<div align="center">

Oyster River Cooperative School District

Hybrid Workshop Meeting* Minutes

*In accordance with Governors Executive Order #12

</div>

July 30, 2020   **DRAFT**

SCHOOL BOARD PRESENT: Dan Klein, Tom Newkirk, Denise Day, Michael Williams, Al Howland. Remote Access: Kenny Rotner. Absent: Brian Cisneros,

Student Representative:

ADMINISTRATORS VIA REMOTE ACCESS:

STAFF PRESENT: Jim Morse, Todd Allen, Suzanne Filippone, Jay Richard, Misty Lowe, David Goldsmith, Andy Lathrop, Kim Wolph, Josh Olstad, Doris Demers, Lisa Huppe, Felicia Sperry

GUEST'S PRESENT VIA REMOTE ACCESS:

I. Meeting began at 7:00 PM

Jim Morse welcomed everyone to the second workshop informed the listening audience who was attending the workshop and gave a summary of what an actual workshop entails, and that there would be no motions taken or decisions made at this meeting. He also stated that everyone that is working with students is doing that with positive intentionality and the Board and himself have received dozens of passionate emails from parents and staff on thoughts for opening schools. Jim also reminded everyone that the Board has met numerous times for discussion surrounding the re-opening of schools and that the workshop this evening will be their last time meeting before a decision will be considered at the August 5th meeting. Jim thanked everyone who submitted comments to him and the School Board. He stated that we are all trying to accomplish the same thing and that is the safety of all our students and staff. He also informed the Board that he has been working with Theresa Proia, HR Coordinator, and that she has spoken with 53 individuals about their health concerns and the category that they fit into. This will also affect some of our students as well. As with the last workshop, there would be presentations by the administrators from the elementary, middle, and high school, with input from other administrators if needed.

Jim Morse introduced both David Goldsmith, Moharimet Principal and Misty Lowe, Mast Way Principal to begin their discussion surrounding the elementary schools as they had the least amount of changes.

David explained that we take the health of our staff and students very seriously and that whatever model is chosen the staff will execute with creativity, compassion, and professionalism. Also, any model that is not all day 5 days per week negatively impacts our students their learning and socialization, negatively impacts their families for job requirements, financial necessities, home dynamics, and childcare needs.

Elementary options are Remote, Hybrid or a targeted support model and explained the challenges for these options. The various options were broken down the following way. Hybrid Model: AM/PM Half Days: Classes split into 2 groups; AM/PM, In-person classes @ 10-12 students, Students learn for ½ day in-person and ½ day remotely. The Pros to this are: Equity: All students in school, Continuity of learning, Continuous Model, Minimize the need for technology, Remote learning directly connected to in-class, Flexible staffing and space use, Mental Health.

Fully Remote Model and presented a sample schedule of what a day would look like. The Pro to this is: No risk of exposure.

District choice of remote learning allows students to access building for targeted learning environment. Targeted groups can come on a scheduled basis, Every day for K, Every student twice a month, Assessments, Specific in-person services, SEL activities, Check-ins. The Pros to this model: lower risk of exposure, provides some level of in-person benefits, more "normal" experience for youngest students. Examples of targeted groups include kindergarten and First Graders, Disadvantaged youth, Students identified through our MTSS process who have social/emotional, academic, and/or behavioral needs, Special education students. Options for supporting targeted groups: *Fully remote model*: Target groups could access the building and receive additional direct instruction and interventions as needed. *Half day model*: Targeted groups could come in early or stay late during the transition times to receive additional direct instruction and interventions.

Comments from the Board included, the possibility of teachers doing two things at one time both teaching a class and remote. Dissolving of structure for students once they leave school. Is there a mechanism that they can be provided for structure? Thoughts shared about outside learning areas being utilized but concerns for school safety. If a hybrid model, there is a possibility of even smaller groups of students. If a third of teaching was remote, could have physical space, but not the staff.

Tom thanked David and Misty for their presentation.

Jay Richard, ORMS Principal stated that he did make modifications and began by explaining his first slide. Model 1: Grades 5 & 6 AM/PM, Grades 7 & 8 – 2 Days a Week, Wednesday – Re-learning Day and the benefits and challenges to this model. Grades 5 & 6 would be in school every day for ½ a day and Grade 7 & 8 would be in school every other day for ½ day. He also provided a sample schedule for this model.

Model 2: Grades 5 - 8 AM/PM, Wednesday – Re-learning Day and explained the benefits and challenges.

Model 3: Grades 5 – 8 two days per week, Wednesday – Re-Learning Day and again explained the benefits and challenges of this model.

The Board asked clarifying questions pertaining to leaving the 5-8 grades on same schedule, the separation of the students as two separate sets per session, that in certain models the students stay in class and the teachers rotate.

Jim Morse stated that in a non-academic model they would need to assign several buses exclusively for the use of MS students to move students to the different town fields as the current middle school construction will not allow for student use of the area around the school.

Tom Newkirk stated that there is little time to make a complex determination for the August 5th meeting and then be ready to open on the 28th. We will need to look at the calendar.

Jim explained that he has been in contact with the area superintendents who are making that decision now and he will keep the Board informed of the decisions that are made and that the calendar is on the agenda for the August 5th meeting.

Todd Allen stated that no matter which model is chosen that Professional Development time is going to be a key variable.

Jay Richard stated that more time to plan will be helpful, especially for 5th graders and new student orientation.

Jay then presented the MTSS: Targeted Learners slide and explained its meaning.

Jim asked Jay to read the Target Assistance Groups for any listeners that did not have the information in front of them.

Jay read the following list: Special Education, 504, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), remote learning challenges, social emotional concerns, poor attendance, 5th grade, pre-k, kindergarten, 1st grade and 9th grade.

Denise asked for the number of students per school would this be if we went with this model.

Jim explained that it would change according to the focus.

Tom asked if there was a 4th model for middle school like the elementary model with the target groups coming in. Jay stated yes.

Tom thanked Jay for his presentation.

Suzanne Filippone, HS Principal began by reviewing the Goal which is for ORHS is to provide a safe and equitable environment for rigorous and engaging studies which reflects our Vision of a Graduate and Mission as a school. She stated that she did add a new model began explaining her proposals.

Model 1 – 50% return per day/alternating days alphabetical/or by grade – all students 2 days/week.
Benefits: Equity, in person/in time monitoring of student learning and growth for academic success (which compliments remote instruction and learning), SEL/Mental Health Supports in Person Human Connection, School Community.

Challenges: Cohorts and social distancing, Electives, lunch, hallways, larger classes, classroom size, student privilege, arrival and dismissals, Cleaning spaces and materials throughout the day, monitoring movement in the building, Faculty and students who do not return –Staff Dependent with faculty dependent staff, Creation of robust and engaging curriculum and instruction for dual modes (remote and in-person).

Suzanne went on to explain the Bell Schedule: Classes are on alternating days A Day and B Day Classes are blocks of time; same schedule could be used regardless of model making transitions between models easier. Schedule has been created/adjusted according to student input. She also provided a sample schedule of what the week would look like.

Model 2 – Hybrid – Start with In-Person Flex and additional learners slowly introduce classes, mixing cohorts.
Benefits: Small cohorts, social distancing and cleaning, Equity, Some SEL/Mental Health Supports in Person, some human connection, school community and in person monitoring, ability to bring in students who need more frequent check-ins,, focus on creation of robust and engaging remote curriculum and instruction (single mode).

Challenges: Regulating movement in building, school community/climate, limited in person, faculty time to adjust curriculum & instruction, structure/protocols to determine individuals or groups for in-person experience (examples: 9th grade transition or student needing services)
She provided a schedule for the Model for first two weeks of school with this model along with a bell schedule.

Suzanne also provided a weekly schedule done by grade level of an In-Person FLEX & Additional Learners Model– Goal is to create small cohorts and have kids on campus for one on one time with faculty.

Suzanne went on to explain her slide pertaining to MTSS: Targeted Learners.

Faculty plan for a robust and engaging remote learning experience, bring in specific students who need supports and/or programing, SEL, Mental Health, Spec. Ed. Services, Academic Supports Depending on community outbreak of COVID-19 bring in targeted groups based on student needs and faculty requests.

Suzanne explained her slide pertaining to Grading, Reporting and Marking Periods and that grading is a challenge for teachers. Suggested the possible move from ¼ grades to semester grades.

There was a brief discussion surrounding grading.

Tom Newkirk stated that we could talk about this forever and suggested we make this a future agenda item.

The Board and Suzanne had a clarifying discussion surrounding the In-person flex model.

The Board thanked Suzanne.

Jim explained that we had other administrators at the meeting if the Board had any questions for them. He went on to explain that Lisa would run all the buses using the flex model and that there would be an increase in mileage, but ridership would be lower. He explained that the costs would go up as we would need to purchase PPE for the drivers, face shields and shields that can be put up on the bus to surround the driver.

The Board asked additional questions surrounding the practices that will be put in place at the schools for protecting students and staff. Jim responded that face masks, shields on a desk for the primary level, social distancing, hand washing and outside teaching whenever possible.

Al Howland felt that everyone starts remote and slowly move to a hybrid model bringing in the targeted groups.

Denise Day felt that there is a need to establish an initial relationship with their teacher and sees a value of bringing all kids in for a limited time for the introduction. There is a risk, but establish a baseline then go remote.

Michael Williams asked for the possibility of utilizing the high school building for other grade levels.

Kenny Rotner stated that this is the hardest decision that we have ever made and the decision that is made is not going to make everyone happy. We are facing many unknowns and the remote option is safest.

Michael Williams asked Jay what the remote option looks like for the MS. Jay responded that it was very structured with block scheduling.

Jim stated that it is very similar to the high school.

Michael asked what the significance of the Wednesday Re-Learning day was. Jay responded that changing to a Wednesday instead of a Friday stops a chance for a long weekend.

Tom Newkirk expressed concerns for the K-2 or K-3 level as the needs are different there and this is a very critical period and how effective is remote learning at this level.

David Goldsmith agreed that kindergarten, 1st, and possible 2nd grade are target groups.

Michael Williams asked about the chance of utilizing UNH for their assistance with testing staff.

Jim stated that UNH has invested millions of dollars in testing and that he will reach out to UNH with this request. There was additional talk surrounding testing and the current turnaround time for results.

Jim explained the current protocol that we have in place at all buildings before anyone enters and that we encourage our parent to be the first line of defense with their children if they show symptoms and not send to school.

Dan Klein struggles with how little we can control, and it makes sense to look at transportation, busing. There are a great many things that we cannot control, so I do not know the answer.

Michael Williams stated he would choose fully remote based on the evidence, probably assume the entire year. He also asked what structure we need for a decision, establish policy, write a statement.

Jim explained that it would be the same structure we do now with a motion, 2nd, and a vote.

Tom Newkirk felt that there should be three separate motions, one for elementary, one for middle school and one for the high school.

Jim stated that he will work with the building administrators to put a couple of motions in list format.

There was additional discussion by the Board with pros and cons to each of the options suggested.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT:

Tom Newkirk thanked everyone and appreciated all the presentations. The meeting ended at 9:06 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Wendy L. DiFruscio
Executive Assistant to
Superintendent of Schools