High School Schedule Task Force: Meeting Summary

The High School Schedule Task Force voted 11 of 13 to recommend Model Four, the A/B block schedule, to the Executive Cabinet.

Meeting Information

Meeting	High School Schedule Task Force
Date	Tuesday, November 10, 2026
Location	LTC-Cougar/Panther
Facilitator	Mr.Hutcherson Hill
Recorder	Ms. Ruthie Yamaguchi, meeting notes
Outcome	Model Four recommended to the Executive Cabinet

Purpose and Charge

The task force was charged with finding cost savings within the district's current high school schedules while preserving the student experience and staff morale as much as possible. Because the charge required savings, keeping the current schedule unchanged was not an option the task force could recommend. District staff noted that savings from a schedule change come mainly from teachers teaching a larger share of the school day.

The task force is a recommending body. Its recommendation goes to the Executive Cabinet, and the final decision is an administrative one made by the Superintendent with the Executive Cabinet. It is not decided by a vote of the Board of Trustees. Staff explained that a decision would be made even if the task force did not recommend a model, so a recommendation ensures the task force's voice is part of that decision.

The final meeting had four goals:

- Review what parents, students, staff and community members shared through the public hearing and survey.
- Revisit the two finalist schedule models.
- Take a final vote.
- Forward a recommendation and a list of considerations to the Executive Cabinet.

Membership and Operating Norms

Thirteen members cast ballots at the final meeting. The task force includes parents, students, campus staff and district staff.

- Ballots were anonymous. Each voter marked a membership category and chose Model One, Model Four or abstain.

- District staff representing fine arts, athletics and Career and Technical Education (CTE) were eligible to vote.
- A member of the Executive Cabinet took part in the discussion as a non-voting participant.
- The printed ballot listed "Model Two" in error. Before voting, the facilitator clarified that this option represented Model Four.
- A staff member recorded the challenges raised by members so they can be presented to the Executive Cabinet with the vote.

Meeting Schedule and Public Engagement

More than 2,300 people took part in the ThoughtExchange survey, and about 1,800 completed it. More than 1,100 participants had participated in the survey by Oct. 27th, the day of the public hearing. The survey had only been for a few days.

Date	**Milestone**
Tuesday, November 10, 2026	Final task force meeting and vote
Monday, November 9, 2026	Community survey closed
Tuesday, October 27, 2026	Public hearing, with about 24 speakers
Tuesday, October 20, 2026	Task force selected its top two models from the four developed
Late August 2026	Task force began meeting

What the Task Force Heard

Public feedback favored Model Four over Model One, while many participants said neither model was ideal.

The two finalist models

- **Model Four** is an A/B block schedule in which teachers teach seven of eight periods and have a conference period every other day.
- **Model One** is a schedule in which students attend eight shorter class periods each day.

Public hearing

Speakers overwhelmingly preferred the A/B block schedule. No speaker favored Model One. Many students and parents supported Model Four as the better of the two options because it maintains the student experience. Several teachers asked the task force to reject both models because of the loss of planning time.

Survey themes by model

Model Four (A/B block)	Model One
Seen as benefiting students	Time constraints in shorter class periods
Provides additional academic support	Workload and stress for students and teachers
Familiar and stable	Concern about academic impact
Maintains academic rigor	Challenges for extracurricular programs
Teacher concern about reduced planning and professional learning time	Time lost to more transitions between classes

Themes across both models

- Protecting instructional time.
- Meeting the needs of specialized programs, including early college, CTE pathways, dual credit and OnRamps.
- Supporting fine arts and athletics, including double-blocked classes.
- Student well-being and the risk of students feeling overwhelmed with eight classes.
- Teacher planning time, which is reduced under both models.
- Staff retention, including the risk of losing staff to nearby districts.
- Where the remaining budget savings will come from.

Task Force Discussion

Members said the survey and hearing confirmed a strong community preference for Model Four, and also confirmed that neither model fully satisfies students, families or staff.

- **Teacher preference.** One member had expected more teachers to prefer a daily planning period. Survey comments indicated that teachers generally preferred the block schedule despite the change in planning time.
- **Survey design.** The survey offered a "no preference" choice, selected by fewer than 10 percent of participants. It did not offer a "neither model" choice. Members noted that "no preference" is not the same as opposing both models.
- **The charge.** District staff acknowledged that some teachers asked for both models to be rejected. Staff explained that the charge was to find efficiencies in the current schedule, not to design a new schedule without budget limits.
- **Timing of the decision.** Several members asked whether the decision could be delayed until after the 2027 state legislative session, in case school funding improves. One member suggested waiting a year.

District staff offered informal views in response to the timing question. These views are not a formal district position, and no decision about timing was made at the meeting.

- The amount and timing of any new state funding is uncertain and may not be known until mid-2027 or later.
- The district still faces a structural budget deficit and declining enrollment, even with planned school closures.
- Delay could increase the deficit.
- New funding, if provided, would first be needed for existing priorities such as employee compensation and rising health care costs.

Strategy and Considerations

Members asked that the following challenges go to the Executive Cabinet with the recommendation. They are considerations raised by members, not decisions or commitments by the district.

- **Teacher planning time and burnout.** Members asked for clear, consistent guidelines for principals on protecting planning time, shared before campuses begin building master schedules. Examples included limits on before-school meetings and adjustments to duty assignments.
- **Required meetings.** Members asked how teachers will be released for special education (ARD) and Section 504 meetings when their schedules are at the required instructional minutes.
- **Academic calendar.** Members suggested reviewing the calendar for periodic planning days or breaks, such as one each grading period, to help teachers keep pace.
- **Staff retention.** Members asked that mitigation steps be communicated early, before teachers consider positions elsewhere.
- **Remaining savings.** Members noted that Model Four is estimated to save about $1.7 million against a goal of about $3 million. Staff said the estimate is preliminary, that campus rosters are still being verified with Human Resources and principals, and that the figure may rise slightly.
- **Savings in other areas.** Staff said the district is also reviewing athletics, fine arts, CTE and double-blocked classes. One proposal under review would streamline athletic periods so more assistant coaches can teach additional classes.
- **Consistency across grade levels.** A member asked how planning time for middle school core teachers will be viewed if high school teachers move to seven of eight periods. Staff said this is under review and that efficiencies are being examined at every level.
- **Timing.** Some members asked the Executive Cabinet to weigh whether to wait for the outcome of the 2027 legislative session.
- **New CTE Center.** Staff noted that the opening of the district's CTE Center adds scheduling constraints that limited other hybrid models.

Final Vote and Recommendation

Model Four received 11 of the 13 ballots cast, about 85 percent, and moves forward as the task force's recommendation.

Category	Model Four	Model One	Abstain
Parents	3	1	0

Students	1	0	0
Staff	4	0	0
District staff	2	0	1
Category not marked	1	0	0
Total	**11**	**1**	**1**

Next Steps

1. The facilitator will present an overview of the task force's process and recommendation to the Board of Trustees on Thursday, November 12, 2026.
2. The recommendation and the considerations listed above will go to the Executive Cabinet for a decision.
3. Meeting materials will be posted publicly, as they have been for each task force meeting.
4. After a decision, district staff will begin implementation planning for the 2027-2028 school year.

This was the final scheduled meeting of the task force. The facilitator thanked members for their engagement since late August and noted that the recommendation is a first step in addressing the district's budget while maintaining the student experience.