

REVISED 8/25/20

Oyster River Cooperative School District

Hybrid Remote Meeting* Minutes

***In accordance with Governors Executive Order #12**

August 5, 2020

DRAFT

SCHOOL BOARD PRESENT VIA ROLL CALL VOTE: Brian Cisneros, Dan Klein, Tom Newkirk, Denise Day, Michael Williams, Al Howland Absent: Kenny Rotner.

Student Representative:

ADMINISTRATORS PRESENT VIA REMOTE ACCESS: James Morse, Todd Allen, Sue Caswell, Catherine Plourde, Suzanne Filippone, Jay Richard, Bill Sullivan, Misty Lowe, Felicia Sperry, Josh Olstad, Jim Rozycki, Doris Demers, Lisa Huppe

STAFF PRESENT:

GUEST'S PRESENT VIA REMOTE ACCESS:

Tom began by stating that Kenny Rotner would not be in attendance this evening as most know that he is undergoing treatment for cancer and is at Mass General this evening and that our thoughts are with him and his family.

Tom Newkirk read the following statement:

As Chair of the Oyster River Cooperative School Board, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are:

a) Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means:

We are utilizing Microsoft Teams for this electronic meeting. All members of the School Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through dialing the following phone # 1-603-766-5646 and ID Code 461362#, or by clicking on the following website address: <http://www.orcsd.org/stream>

b) Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting:

We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting, including how to access the meeting using Microsoft Team or telephonically. Instructions have also been provided on the website of the ORCSD Board Agenda for 08/05/20.

c) Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access:

If anybody has a problem, please call 603-280-4202 or email at: orcsd-video@orcsd.org.

d) Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting:

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled.

Please note that **all votes** that are taken during this meeting shall be done by **roll call vote**.

Let's start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance. When each member states their presence, please also state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-to-Know law.

A roll call vote was then done with 6 Board Member present

I. CALL TO ORDER at 7:00 PM by Tom Newkirk

Tom Newkirk stated that he was fine with the agenda and asked the Board Members if there were any changes.

There were none.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Denise Day moved to approve the agenda as written, 2nd by Brian Cisneros. Motion passed via roll call vote 6-0.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

IV. APPROVAL OF WORKSHOP MINUTES:

Motion to approve both the July 14, 2020 and July 30, 2020 workshop meeting minutes: Revisions:

Denise Day requested the following changes: page 6 following paragraph 9, Add the following sentence. "Beginning of the year is the best opportunity we have to bring kids in.

Michael Williams asked to have on Page 6, paragraph 9 to replace the first sentence with, "If we started remote, will likely go remote all year.

Denise Day moved to approve the July 14, 2020 and July 30, 2020 workshop meeting minutes as amended, as a block 2nd by Al Howland. Motion passed with roll call vote 5-0-1 with Brian Cisneros abstaining.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS, COMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS:

A. ~~District:~~

B. Board:

Denise Day thanked everyone that took the time to write letters to the School Board and that we received dozens and appreciated everyone's perspective thoughts and concerns.

Tom Newkirk also commented on the public comments that were received. He counted over 90 responses and that the letters were well written, diplomatic and appreciated the intensity of people's position and the care taken in writing those letters.

Al Howland stated that the he had a public service announcement that the Town of Durham passed an emergency mask ordinance on Monday night and that it will last for 61 days and covers 4 zones, central business zone, church hill area, court house zone and the downtown area. The police will be passing out signs for educational purposes and masks to those that need them. He is hoping that they can have a consistent policy with UNH and explained that fines will be imposed if not followed starting at \$100, 2nd offense of \$200 and \$500 thereafter.

Tom also informed the Board that he has set up another MS walk through for Friday, August 28 and at this point in time the vertical construction of the steel will have begun. He will send out additional information to the Board.

VI. DISTRICT REPORTS:

A. Assistant Superintendent Reports: None

B. Superintendent's Report:

Jim began by stating that he echo's Denise's appreciation for all of the emails, texts and phone calls that he has received and also echoed Tom's thoughts of the powerful statements of people's positions relayed by the community.

He thanked the administrators and teachers that have worked tirelessly for the past few months on planning for the re-opening of school. Their hard work is being represented tonight.

He followed up on the Board's request from the last meeting to touch base with UNH about their COVID 19 testing. He spoke with Chris Clement the VP of Operations for UNH who is overseeing the testing. He stated that UNH would be willing to work with Oyster River to test all of our teachers and staff and the cost is \$120/staff member approximately \$51K. The Board leadership again asked Jim to reach out to UNH to test staff if there is a concern, and refer them to UNH, which is a better option. UNH once again stated that they are willing to do that and Jim stated that he appreciated how willing UNH is to help us out and thanked them.

Jim stated that he received several emails around sports and the decision by the NHIAA to move fall sports until September 8. He felt that Andy should be brought in at the next Board meeting to discuss the situation and bring the Board up to date on school sports.

Tom Newkirk asked how the NHIAA decision affects the district.

Jim stated that even if we couldn't do interscholastic sports, his concern is to make sure that kids have options and also how to keep kids active.

Jim mentioned the effort put together surrounding PPE needs and our health and safety needs. He has been working with Jim Rozycki who summarized the requests made by staff and provide a spreadsheet. Initially taking into consideration whether the request was a want or a need, this reduced the original summary costs of \$167K down to \$130K. These costs were not budgeted, and I will need to find a way to cover these costs for the safety of our staff and students. I had a conversation conceptually with the Finance Committee and as a result of the great interest rate on the bond it freed up \$250K. We will still need to be frugal, but we have no choice as we need to protect our nurses and staff. Additionally, a request by Lisa Huppe to purchase foggers for the bus was discussed. Even though this method is very thorough and gets into the crevices, we believe that the disinfecting spray that we currently have been using, along with 1 child per sheet with windows down and wearing masks will be sufficient.

Antiracism Committee

Jim updated the Board that a first organizational meeting of this small committee has been set for Tuesday, August 11 in the evening. We will be starting out with this small group to get things organized and then we will figure out how to expand out to the community.

C. Business Administrator:

Budget Update for End of Year

Sue stated that the end of year balance is \$962K with revenue it is \$1.1M and that we will meet the town obligations.

Al Howland asked how much will go into the emergency fund? Sue explained that there is a maximum of \$930K, but she will need to confirm that figure with the DRA and that she will get back to the Board with that number.

Brian Cisneros asked if the year was now closed? Sue stated yes.

ORMS Bond Final Number

Sue stated the budgeted bond payment was \$267,521 more than needed to make the first payment.

Denise Day asked if there would be savings every year. Sue stated that sometimes, but it is an average so it might be higher. She will work on a schedule for that.

Bus Lease

Sue referred the Board back to their back up information where a copy of the motion that needs to be used for this approval.

A motion was offered by Denise Day, seconded by Brian Cisneros, and carried by a vote of 6-0 to approve entering into a Master Installment Purchase Agreement with Mercedes-Benz Financial Services USA LLC for the purpose of purchasing, via a financing contract, the equipment listed on the attachment. Roll Call vote of 6-0. The motion passed.

D. Finance Committee Update:

Al Howland informed the Board that the Finance Committee met on July 29th and stated that in all the years of serving on the School Board and Durham Town Council, this is the first time that he has sat down with all three representatives of the school district. They began the meeting with Dr. Morse giving a summary of the work being done for reopening schools. Al went on to say they spoke about the town impact of the lower interest rate on the taxpayer. The impact to the towns if tax bills are not paid, the unemployment trend currently happening and its impact. There was discussion surrounding ways the School District and towns can work collaboratively one being the REACH Program with the School District. He stated that currently the Town of Durham's Recreation Director works with the school district to provide summer programs to students and that they accept children from all 3 districts. The Town of Durham does not have the staff to expand this program and would like to see if Lee and Madbury would work with us. There was discussion surrounding the possible consolidation with all towns and the school district for trash and composting. They talked about investigating self-funding health care. Electric Aggregation (Green Power), Solar Arrays and the agreement the town has with the school district. This is a really good start.

The Board asked some clarifying questions regarding a section of the Finance Committee Minutes, and the use of funds, which Dr. Morse explained.

~~E. Student Senate Report:~~

~~F. Other:~~

VII. DISCUSSION ITEM:

Tom Newkirk began by stating that the next part of this meeting is going to be hard, as any decision that is made will result in disappointed parents and guardians. He went on to explain that this is a very complicated process and that they will be following Robert's Rules of Order by using repeated voting to eliminate the individual options until they have a majority vote of four. He stated that the administrators will go over their presentations, and after their presentation the Board will have a chance to ask questions and have a discussion before the elimination voting. He asked the Board if they had any questions.

Al Howland stated that he re-arranged his listing so that the elementary program, which would be the most difficult, should go first.

Dan Klein asked if after a vote was taken for a school option, what choice did they have if other decisions made affected the current school vote. Tom stated that they could move to reconsider.

Denise Day stated that she had a couple of questions and should she ask them now. If the decision was to move to remote, how would that affect the bus drivers.

Dr. Morse explained that they would become food delivery vehicles, and also material delivery vehicles for families, some would work in other divisions, but depending on the model, we will need drivers to do numerous runs throughout the day and keeping with the safety concerns of only having 26 children on a bus, open windows and masks.

Denise Day asked what would happen to meals for our students if we are in remote learning.

Jim explained that due to federal laws we would provide meals for free and reduced students and to every family who wishes to purchase food per district guidelines.

Denise Day asked what happens if we lose students to Home Schooling, what if they go to VLACS. Are they still part of our census?

Jim explained that if the student is unenrolled and goes to VLACS then we lose that student. If they participate in any model and take a VLACS course, then they are counted.

We currently receive \$3,700 per student approximately 10% of the budget. It is about our commitment to the children not the state subsidy that is received.

Denise asked that if we lose our Barrington students, that would be significant. If we choose an option that they do not like they could choose Coe Brown or Dover.

Jim stated that could happen as Coe Brown is going all-in and nothing could stop a parent from enrolling them somewhere else.

Brian Cisneros stated that as he has watched the last two meetings and is pretty sure that a full return is not an option or a popular one, what is the threshold of us fully returning and what measurement do we use.

Jim stated that he is using the CDC Guidelines from March opposed to the most recent and also watching the baseline of 0 cases for two weeks which Madbury is the only town right now that meets that.

Brian asked what the threshold is for shutting everything back down.

Jim stated two things, the Governor or the district parents.

Brian Cisneros asked despite their best effort the parent choice is to go remote and then their schedule doesn't allow it. Do we have a contract that the decision is final?

Jim explained that we will ask parents to re-register, are they using the buses, are they remaining remote or going with the model chosen. Once chosen it can't be a revolving decision and that decision will be up for review once a quarter.

There was no additional questions or comments and Tom stated that they would begin with the K-4 Elementary Model presented by Misty Lowe, Mast Way Principal but wants to keep the high school presentation before the middle school presentation.

Re-Entry Planning Decision for Elementary School

Misty Lowe presented the 5 models that are up for consideration of the Board beginning with Model 1 – Fully In-Person Model.

This would be a very difficult model to achieve both for classroom usage and staff. Not all classrooms are large enough for a full class at 6' distancing, neither school has enough individuals, additional spaces for all pods and the current staffing cannot support all pods.

Model 2 – Hybrid AM/PM Half -Day Model –

This model allows for in-person classes of 10 -12 students with students learning ½ in-person and ½ day remotely. Everyone would wear a mask, maintain 6ft distancing, and follow other health guidelines. All remote learning assignments will be directly connected with in-person learning with a mix of technology and no-technology. Students continuing learning at home with an integration of in class assignments and remote instruction.

Model 3 – Hybrid AM/PM Half Days, K-2; Targeted Remote 3 & 4 –

This model splits K-2 into 2 groups AM/PM 4 days a week with in-person classes of 10- 12 students, which students learn for ½ the day in-person and ½ day remotely. Everyone would wear a mask, maintain 6ft distancing, and follow other health guidelines. All remote learning assignments will be directly connected with in-person learning. Students continuing learning at home with an integration of in class assignments and remote instruction.

Grades 3 & 4 remote learning with targeted, scheduled returns to school as needed: SPED/504, MTSS, SEL, Assessments, Check-in, small group lessons. Misty presented a sample schedule and also mentioned the Pros for this type of model. She also stated that she was very impressed with their 3rd & 4th graders at the end of the year to remain engaged. She is worries about their foundational skills that require adult supervision.

Al Howland asked what the number of students would be for this model?

Jim Morse stated approximately 160.

Brian Cisneros clarified that it would actual be $\frac{1}{2}$ that amount in the building at this time. Jim stated yes.

Michael Williams asked why it says 4 days a week.

Misty explained that this allows for a day of meetings for teachers as well as a day for thorough cleaning.

Michael Williams stated that he is assuming the previous model is also 4 days a week, but it doesn't say that. Misty stated yes.

Al Howland asked if cutting from 5 to 4 days, how does that meet state requirements? He also relayed an example from a HS parent that if a student was not having any trouble, this re-learning day is technically a day off. What structure is there on that 5th day to keep people engaged?

Todd Allen stated that the remote learning days are counted as instructional days based on a 6-hour day schedule and that the state requirement for elementary is 945 instructional hours. He agreed that in the spring the teachers were new to this type of learning and were not adapted to that and agree that the concept of re-learning days was lost in the shuffle. How do we make sure those re-learning days are purposeful for kids?

Catherine Plourde stated that with those Re-Learning days other benefit in an AM/PM session you are coming back into the classroom and the teachers are checking in that the work is being completed. She also expressed that without the re-learning day, meetings for special ed, 504 would not be happening as you would need to pull teachers to attend these meetings.

Dan Klein expressed concern for a $\frac{1}{2}$ day model is lacking as you just get settled in and you need to wrap up and get ready for the next session. Also, you are building in with a $\frac{1}{2}$ day model, additional transitional periods we are building in more exposure. Maybe talk more about why that model was taken away.

Misty explained that the direct instruction in class time in the morning carries over to the afternoon providing a more robust carry over.

Jim also mentioned that especially for the elementary level it eliminates technology as a heavy component of the teaching. In an AM/PM model you have had contact with your teacher, and it reduces screen time.

Brian Cisneros asked as a follow up to Dan, if the teacher in the AM is the same teacher in the PM. Jim stated yes.

There was additional discussion surrounding the make-up of class sizes, exposure chances with larger gatherings, the technology aspect of a re-learning day, the loss of continuity and the effectiveness of a re-learning day with the elementary level compared to the middle and high school level.

Tom Newkirk made a suggestion of the possibility of starting out with a re-learning day and then move to a 5th day scenario.

Jim reminded the Board of the plans for review at each quarter and 1 month before get feedback from the staff for the effectiveness of the model, what is working, what is not.

Al Howland asked how Catherine's special education component and the professional development training component fits into any of these schedules?

Misty provided a sample of what an A/B schedule looks like.

Michael Williams asked how recess fit into this schedule.

Denise stated that every option is going to hurt someone. She gave an example of what is working at her job pertaining to bringing in children to a school environment. Small groups and very limited sharing of materials with little bins for everything and the cleaning process that happens daily.

Misty replied that she has been speaking with her staff about similar ideas for students and that this will be a very difficult situation.

Michael Williams shared that the evidence of transmission by contact is unlikely, but by air transmission. He also asked if a ½ day program is chosen, what does that look like for PEP. Do they have a regular session?

Catherine stated that yes, the AM session is for 3-year old's and the PM session is for 4-year old's. There might be a slight modification that we will need to work on.

There was additional discussion surrounding the PEP program options.

Model 4 – Hybrid Remote Instruction with Targeted Groups Model K-4 –

For this model, Misty presented a sample schedule of ways students can be live with teachers throughout the remote week and she was concerned about the amount of live Team time. There would be no risk of exposure with this model.

Al Howland asked with this model that only target students come into the schools and how many students that would be.

Jim Morse stated about 20%

Model 5 – Fully Remote – most risk-free option but concerned about younger learners there would be no option for in-person targeted learners with this model it would all be done virtually.

Dan Klein asked Todd Allen what the process would look like for teachers if they needed to move to remote in a 3-day timeframe.

Todd Allen stated that no matter what option is chosen we will need more than 3 days to transition to that model and that he will be covering additional professional development days later in the presentation.

Jim stated that every model that we developed can transition.

Al Howland stated that theoretically if school shut down, this would be the model.

The Board had a continued discussion surrounding survey results for the ½ day model, that younger learners are not ready for a virtual component, the ½ day to full day comparison, and the hardship to parents surrounding some of these options. Addition of a two-day hybrid option was

suggested. Questions raised of the possibility that with any in-person learning a remote option be offered along with it. Clarification of what will be in the registration packet that will be going out.

Jim explained the staff options needed to have this in-learning option along with the remote option.

Al Howland made a motion to direct the superintendent to develop a remote option, 2nd by Dan Klein. Motion passed with roll call vote 6-0.

Tom moved the meeting forward with the voting options with a roll call vote for all.

K – 4 Elementary Schools – 5 Models for voting.

- Elementary 5 - Fully Remote

VOTE: No – 6-0 Option removed

- Elementary 1 - Fully In-Person Model

VOTE: No – 6-0 – Option removed

- **Elementary 2 – Hybrid AM/PM Half-Day Model**

VOTE: Yes: 6-0 – Option chosen with confirmation for PEP included

- Elementary 3 – Hybrid AM/PM Half Days K-2; Targeted Remote 3&4

VOTE: Not voted on due to choosing Option 2

- Elementary 4 – Hybrid Remote Instruction w. Targeted Groups Model K-4

VOTE: Not voted on due to choosing Option 2

- Elementary 6 – Hybrid Model Full Day K-4

VOTE: Not voted on due to choosing Option 2

At this point Doris Demers came to the podium to clarify a question from Denise Day pertaining to the providing of food to the district students that all students would be offered meals and those meals would be charge to the student accounts to protect the identity of the students that receive Free & Reduced.

Suzanne Filippone, HS Principal presented her options to the Board.

High School 1 – Fully Return

This model would be the traditional model of all students and faculty returning to the building. This would be out most challenging option with over 1,00 people in the building. She reviewed the benefits and challenges associated with this model. She provided a sample schedule for this model and explained that the schedule would remain the same for all models.

High School 2 – 50% Return/Alternating Days

August 5, 2020

She stated that with this model there will be the same challenges as the previous model with over 600 people in the building and a mixing of cohorts and social distancing challenges. She again referred to the schedule provided and reviewed the benefits and challenges.

High School 3 – Remote Instruction with In-Person FLEX

This model would be smaller cohorts with some in-person support for SEL, Mental Health. Will provide the ability to be in students who need more frequent check-ins. She reviewed a sample schedule breaking down the weekly remote instruction with In-Person FLEX Model as well as an example of pre-determined dates for In-Person FLEX Scheduling. i.e. SAT Testing for 12th graders would be on September 23rd from 8:15 to 1:30.

The Board asked some clarifying questions which Suzanne answered.

High School 4 – Remote Instruction with In-Person Targeted Learners

Again, the benefits and challenges associate with this model were discussed. The Board questioned if the target groups could change over time, the number of students that would encompass, how the adding of high school students to the bus run would work, clarification of which day is for re-learning, and if a class like a science lab could be considered a cohort to come into the school for that instruction.

Suzanne answered all of the Board questions and clarified the re-learning day.

High School 5 – Fully Remote Instruction

Suzanne brought to the Boards attention a learning schedule that would be followed for all Models with a Blue Day/White Day breakdown and stated that this is fluid for use in-person or at home. There would be an off set for advisory with ½ lunch and ½ advisory and then a flip flop.

Tom asked if a remote in-person target learners was chosen would we begin this way or expand modestly.

Suzanne stated at this point she is referring to MTSS groups.

Suzanne would like to see how the building is moving and get the building into some type of structure before making that determination.

Jim reiterate the quarterly timeline that we will follow for moving forward with changes. Suzanne would have moderate ability to flex and the choice made would be reviewed at 7 weeks for feedback.

Al Howland stated that a problem with targeted groups is that they change. Like fully remote and starting small. You need the flexibility. Will learn as time goes by what works or does not work.

Michael Williams asked how you see students that choose a fully remote option fit in to either options 1 – 3?

August 5, 2020

Suzanne stated that she does not want to lose anyone to VLACS and that our teachers are amazing educators. They can offer an incredible experience whether remote or their in-person and would like to do my best to ensure that we keep all of our students.

Dan Klein asked if assume 9th grade was a targeted group and how that would look for them using model 3?

Tom Newkirk asked that this was option 4.

Dan Klein asked if this would also work in option 3?

Denise Day stated that we start slow with the high school and possibility of transmission from the older students, they are most able to handle remote learning and still have the opportunity as with option 4 to bring in those targeted students. This also puts less of a strain on busing.

Al Howland clarified that grade 5 – 12 will have laptops.

Jim stated correct and that the hiccup right now is that even though we order in time, the delivery is not scheduled until October, so, I have asked Josh to hold onto the old laptops.

There was additional discussion surrounding a different use of option 3 for 9th grade, and the athletic participation during a remote learning environment is using option 4 or 5.

No Further discussion and Tom began the voting.

Oyster River High School - 5 Models for Voting

- High School 1 - Fully Return

VOTE: No – 6-0 – Option removed

- High School 2 – 50% Return/Alternating Days

VOTE: No – 6-0 – Option removed

- High School 3 – Remote Instruction with In-Person FLEX

VOTE: No – 4 – Denise Day, Al Howland, Dan Klein, Tom Newkirk.

Yes – Brian Cisneros, Michael Williams Option Removed

- **High School 4 – Remote Instruction with In-Person Targeted Learners**

VOTE: Yes: 4-2 – Option chosen with Brian Cisneros & Michael Williams voting against

- High School 5 – Fully Remote Instruction

VOTE: Not voted on due to choosing Option 4

At 9:25 a 5-minute recess was taken, and the meeting resumed at 9:30 with the Middle School presentation.

Jay Richard began his presentation by stating that he has 7 models for review.

Middle School 1 – Fully Return

This option would be extremely difficult for social distancing as it is using our traditional model for all students and staff returning to the building.

Middle School 2 – Grade 5 – 8 in School Every Day for ½ a Day

Using this model, we would have approximately 330 students and 100 staff in the building. Will not review the benefits and challenges but will answer any questions that you may have and reviewed the schedule.

Middle School 3 – Grade 5-8 in School Every Other Day for a Full Day

This model is very similar to the previous model as we will have the same number of students and staff in the building with the same challenges.

Middle School 4 – Each Grade in School for 1 Day Per Week

Jay explained that in this scenario there would be approximately 160 -180 student and 100+ staff in the building. Could still do an AM/PM rotation.

Middle School 5 – Hybrid 5th Grade in School 2 Days – Grade 6-8 Remote

In this model targeted groups could be brought in as needed by grade level, team, advisory. Tom clarified if this was a full day or ½ day for students.

Middle School 6 – Hybrid/Remote Instruction with Targeted Groups 5 – 8

This would be the mode that I would prefer to start school.

Middle School 7 – Fully Remote Instruction

No one in the building. Jay showed the schedule and stated that this schedule would work for a hybrid or remote model.

The Board asked clarifying questions pertaining to the length of a core class, live instruction time with students, the use of time if only have students for ½ a day, the need for consistency between all grade levels for parents, the differences of the physical buildings, the clarification of the number of students in the different options.

August 5, 2020

Tom Newkirk asked Dr. Morse if staffing was an issue.

Dr. Morse stated that the middle school has the most health issues for staff coming into the building.

The Board asked Jay if he had a preference, a question was asked to explain option 5 and why it was structured that way.

There was no additional discussion and Tom proceeded with voting.

Middle Schools – 7 Models for Voting

- Middle School 1 - Fully Return
VOTE: No – 6-0 – Option removed
- Middle School 2 – Grades 5-8 in school every day for ½ a day
VOTE: No – 6-0 – Option removed
- Middle School 3 – Grades 5-8 in school every other day for full day
VOTE: No – 6-0 – Option removed
- Middle School 4 – Each grade in school for 1 day per week
VOTE: No – 6-0 – Option removed
- Middle School 5 – Hybrid 5th grade in school 2 days – grades 6-8 remote
VOTE: No – 4 – Denise Day, Al Howland, Dan Klein, Tom Newkirk
Yes – Brian Cisneros, Michael Williams - Option Removed
- Middle School 6 – Hybrid/Remote Instruction w. Targeted Groups 5-8
VOTE: Yes: 4-2 – Option chosen with Brian Cisneros & Michael Williams voting against
- Middle School 7 – Fully Remote Instruction
VOTE: Not voted on due to choosing Option 6

VIII. ACTIONS

A. Superintendent Action Items: None

B. Board Action Items:

Todd Allen came forward to explain the reasoning behind the suggested calendar changes:

8/24 – 9/1 teacher workshop days. 9/2 – 9/18 re-entry transition orientation with first full day for students for the model selected would be 9/21.

The Board asked a clarifying question regarding the hour requirements for the state, which Todd answered. They asked if a motion was being sought for a calendar change. Jim stated that a motion was needed to change the start date for school to September 2.

There was additional discussion surrounding the time frame for review of options being too long at 9 weeks, concern that the length of time for orientation is too long and the possibility of shortening that period from September 18 to September 11. The different reasons for the schools need for the extended time for orientation.

The administration and principals answered the questions as they relate to their schools.

Al Howland made a motion to adjust the school calendar start date to September 2, 2nd by Denise Day. Motion passed with roll call vote of 5-1 with Michael Williams voting against.

Brian Cisneros asked if we could change Re-Learning day to Remote Learning Day. He also asked about snow days becoming remote learning days.

Jim said yes that is correct and this also can be used for heat days.

There was a brief discussion.

IX. SCHOOL BOARD COMMITTEE UPDATES:

~~A. Manifests Reviewed and Approved by Manifest Committee:~~

~~Denise Day and Dan Klein reviewed the manifests.~~

~~Payroll Manifest #~~

~~Vendor Manifest #~~

Denise Day mentioned that the Policy Committee met and that they reviewed, with District Counsel the Title IX policy that needs to be revamped due to Federal guideline changes. She also informed the Board that the District Counsel will be at the next Board meeting to review these new Federal regulations.

~~X. PUBLIC COMMENTS:~~

XI. CLOSING ACTIONS:

- A. Future Meeting Dates: 8/19/20 - Regular Hybrid/Remote Meeting 7:00 PM
9/2/20 - Regular Hybrid/Remote Meeting - 7:00 PM

~~XII. NON-PUBLIC SESSION RSA 91-A:3 II {If Needed}~~

~~NON-MEETING SESSION: RSA 91-A:2 I {If Needed}~~

XIII. ADJOURNMENT:

Brian Cisneros made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:10 p.m., 2nd by Al Howland. Motion passed with a roll call vote of 6-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Wendy L. DiFruscio
Executive Assistant to
Superintendent of Schools