

**Flip Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
October 9, 2007**

**Attendees:** Laurie Baker (Chair), Sandy Evans, Jill Jakulski, Laurie Lindberg, Charlie Monts, Bruce Steubner, Robin Carroll, Jill Hecht, Christina Kim, Jan Auerbach.

Laurie Baker distributed a compilation of comments she received from committee members regarding their scenario preference and their concerns/comments regarding the scenarios. The vote of the members present (plus those who had voted via email) slightly favored Flip scenario 2 (7-5). Members who voted for Flip 2 were: Jan Auerbach, Laurie Baker, Robin Carroll, Lisa Cherubini, Christina Kim, Charles Monts, and Bruce Stuebner. Members who preferred flip 1, but would settle for flip 2 rather than the current bell schedule, were Sandy Evans, Jill Hecht, Carol Vennergrund, and Jill Jakulski. Laurie Lindberg preferred Flip 1. Therefore, the meeting focused on refining scenario 2 to make it more feasible. (Flip 2 as defined previously only had a 75-minute window from first bell to last bell, which is too short.) Laurie Lindberg and several others supported Scenario 1 because it was not as drastic a change as Scenario 2 and, because MS is only for two years, there would be less resistance moving it to Tier 3 than there would be to move HS to Tier 3. Jan Auerbach suggested the committee focus on what we thought best since it is difficult to predict where and how strong the opposition will be. Committee members thought parents might have a role in “selling” the scenario to their teens, who might not like the idea of getting out of school two hours later, even though they could sleep longer in the morning.

Members noted that busing is currently inefficient because of school boundaries, G/T centers, and other special programs. They recognized that the Tweak Committee is addressing this issue but thought it important enough to be mentioned in our minutes.

The committee then drew a timeline for Tiers 1-3 if Flip Scenario 2 were adopted, in order to consider whether the Scenario is doable. Tier 1 (ES) would start from 7:50 to 8:10 and end at 2:30 to 2:50, assuming a 6 hour, 40 minute day. The committee thought those schools with the shortest runs should go first to avoid any civil twilight concerns. Tier 2 (ES and some MS) would start from 8:35 to 8:55 and go to 3:15 to 3:35 for ES and from 3:25 to 3:45 for MS (assuming a 6 hour, 50 minute day for MS). In Tier 3 there should be no ES unless absolutely necessary. Tier 3 should be HS, secondary schools (MS/HS) and any other MS that could not be accommodated in Tier 2. Tier 3 would start 9:20-9:40 and end at 4:10-4:30, assuming a 6 hour, 50 minute day.

There would be 45 minutes between each tier. If that much time is not needed between tiers in all cases, then some MS and HS in Tier 3 could start and end a little bit earlier. Once the committee could see the overall schedule, it concluded that the proposal should be doable and continues to support it. The resulting window in the morning from first bell to last bell (7:50 am - 9:40 am) is 1 hour 50 minutes; in the afternoon, the window is 2 hours (2:30 pm – 4:30 pm). The ES school day is shorter than MS and HS by ten minutes. Putting ES in the first tier should cause less bus overlap in the afternoon. By starting the school day with short ES bus runs, the overall driver day should be the same or shorter than it is now.

The committee noted that the only schools outside of Fairfax County that FCPS HS play against in sports are in Arlington and Loudon, both of which have later HS start times than the current FCPS HS start time.

The logic for supporting Scenario 2 is: biology of the students, safety (HS drivers, civil twilight, less unsupervised after school time for MS and HS), and it is feasible to have HS activities (including sport practice) before school.

**NOTE:** The committee would like information on the methodology for costing out scenarios, and what is the cost of meeting current standards, even if no TTF recommendations were adopted.

Laurie Baker committed to having a draft of the committee's Oct. 18 presentation to committee members to review by October 11, with comments due by October 15.