not be in their boundaries (my son attended ALPs with a classmate coming from Sandy), and this small population should not take precedence over an entire school. Please make the best logical and best long-term decision for South Jordan Elementary families and realign boundaries with Jordan Ridge and relocate the ALPs program.

Sincerely,
Brianne Britton.

From: T LE <tle305@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 4:20 PM
Subject: Relocating Jordan Ridge ALPS
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>, <bryce@dunford.com>, <tracymiller.ut@gmail.com>, <matthewyoung127@gmail.com>, <jenzatwood@gmail.com>, <marilynrichards4jordan@gmail.com>, <drdarrellrobinson@gmail.com>, <janice.voorhies@gmail.com>, Melissa Beck <melissa.beck@jordandistrict.org>, Kimberly Sanders <kimberly.sanders@jordandistrict.org>, Leslie Shelledy <leslie.shelledy@jordandistrict.org>

Dear Jordan School District Board Members:

Thank you for all the work that you do including the behind the scenes daily tasks that go unnoticed; however, I disagree with the board’s current plan to move ALPS from Jordan Ridge Elementary.

Jordan Ridge ALPS is not a portable program that can be easily and successfully transplanted to another school simply with some additional cost to train teachers to become ALPS teachers and with the buy-in by the principal at the new school as claimed by the board’s 5/12/20 study session. ALPS is a great program because of Jordan Ridge and vice versa. This integration between ALPS and Jordan Ridge took years to develop. If Jordan Ridge's ALPS program is portable, then lets train teachers in every school in our district to become ALPS teachers and have the principal from each school buy in and we will miraculously have successful ALPS programs in all of our elementary schools.
Do we want to move ALPS and ruin the only high ranked elementary school in South Jordan? We should investigate to understand what makes Jordan Ridge a top ranked and well-loved school instead of studying how to dismantle its successful ALPS program. Let's focus on long-term planning to improve education for all our students including possibly expanding ALPS.

Moving ALPS from Jordan Ridge will have negative consequences including decreased quality of the education, along with long-term negative emotional and developmental effects for some ALPS students. Also, in the past, affluent families have bought homes in Jordan Ridge boundary because Jordan Ridge has an ALPS program and is a top ranked school. Once ALPS is moved, affluent families may seek to invest in their children’s education elsewhere, including in another school district with better ranked schools and programs. This will further decrease our districts' school funding collected through property tax. Also, the value of the homes in Jordan Ridge boundary may decrease as well further decreasing our district's education fund.

We can not justify helping South Jordan Elementary at the sacrificial expense of Jordan Ridge. Until we have enough funds to build a new school on the east side of South Jordan, how about we transfer some students from South Jordan Elementary to Jordan Ridge without moving ALPS. We can hire more teachers/aids and place more portables at Jordan Ridge and South Jordan Elementary if needed to make this temporary plan work.

Thank you to each board member’s commitment to improve the education of all our students, who are our most precious investments. I ask the board to consider moving students from South Jordan Elementary to Jordan Ridge without moving ALPS or to consider another alternative solution that will benefit both South Jordan Elementary and Jordan Ridge until we can build a new school on the east side of South Jordan.

A concerned parent with 2 ALPS students at Jordan Ridge, whose in-boundary school is Welby Elementary.

Trung Le

****

From: Angela Duncan <angelamduncan@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 7:31 PM
Subject: South Jordan Elementary School Schedule
To: boardcomments@jordandistrict.org <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear School Board,

It has come to our attention that the school board intends to change South Jordan Elementary to a traditional school calendar starting the 21-22 school year. We are writing to voice our concerns with this change and strongly urge the board to reconsider.

First, as parents of four children at the school, we found it inappropriate that this news was announced as an afterthought in a survey concerning school schedules during the pandemic. There were no meetings to hear public comments about this change, and so it came as an unsettling surprise that it was a sure thing.

Second, there are many reasons why changing South Jordan Elementary to a traditional calendar is not the best option:

- To accommodate the number of students, more portables will need to be built.
  - This is an added expense to the district and tax payers. The money spent on portables can be saved for building another school in the district, alleviating the already large classroom sizes.
  - Portable classrooms are not well ventilated, increasing the risk of sickness being spread.
  - The remote access to bathrooms is a poor experience for learning since it takes 3x the amount of time for a student to use a bathroom.
  - There are also safety concerns with teachers being alone with students.
- The learning experience with the year-round schedule has been very positive for our children and many others. We have found that children are not as easily "burned out" from school by the middle of the year. The frequency of off-track periods gives students time to refresh and then get back to learning with excitement.
- Going to a traditional calendar gives parents and students less flexibility with vacation schedules. A great thing about year-round school (and a key reason we moved to this school area) is that we can take family vacation time during off-peak time periods, providing more enjoyable experiences, less-costly travelling, and easier to find accommodations.
- Changing to a traditional school schedule will create more traffic problems around the vicinity of the school. The school is positioned in an area where it is very difficult to get in and out. Traffic is already difficult during drop-off and pick-up times, but changing everyone to a traditional calendar will ensure more traffic, resulting in greater wait times, more tardiness (at no fault of the students), and an increased safety risk to children walking or riding.
- Classroom sizes will be larger with a traditional calendar. There are plenty of obvious reasons why this is not optimal.
- Moving to a traditional calendar ignores the root of the problem--more students coming into the area each year. The year-round schedule has handled this problem well so far. We encourage the school board to be more creative in finding solutions to this problem.

Based on the feedback we’ve received from many other parents in our neighborhoods, this is a very serious issue that hasn't been well communicated and seems to be forced upon everyone with no public input. Most parents we’ve spoken with are strongly against moving to a traditional calendar. Please consider these points and bring the decision-making more out in the open.
We are happy to provide more detail to any of the items listed above. Please advise as to what the board plans to do to address these concerns.

Sincerely,
Bryson & Angela Duncan
801-979-0403

****

From: T LE <tle305@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 8:30 PM
Subject: ALPS moving Letter from student
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear Jordan District Board,

I am a fourth-grade ALPS student at Jordan Ridge Elementary (JRE). I disapprove of the motion to move Jordan Ridge's ALPS program to West Jordan. I understand that it's one way to allow South Jordan Elementary (SJE) to transition to a traditional school schedule, but you shouldn't do it. Here's why.

The main reason you should not move ALPS from my school is that it would negatively impact JRE's students, teachers, and the ALPS program. We would be put in an environment that would be unfamiliar and strange. The teachers would not be able to teach as well because they would have to learn a new system and that takes time. We wouldn't be able to learn as well because we will also have to learn a new system. My fellow students and I would be frustrated and confused trying to learn in a new environment. That is why you shouldn't move my school's ALPS program.

I understand that board members feel that they have no other choice but to move ALPS from my school to West Jordan; however, this is not the only solution. One possible solution is to move 200 SJE students to JRE and not move the ALPS program. JRE's website says "Current enrollment is 975." Although the number will change in the next two years, I would imagine that it will stay around that number. The Jordan School District's website says that the capacity of my school is 1130 students. If you were to add 200 additional students, it would somewhat go over the capacity by 45 students, but this is still workable if we add more portables to my school to accommodate them.

In conclusion, please do not move my school's ALPS program because it would harm the students, teachers, and the ALPS program in my school. There are other ways to help SJE's without hurting our school.

A very concerned student,
Phoenix.

****

From: Annie Kartchner <anniekartchner@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 8:50 PM
Subject: Please move us to traditional by moving ALPS
To: boardcomments@jordandistrict.org <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear Board

We are asking that you find a way to move South Jordan Elementary to traditional as soon as you can rather than years down the road. We prefer a boundary change with Jordan Ridge over the other options you have looked at. We think it is the most financially sound and most logical option that is available at the present moment. Then once SJE is on the same schedule as the rest of the district, you continue to look at options for building a school when possible because of the possibility of future growth. Here are some of the reasons we prefer traditional over year round:

- We are the only school left on year round which means you have to keep a few crossing guards, bus drivers and lunch workers on staff all year long. I am not sure about district support staff, but I am sure it is difficult for district teacher training programs when only a few of your elementary teachers don’t have the same days off.
- It is hard to find aides for our school who are willing to be a non-track position. Many parents are willing to fill those spots but they don’t want to be working when their kids are out of school for 3 weeks.
- It is hard on families that have kids in the upper grades because days off rarely match up.
- It is hard to participate in summer camps. There are no community programs left for off track times because there is not enough demand. Any businesses that cater to kids are not open during the day when kids are off track because again there is not enough demand.
- Daycare can be difficult because again there is not enough demand for daycares to offer 3 week programs. Working parents have to pay for their child's spot even if the child is at school just so there is a place for them to go when off track comes.
- When on year round, schools have to do everything twice; two field trips, two assemblies, two teacher appreciation weeks, two parent teacher conferences, two red ribbon weeks, two maturation programs, etc.
- To participate in the school play or choir, kids have to still come in during their off track times. At other schools, when you have a day off, then those programs have the day off.
Tracks break up neighborhood's kids when they end up on different tracks. Parents have to drive them to other places to find friends when off track instead of walking next door. The sense of community feel that comes from summer night games is not there because some kids will have school the next day in June and August.

Each year it is a source of worry and anxiety for kids and families as they await their track assignments wondering if their friends will be on the same track or if they will have to find someone new to play with. This can be hard on children who suffer from anxiety and depression.

The constant change in routine with 6 weeks on 3 weeks off wreaked havoc on one family that had a child with type 1 diabetes. They finally transferred to a school with a traditional calendar to help keep the child's blood sugar levels stable. The constant change of routine is hard for families even if they don't have health issues.

Deep cleaning an elementary school on year round is difficult because the janitors only have 3 weeks of no one in the school. A traditional elementary school janitor has at least 2 months to do the same work.

Of course there are pros to year round, but we believe that when most of the schools went traditional the cons began to heavily outweigh the pros. We hope that you will soon move forward with implementing ALPS in all of the schools then it won't matter that ALPS was moved out of the South Jordan area. Thank you for your time. I hope you vote to move us to traditional sooner rather than later.

Annie Kartchner, Amy Stevenson, Cherie Musick

****

From: Carol Liska <carolliska@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 11:49 PM
Subject: RELOCATION OF APLS PROGRAM FROM JRE
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Good afternoon, my name is Carol Liska and I'm a parent of 2 ALPS students at JRE, our boundary school is Golden Fields Elementary. I'm asking to please leave the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge Elementary, moving the program makes it more difficult for all gifted and talented students to receive the services they need and deserve, specially for those students who live in the South Jordan area. In our personal case, we wouldn't be able to continue to attend this program if it is moved farther north, all these kids really need this program, please don't relocate it.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Carol Liška

****

From: Lauren Hoyt <laureneddingtonhoyt@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 9, 2020 at 8:23 AM
Subject: No to Adding Portables at South Jordan Elementary (Against Option A)
To: <Boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear School Board Members,

I am writing to weigh in on the discussion about South Jordan Elementary options for the 2021-22 school year. Before I get to the main point of my letter, I want to mention that I would prefer to keep the year-round track system in place, though that wasn’t listed as one of the proposed options; I’d be happy to discuss my reasons for that if there is an opportunity. However, the main point of my letter is I’d like to describe the reasons why I am against the proposed option of adding portables (Option A).

As a former elementary classroom teacher in the Jordan School District, I’ve had first-hand experience with the inconveniences and disadvantages of portables. First, students needing to use the restroom must borrow a teacher’s key to get inside the main building and need to walk outside between the portable and the building. This takes away more time from classroom learning as it takes longer to get to the restroom and includes added distractions along the way. Portables are also quite noisy from the nearby playground commotion and from the walking up and down the steps or ramp. The noise makes it harder for students to concentrate, especially those with underlying attention deficits. Additionally, I’ve experienced the issues portables often have with unreliable heating and cooling systems – another potential distraction to students trying to focus on schoolwork. I also see portables as a significant safety concern; with fewer barriers an intruder would be able to break into a stand-alone portable much easier than a classroom inside the main building.

My final (and most personal) reason against adding portables is because the parent survey listed the special-education class(es) being relocated to the portables, which would have the impact of further isolating those students from the mainstream education experience and of having them seen as outsiders in every way. My daughter with special needs will soon be attending South Jordan Elementary, and she already faces obstacles in public education. The challenges described above about portables as well as the inherent isolation of portables would only add to her difficulties and to those of other special-education students. This would certainly not be a “Least-Restrictive Environment” setting. Intentionally finding ways to integrate special-education students instead of ostracizing them benefits all students and fosters an inclusive, accepting environment. Furthermore, the special-education staff benefit from being closely connected to support and resources by remaining inside the building.
These are the reasons I am strongly opposed to the option of adding portables to South Jordan Elementary. I would instead opt for the expansion of the main school building (Option E) which has the added benefit of accommodating more students (two more classes than Option A). Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

Sincerely,

Lauren E. Hoyt
Email: laureneddingtonhoyt@gmail.com
Phone: 801-664-8621

****

From: Katie Irion <katieirion@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 9, 2020 at 11:32 AM
Subject: To be read at the meeting
To: boardcomments@jordandistrict.org <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

June 8, 2020

Dear Jordan School District School Board,

We are parents of students at South Jordan Elementary School. We are very much appreciative of the enriching environment/experience that our children have the opportunity to participate in at SJE. It is a great school!

We recognize the efforts of the school board to transition the school to a traditional school year calendar. With that decision already established, our concern now becomes the issue of how overcrowding at the school will be addressed both in both the short and long term.

We reside in one of the South Jordan neighborhoods (North of 9800 S and East of Redwood Road) that – based on school board boundary restructuring discussions both past and present – seems likely to be reassigned to a different school should a boundary restructuring be needed.

Of those recently proposed options that we are aware of, despite our affinity for SJE, we are supportive of the boundary change that would place our neighborhood at Jordan Ridge Elementary (necessitating a move of the ALPS program to a different location). We understand and sympathize with any ALPS parents/students that may take issue with this option as our children would also be required to relocate to an unfamiliar school. But this option seems to best address the larger population. While ALPS is a wonderful program, it only benefits a small percentage of students within the district. Addressing the overcrowding problem with this solution, however, benefits the entire existing SJE population.

We are aware that another proposal to address the overcrowding at SJE is to add 7 more portables at SJE (bringing it to 15 total portables). While this option keeps the ALPS program in the same location and is a more immediate and fiscally responsible option than building a new school would be, it does not “solve” the overcrowding problem at SJE. The same large student body would still share a small gymnasium and cafeteria and a now smaller outdoor play/recess area (reduced in size by the space occupied by said portables). It has been mentioned in the past that in order to accommodate the added students once we go off year-round the special needs program would be displaced, and we would possibly lose our computer lab. Does anyone worry about those students getting displaced? Does anyone worry about losing a computer lab for a generation of students who will live and breath technology? It is our understanding that the open area that SJE now enjoys would be greatly reduced. Will our students have room to run and play and have field day? Will students be able to participate in STEM projects or extracurricular activities with the abundance of students? SJE is a valued commodity but even with the year-round calendar the structure is stretched to its limits. The parking lot is always full, and drop-off and pick-up is already a logical nightmare, just imagine what adding extra kids would do.

We hope that students’ educational success is the goal here, and we hope that the success does not only favor the “gifted and talented” program. In an ideal world, the board would have enough money to build a new school and we would already have land that had adequate acreage, but that is not the case and even if you do vote to build a new school, it would be years until students could use it. What do you do with the overcrowding in the meantime? We sincerely hope you address the long-term overcrowding potential with greater commitment but for right now we humbly ask you to move the ALPS program in order to help SJE have a manageable amount of students in their current space.

Thank you again for all you do for our community.

Sincerely,

Richard and Katie Irion

*****

From: Lisa Cook <lcouk34@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 9, 2020 at 11:50 AM
Dear School Board Members,

My oldest child will be attending the first grade ALPS program this fall at Jordan Ridge. We are in the Jordan Ridge boundary and have two younger children who will be going to this school as well in the coming years. Having the ALPS program at Jordan Ridge is a significant aide to us as we can drop off and pick up at the same location. If the ALPS program is moved I don't know if we can continue having my oldest in the ALPS program if the schools begin and end at the same time, as I am the only person able to drop off and pick up.

Additionally, having my oldest child at the same school will provide comfort to my two younger children as they begin their elementary school years.

I understand discussions are on the table for rearranging boundaries for schools. So, while I'm submitting my opinion, I request you leave the Prospector Park neighborhood in the Jordan Ridge boundary. It is our closest school and makes most geographic sense.

Sincerely,
Lisa Molen

****

From: Jamilah Decker <jamilahdecker@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 9, 2020 at 12:02 PM
Subject: SJE
To: <boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

Dear School Board,

I am not in favor of more portables, or moving the special needs kids, or taking away our two computer rooms. I feel our kids need room to play outside. I also think having the special needs kids is important for children to understand and appreciate and interact with. Our children have greatly benefited from the computer labs and the variety of learning done there. I have been in a school with a portable computer lab and it was pathetic. Basically a class was able to use the computers once a month, and the computers were out of date. The optimal option for me is to build a new school, but I hear there are no funds. So the next best option is to adjust boundaries. I think parents would be happier if they knew that the quality of the school they might have to attend was going to be high and as good as SJE.

One last thought, I feel having our whole population at the school would be make the school more crowded, and offer our kids less time to do PE, computers, art, library etc. I worry that the quality of teaching and the experience at school would go down. Overcrowded schools are never a good thing. I think it would obviously put more wear and tear on the school. I also wonder if it would also spread sickness faster. Thanks for considering my thoughts.

Jamilah Decker

****

From: Laurie <lashdown@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 9, 2020 at 2:04 PM
Subject: Public Comment on South Jordan Elementary Options
To: <Boardcomments@jordandistrict.org>

We are parents of students at South Jordan Elementary who live near the northern boundary of our school.

We strongly oppose the options of expanding South Jordan Elementary. Additional portables or adding on to the school would decrease outdoor areas at the same time as increasing the amount of students using those outdoor areas. We are concerned about more crowded group spaces, such as the lunchroom, gym, and hallways. More classes would mean limited access to enriching rotations like P.E., the library, computer labs, music, and other activities that are such great additions to classroom learning. School-wide activities and assemblies would be greatly impacted. Parking and drop off & pick up traffic would be very congested. All of these factors would contribute to a diminished educational experience for our children.

We also don't see the option of building a new school as a good one at this time. The whole process of planning, funding, and building a new school would take a significant amount of time. We are concerned that in the meantime (years), our students would be stuck in an overcrowded situation. They would experience all of the negative aspects of a crowded school already mentioned.

We do, however, strongly urge the school board to build a new school in the East South Jordan area in the future. Our area continues to experience growth, with significant pockets of new construction and older homes being purchased by younger families. We would like steps to be taken to begin the process of building a new school. But we do not want our children to stay in an overcrowded school while waiting for all of that to happen.
An appealing option is a boundary change involving Jordan Ridge Elementary. We live in the area north of Shields Lane and east of Redwood Road that would be moved to JRE. Jordan Ridge is a good choice because it is still close to our homes and feeds into the same middle school and high school. Remaining in the same feeder system heading into secondary schools is very important for our students.

We know that parents of the Jordan Ridge ALPS students do not wish ALPS to be moved. We understand their concerns. However, their participation in the ALPS program is voluntary. The program would not be dissolved, but transferred to a new school, where they can choose to continue to participate. On the other hand, our situation at SJE is not voluntary. The fact is that we live in a geographic area with a large and growing population of elementary students. The current school boundaries result in a number of students that is too large to ideally educate at a single school.

We know that this is a difficult decision to make and that it is impossible to please everyone. We appreciate this opportunity to voice our concerns and opinions and hope that you will give them serious consideration.

Sincerely,
Laurie Ashdown, representing 18+ neighborhood families

****