

MINUTES
of the meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS of PINECREST ACADEMY OF NEVADA
September 8, 2020

The Board of Directors of Pinecrest Academy of Nevada held a meeting on September 8, 2020 at 12:00 p.m. via Zoom.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Board Chair Kacey Thomas called the meeting to order at 12:21 p.m. with a quorum present. In attendance were Board members Kacey Thomas, Craig Seiden, Marni Watkins, Jeff Cahill, and Travis Keys.

Also present were Lead Principal Lisa Satory, Principal Jessica LeNeave, Principal Jon Haskel, Principal Michael O’Dowd, and Principal Wendy Shirey; as well as Academica representatives Jessica Barr, Gary McClain, Arthur Ziev, Trevor Goodsell, and Ryan Reeves.

2. Public Comment and Discussion

Public comment was made by the following individuals regarding concerns with the reopening plan: Gabriela Diaz, Shelley Seiber, Ashley Muehlen, and Sam Mannino.

3. Approval of Minutes from the August 4, 2020 Board Meeting and the August 11, 2020 Board Meeting

Member Watkins moved to approve the minutes from the August 4, 2020 board meeting and the August 11, 2020 board meeting. Member Thomas seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

4. Nomination and Election of New Board Member

Mr. Trevor Goodsell addressed the Board and stated that he was recommending that Mr. Coby Sherlock be nominated to take the open seat that former member Randall Walker had held. Mr. Coby Sherlock addressed the Board and provided a brief history of his professional accomplishments and why he would be a great addition to the Board; adding that he did not have any children at Pinecrest Academy yet as his son would be turning one on Sunday.

Member Keys asked why Mr. Sherlock had chosen Pinecrest. Mr. Sherlock replied that he had become familiar with the Pinecrest model and a few of the campuses over the past year and a half as he had hosted a financial aid workshop at the Cadence campus to prepare junior and senior students to transition to college; adding that he had also participated with their Fall Festival. Mr.

Sherlock stated that he had partnered with a community group to donate a bus for the Horizon campus and, as a result, had been able to visit the campus and meet the administration. He also explained that, after meeting principals, teachers, and families within the community who were associated with Pinecrest, it had inspired him to be a part of the mission and vision of the school; adding that he wanted to be a part of the educational opportunities that Pinecrest afforded and looked forward to his own son attending school there.

Member Seiden asked Mr. Sherlock whether or not he was aware of the time commitment and the term of the position. Mr. Sherlock replied that he was aware of the time commitment and that he was highly committed to what he put as a priority; adding that his family was supportive of the position and that he was ready to commit to the Board for the full ten years.

Member Thomas asked Mr. Sherlock whether or not he would be able to participate on short notice, and whether he would be willing to visit the campuses. Mr. Sherlock replied that he would be providing a disservice to the Board, and to the entire Pinecrest community, if he did not familiarize himself with the Pinecrest culture; adding that he was eager to visit each campus to get to know the principals and their administration teams and staff. He also stated that, as a self-employed businessman of his own company, he would be able to make the time to be available on a moment's notice.

Member Watkins asked Mr. Sherlock why he chose Pinecrest over the other charter schools. Mr. Sherlock replied that his experiences with Cadence and Horizon, meeting Principal Shirey, and member Thomas's enthusiasm for Pinecrest had attracted him to Pinecrest Academy. Member Thomas stated that it was important for her to find another Board member that was willing to put in the time, excitement, and passion that was needed; adding that she had worked with Mr. Sherlock on community service projects and believed that he would be a great addition to the Board.

Member Thomas moved to approve Mr. Coby Sherlock as the newest board member to Pinecrest Academy of Nevada. Member Seiden seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

5. Approval and Acceptance of Grant Funding Awarded to Pinecrest Academy of Nevada for the 2020/2021 School Year:

- a. CTE – Competitive**
- b. CTE-Allocation**
- c. CTE-Perkins Rural**
- d. CTE-Perkins Local**
- e. Social Worker**
- f. CCR-AP**
- g. School Safety – School Improvements**
- h. AB309**
- i. Title II**
- j. Title III IMM**

k. SPED Part B

l. AB3

Lead Principal Lisa Satory addressed the Board and reviewed the grant funding that had been awarded to Pinecrest Academy of Nevada for the 2020/2021 school year.

Member Keys moved to approve the grant funding awarded to Pinecrest for the 2020/2021 school year as presented. Member Watkins seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

6. Lead Principal and Principal Reports and Update Regarding School Initiatives and Activities

Lead Principal Lisa Satory, Principal Wendy Shirey, Principal Michael O’Dowd, Principal Jon Haskel, and Principal Jessica LeNeave provided updates on campus events and current student enrollment, as well as updates regarding Federal and State correspondence, strategic planning, college and career initiatives, communication and marketing, special programs, instructional technology, school improvement, STEM, and professional development.

Member Thomas stated that Pinecrest Academy was up for the Best of Las Vegas and asked that the Principal send reminders to their communities. She also congratulated the principals on finding social workers and reaching 98% attendance rates across the campuses; adding that she was interested to know whether student clubs were still being ran at each campus. Principals Haskell, O’Dowd, and LeNeave replied that their student clubs were currently running at their campuses.

7. Presentation Regarding Prior Year School Data

Ms. Jessica Barr addressed the Board and reviewed the prior year’s spring iReady base-line school data; adding that Pinecrest had been the only system that had initiated their assessments in the homes of the students. Ms. Barr reviewed four areas of focus when addressing validity concerns, which included participation and completion rates, high test integrity, low test integrity, and reliability; adding that the data had shown consistent growth in all Pinecrest students during the spring term.

Ms. Barr explained that studies had indicated that the spring quarantine would have shown a negative impact on student’s learning, and that only 30% to 70% of the gains normally seen would have been possible; adding that many subjects would have seen a full year of academic loss. Ms. Barr stated that the results of the iReady data indicated that Pinecrest students had continued to grow educationally despite virtual instruction, being quarantined, and being in a crisis-response mode; adding that, on average, Pinecrest Academy saw tremendous gains that exceeded what researchers had thought would be normal in a typical school year without the state of the world

being as it was now. Ms. Barr reviewed the analysis as provided in the support materials and reported that Pinecrest had doubled what was typical in growth across all grade levels across all campuses.

In conclusion, Ms. Barr stated that the iReady data overwhelmingly showed that all five Pinecrest campuses would have had a high probability of earning a 5-STAR status for their elementary and middle schools; adding that Cadence's high school rating would have listed them as the #1 high school in the State of Nevada. Ms. Barr reported that the next rating would be in two years; adding that she would continue to provide the schools with their report card periodically throughout the school year to gauge progress towards goals.

8. Consideration of a Bond Financing Resolution Authorizing the Execution and Delivery by Pinecrest Academy of Nevada of an Amended and Restated Lease Agreement and All Other Documents Required in Connection with the Proposed Issuance by the Arizona Industrial Development Authority of its Education Revenue Bonds (Pinecrest Academy of Nevada – Sloan Canyon Campus Project) Series 2020 (the “Bonds”) and Authorizing the Taking of All Other Actions in Connection with the Issuance of the Bonds

Mr. Trevor Goodsell addressed the Board and stated that the bonds were for the second phase of the Sloan Canyon campus build out; adding that the bonds were being restructured to secure a better interest rate in the market. He explained that the school would be included and marketed as a whole Pinecrest system rather than as one campus, which would secure a rating that brought down true interest costs and made it more attractive to buyers; adding that the \$57 million dollars would be the maximum level to borrow. Mr. Goodsell continued that the new buildings would consist of classrooms, a gymnasium, a multi-purpose room, and a theatre that would also house additional classrooms; adding that the seats in the theatre would be movable to allow for other uses throughout the school year.

Mr. Goodsell reviewed the debt coverage service ratio on page 78 of the support materials; adding that page 41 indicated where the interest rates had been going for the past several months, which were around 4.5% for a BB municipal bond. Overall, he stated that it was a good time to go to market. Member Seiden stated that, prior to the meeting, the Pinecrest Foundation Board had met and had gone over the bond financing resolution in detail; adding that he felt comfortable with where the refinancing was headed and bringing it in line with the rest of the Pinecrest system bonds while keeping the same maturity date as the original 2018 bond issuance. Over all this would lower the interest rates and keep the maximum rent around \$325,000 a month.

Member Keys asked whether the bonds would cover everything needed for the buildout including furniture and fixtures. Mr. Goodsell replied that the furniture would be secured through the procurement department with a Zion's lease agreement; adding that the bond would cover all

the buildings and structures needed. Member Thomas asked if the bond would also cover the retractable seating. Mr. Arthur Ziev addressed the Board and replied that it would.

Member Thomas moved to approve the consideration of the bond financing resolution authorizing the execution and delivery by Pinecrest Academy of Nevada as presented. Member Seiden seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

9. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve a Janitorial Contract for Pinecrest Academy of Nevada from the Following: 1) MBJ Building Services, 2) Windy Storm Janitorial Services, 3) Brilliant General Maintenance, 4) Merchants Building Maintenance, 5) Interstate Premier Facility Services, and 6) Marsden West

Mr. Gary McClain addressed the Board and stated that each Pinecrest principal had been able to review and discuss each of the janitorial bids; adding that all the principals, with the exception of Cadence, had chosen MBJ Building Services. Mr. McClain explained that Principal LeNeave had requested to stay with her current janitorial vendor, Brilliant General Maintenance; adding that doing so would keep Cadence within \$3,000 of her current janitorial expense. Principal LeNeave stated that they had switched janitorial companies multiple times and had spent several years training the current company to their expectations and found value in their responsive management team.

Member Keys asked if there would be any issues with selecting two providers. Mr. McClain replied that each campus had been bid separately and that there would not be an issue with selecting two providers. Member Seiden asked what the length of the contracts would be. Mr. McClain replied that each contract would be for three years with 30 days to quit without cause. Member Keys asked when the new service would begin. Mr. McClain replied that they would begin 30 days after today.

Member Keys moved to approve MBJ Building Services as the janitorial provider for all campuses except for Cadence, which the Board would be selecting Brilliant General Maintenance as the janitorial provider . Member Watkins seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

10. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Reopening Plan and Possible Revision based upon the Updated Covid-19 Metrics

Mr. Goodsell stated that all public schools in Las Vegas were currently providing virtual education. He continued that the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) had met two weeks ago and had voted to allow each school to bring up to 25% of their enrollment into the

buildings, which included the highest needs students: SPED, ELL, and young learners who were at a disadvantage learning online. Mr. Goodsell stated that, presently, there were only a few students coming to campus by invitation only due to required SPED minutes.

Mr. Ryan Reeves addressed the Board and reviewed the Covid-19 In-Person Learning Guidance that was provided by the SPCSA; adding that Clark County was currently at mitigation level one, and that the mitigation level would need to be at a level two for an in-person, or hybrid, model to be considered. Mr. Reeves explained that Washoe County had applied for, and received, modifications to allow 25% to 50% of their students to participate in person; adding that the Clark County schools could also apply for the modifications, especially since the August 26th Covid-19 statistics in Clark County were trending toward a mitigation level two. Mr. Reeves stated that, based upon current base-line numbers, there would be space to initiate limited in-person instruction at no more than 25% of the schools population; adding that targeted student populations would be considered first and that the SPCSA would need to approve additional students beyond the targeted student populations.

Member Seiden asked if any other school system had put in for exceptions within Clark County. Mr. Reeves replied that he was not aware of any; adding that the other Academica partner schools had approved nine weeks of virtual education at the time schools went virtual, and they were not planning to revisit their stance until closer to the end of the nine weeks.

Member Keys asked Mr. Reeves if he was aware of the impact that had been made when a few of the Washoe County charter schools, who had gone back to school in limited form, experienced a few Covid-19 cases. Mr. Reeves replied that all of the SPCSA sponsored charter schools did not go back fully; adding that the non-charter schools in the Washoe County School District had welcomed back all elementary school students who had wanted to return to school under the Governor's restrictions. Mr. Reeves explained that, on top of the SPCSA regulations, the Governor's directives must also be adhered to; adding that there had been some positive outbreaks and were dealt with according to the directives that had been given by the health districts. Mr. Reeves reviewed the Covid-19 Preparedness and Response Plan for Schools; adding that guidance had been provided for reporting illnesses and contact tracing.

Member Keys asked if Academica had a recommendation for Pinecrest since they worked with other systems that would be having the same conversations. Mr. Goodsell replied that he had met with the principals and was comfortable with their recommendations. Principal O'Dowd stated that he and the other principals had discussed in detail offering a pilot program at one of the Pinecrest campuses to allow the kindergarten students back into the building for in-person instruction on an AM/PM schedule; adding that the Inspirada campus had been selected as the pilot campus due to the parameters that had already been set at the beginning of the school year for their kindergarteners to come back on an AM/PM schedule. Principal O'Dowd explained that their kindergarten students had already been assigned to either an AM, PM, or fully virtual schedule; adding that, should the Board approve the pilot program, the AM/PM students would

attend school for almost three hours, either in the morning or the afternoon, five days a week, and would not need a lunch or an elective. Principal O'Dowd stated that they could run the pilot program for two weeks to see if the program worked; adding that, if successful, they could expand the program to include first grade and then second grade after a few weeks.

Principal O'Dowd stated that the other campuses that had intended to go with a hybrid A/B schedule thought that transitioning to an AM/PM schedule on short notice would not work as well at their campuses; adding that they would be willing to make the transition as long as the pilot program was successful. Principal O'Dowd stated that all of the Inspirada kindergarten teachers were 100% on board, and eager and ready to start back to school; adding that the teacher who had been designated to teach the fully virtual model was still prepared and also ready to go.

Member Seiden asked if the older SPED, ELL, and disadvantaged students would be included with the kindergarten students to comprise the 25% of the student population being allowed to return to the building. Principal O'Dowd replied that the SPED students and small group students could also be included since 25% of his student population equaled 300 students. He continued that, with the AM/PM schedule, there would only be around 62 kindergarten students on campus at a time; adding that all kindergarten, first, second, SPED, and small group students would be able to participate in-person without violating the 25% mandate.

Member Watkins asked whether Inspirada's second grade had been set up as AM/PM. Principal O'Dowd replied that their second grade had been set up as an A/B hybrid model; adding that, if the second grades were to start with an AM/PM schedule, the parents would be notified of their options and then re-surveyed. Member Watkins asked if there were any other campuses that wanted to pilot the program. Principal LeNeave replied that all the principals shared in similar hesitations and that it would be important to make sure that the pilot program was successful at a campus that had already been set up with the AM/PM schedule; adding that they did not want to cause unnecessary changes to the students, families, and teachers on the chance that students would be able to stay on campus.

Principal O'Dowd stated that the biggest reason in initiating the AM/PM pilot program at the Inspirada campus was that there would be a very limited number of students who would need to change who their current teachers were. Lead Principal Satory also commented that, in order to initiate an AM/PM structure at the Sloan Canyon campus, there would be changes to student's assigned teacher; adding that there would have been many logistical changes needed as well. She also stated that the SPED departments, ELL teams, and intervention teams had been identifying students who are in most need to return to campus, and those students would be brought back to campus immediately. Principal LeNeave stated that she had felt that there had been a little ambiguity regarding the 25%; adding that she did not know if it was intended as 25% of each building or total school population. Mr. Reeves replied that the Cadence campus would be allowed to bring back 25% of the total population at each site; adding that the State would need proof that these students were at a grade level, or course, that was better suited to in-person instruction.

Member Thomas stated that she wanted the students in the building as soon as possible, but Pinecrest would need to stay within the State and SPCSA guidelines; adding that it was important that at least the students who were at an academic disadvantage be able to return. She also stated that she would not be opposed to a pilot program that included kindergarten and possibly first grade students returning with the disadvantaged students; adding that she did not want to give families any unnecessary changes that would negatively disrupt their lives. Member Sherlock asked what the time frame would be for testing the pilot program. Principal O'Dowd replied that his campus would be able to begin the pilot program as early as a week from today; adding that everything was set up and that communication could be sent to the parents giving them a week to prepare. He also stated that he would be happy to report back when the Board desired.

Member Cahill stated that it would be a mistake to open a pilot program at one campus and not the others; adding that he anticipated there being a large number of upset parents that would argue that their child would not be getting the same services as the Inspirada campus. He also stated that the Inspirada campus could have two weeks with no Covid-19 cases but that wouldn't necessarily mean anything since the incubation of the illness can last longer than that; adding that he felt the pilot program had been rushed and that there was not a set plan.

Member Watkins stated that she 100% supported a pilot program; adding that the kindergarteners, first graders, and SPED students were suffering educationally. She also stated that she recognized that they were in the midst of a pandemic and that what happened at one campus might not happen at another; adding that the pilot program would be a good indicator for how the other schools would perform. Member Watkins agreed that there would understandably be upset parents at the other campuses; adding that they would have upset parents no matter what the Board decided today. Member Cahill asked why a solid plan could not be created for all the campuses to use; adding that what happened at one campus should be available at all of them.

Member Sherlock asked the other principals how long it would take their campuses to be able to implement an AM/PM schedule if the pilot program was successful. Principal LeNeave replied that, in her opinion, an AM/PM schedule would not necessarily be the only way to go; adding that she would like to keep the A/B hybrid model at her campus for the elementary should the Inspirada campus be successful. She also stated that there were a number of teacher and family hesitations across the campuses to return to in-person instruction; adding that, even though the data might be marginally improving in the county, it had not significantly improved to the point where the State was making recommendations for students to return to in-person instruction. Principal LeNeave concluded by stating that, since Pinecrest was one of the only systems trying a pilot program, a slow roll-out would be better than no roll-out.

Member Keys stated that he agreed with member Cahill and that that each campus should be equally offering the same things if possible. He also worried that Pinecrest might be jumping the gun; adding that if the students go back to in-person instruction too soon, we could see the same things happening as in other states. Member Keys stated that he liked having a small roll-out

and that his preference would be to open all the campuses to the at-risk students first; adding that he would give the principals discretion for deciding which SPED, ELL, and/or any other students that would categorically fit within those parameters of needing in-person instruction. Member Seiden stated that he agreed with member Keys and that he would support a decision based upon his recommendation.

Member Cahill stated that his recommendation would be that more time be taken to formulate a plan for every campus, and to roll out that plan without feeling rushed; adding that he felt there wasn't a well-established plan for Pinecrest as a whole. Member Keys asked if the principal's initial reopening plans would change by allowing at-risk and/or kindergarten students to return first. Principal O'Dowd replied that, if each school had contemplated bringing back kindergarten students and followed the same plan that they had originally designed, then the initial reopening plans would have been followed and completed; adding that Principal LeNeave had alluded to this earlier, and that his campus had planned for a kindergarten and first grade AM/PM model while Principal LeNeave had planned for a kindergarten and first grade A/B hybrid model. Principal O'Dowd then stated that each campus had a written plan; adding that the question might be whether or not each campus would be ready to start their reopening plan and to allow the principals to decide that for themselves.

Member Cahill asked what the pilot program was for. Principal LeNeave replied that the pilot was for in-person instruction, and Mr. Reeves also replied that the pilot program was not just to see if anyone contracted Covid-19, but to see how schools could function while the restrictions were still in place. Member Cahill stated that, if all the campuses were ready to open under the restrictions, all the campuses should be able to open as opposed to just one. Mr. Reeves explained that many of the specific requirements for reopening had come out after the reopening plans had been submitted to the SPCSA; adding that the reopening plans were required to be submitted twenty days before the initial planned start date of school. Mr. Reeves stated that the pilot program could provide information beyond whether or not someone may or not contract Covid-19.

Principal O'Dowd stated that there were teachers at Inspirada who were willing to see if the pilot program would work under the current restrictions; adding that, worst case scenario, he could come back to the Board and report that it wasn't working after two weeks from the roll-out, saving the other four campuses from going through the same thing. Principal O'Dowd continued that the pilot program would allow them to find out what they did not know and to share that knowledge with the other campuses. Lead Principal Satory agreed and stated that her teachers had been worried about the outcome and wanted to wait for the feedback from the pilot program; adding that SPED teachers would only be working with a small number of students throughout the entire building.

Member Thomas stated that the Board would need to remember that the Inspirada teachers, who would be involved, were all comfortable with the pilot program; adding that there were teachers who were not comfortable coming back yet. Member Thomas stated that she agreed with

members Keys and Seiden in giving some autonomy to the teachers to allow the at-risk students to come back; adding that she also agreed with member Cahill that Pinecrest was known as one system and didn't want a rogue campus. Member Thomas explained that she was not against a pilot program, but there was more information that needed to be discovered other than if someone was going to get Covid-19.

Member Cahill stated that, regardless of what happened at Inspirada, every principal would need to figure out the reopening of their own school. Member Sherlock stated that the timeline needed to evaluate the success of each campus had been based upon what the principals had decided; adding that the Board also had to consider the second layer of the Governors regulations that could shift at any moment and send them back to making a new decision to support the schools in whatever way they would need. Member Seiden stated that, at the end of the day, the guidelines would continue to evolve and be dynamic; adding that they would need to be nimble on how the schools were set up once they could return. He continued that they would need to start somewhere and a pilot program was a good way to start with the mindset that everyone could be forced back into fully virtual education; adding that he would prefer that Pinecrest as a system would roll out a pilot program at each campus but also recognized that, no matter what was decided, there would be happy and unhappy parents.

Member Thomas asked member Seiden how he felt about bringing back some of the at-risk students. Member Seiden replied that, if the Governor had allowed it, a process should begin to effectively bring the at-risk students back to campus; adding that plans should be established and communicated so that everyone would know what to do if an outbreak should occur on a campus. Member Seiden also wanted to state that, if a teacher did not want to return to in-person instruction due to concern for themselves and/or other family members, it would be because their decision would impact so many other people and not just themselves; adding that the decision to not return to campus yet did not make that person a bad teacher. Member Thomas agreed and stated that the Pinecrest teachers had proven to go above and beyond and deserved the support of the Pinecrest community; adding that a blanket statement could not be made for anyone who was, or was not, willing to come back.

Mr. Reeves stated that he wanted to make sure that the Boards action would be clear from management's perspective for the sake of the principals, Academica, and concerns from Board members. He reiterated that the roll-out would be identified as a pilot, the duration of the pilot would need to be determined, who would make the determination whether the pilot was a success, and when would the other campuses follow suit, either by way of a follow up Board meeting, or follow suit by a principal cohort with determining a timeframe each campus would go into effect. Member Thomas stated that parents would need longer than one week to prepare for their kindergarten students to enter the building.

Member Cahill stated that, in regards to his comments earlier, the answers to Mr. Reeve's questions would need to be answered before the Board and principals could do anything. Lead

Principal Satory stated that she felt the principals could move quickly, especially the SPED department; adding that the at-risk students could be brought in without any delay. She also stated that the principals could begin planning with their kindergarten teachers how to bring the students back to campus once the pilot started and feedback could be shared from Inspirada.

Principal Haskell stated that he agreed that they could also start to bring back specific students in small groups in a short amount of time; adding that the St. Rose campus had been striving for consistency and would rather wait until the end of the first quarter to give the teachers and students more time to prepare for an entire grade level to return. Lead Principal Satory agreed with Principal Haskell and stated that waiting until the end of the first quarter would give the pilot time to work and to be able to provide feedback to the other campuses. Principal Shirey also agreed that waiting until the end of the first quarter would be more beneficial and provide time to survey the parents as to their opinions.

Mr. Reeves asked member Thomas if she preferred that parents have more than two weeks to prepare for the pilot or to have more than two weeks to experience the pilot. Member Thomas replied that she would prefer to have at least two weeks to experience the pilot; adding that the end of the first quarter would give students time to experience the pilot and provide a breaking point for students to transition. Principal Haskell stated that October 9th would be the end of the first quarter. Mr. Reeves asked the principals when the Board would need to tell them that each campus would be bringing their kindergarten and possibly first grade students into the building. Principal O'Dowd stated that the pilot could begin on September 15th, giving four weeks' time for the other principals to survey their communities and decide what would be best for their campus.

Principal LeNeave asked if the Board could make a motion that, if there were no significant changes to the current county and government regulations, Pinecrest could move forward after quarter one if the pilot had been successful. Mr. Reeves replied that all other Academics charters had committed to a fully virtual model for all grade levels until October 9th; adding that, on October 12th, Pinecrest was looking to take action for only grades K-1 while the other systems would begin bringing back all their students on a hybrid model, including CCSD. Mr. Reeves continued that there would most likely be more changes between now and October 12th with regards to what CCSD would be doing and in regards to what all the other charter schools would be doing; adding that there may need to be a reconsideration of all elementary levels coming back and not just kindergarten and first. He also stated that, should the numbers continue to drop and remain at baseline level, there would be nothing to prevent the schools starting their full hybrid education models; adding that, based upon this information, he suggested that the Board may want to meet and reevaluate the circumstances prior to the end of the first quarter.

Member Cahill stated that the question of what would deem a successful pilot program had not been answered. Mr. Reeves replied that the question would be answered in a general way by determining what had been successful that would necessitate the decision making authority, which would be the Board, to report back on what did or did not work from the pilot in a general format

since there was not a specific measure of what that would be. Member Thomas stated that, in order to serve our students and families, another Board meeting may be necessary before the end of the quarter in order to gauge how the pilot program was doing. Member Cahill stated that, even though he knew he was in the minority, he was still opposed to opening only one school instead of Pinecrest as a system.

Principal O'Dowd stated that the pilot program could be deemed successful if the teachers involved could say that they were able to work under the parameters that had been given from the Governor without any Covid-19 cases reported, and to be able to instruct the students successfully face to face; adding that the pilot program was not intended to see if anyone would contract the disease. Member Thomas asked whether or not parents would be given the option to stay fully virtual. Principal O'Dowd replied affirmatively. Member Sherlock stated that the Board would be looking for Principal O'Dowd to provide weekly updates as to whether or not the pilot was working; adding his invitation to the principals to prepare to open their schools should the pilot be successful and/or the mandates change from the Governor.

Member Thomas asked Principal O'Dowd if he was willing to pilot the program at his campus knowing the risks and the responsibility to the community should the pilot fail. Principal O'Dowd replied that he was 100% committed to piloting the program at the Inspirada campus; adding that his K-1 teachers were on board and that communication would be sent to parents after the Board meeting had ended. He also stated that he would report to the Board on a weekly basis, and that if there were any problems that he would be the first to pull the program.

Member Watkins stated that she was 100% on board with the pilot program being initiated at the Inspirada campus with the anticipation of rolling it out to the other campuses; adding that she was also in support of SPED, kindergarten, and first grade being allowed to attend in-person instruction in the buildings.

Member Sherlock moved to allow in-person instruction for IEP, 504, and ELL students as deemed necessary by each campus principal, and to allow in-person instruction for grades K-1 at Inspirada campus for a 4-week pilot program period to begin on September 15th. On September 30th the Board would meet to review the success of the pilot program and make decisions regarding additional in-person instruction to begin on October 12th.

Member Thomas stated that she was concerned with securing a quorum on the exact date of September 30th; adding that she would recommend changing the wording to read by September 30th. Member Keys asked if the Board should wait and meet at the end of the quarter. Member Thomas replied that the Board would need to meet before the end of the quarter if they wanted to bring students back to start after the first quarter. Member Keys stated that he wanted to give the pilot program enough time and recommend a change to the motion to include that a Board meeting would be held in the week after the first quarter ended. Mr. Reeves stated that the reasoning for the timing for the Board to meet around the 30th was to allow the principals to prepare and start in-

person instruction on the first day of the second quarter; adding that the principals would not be allowed to do so if the Board met during the first week of the 2nd quarter. Member Keys asked if meeting around the 30th would provide the Board enough time to evaluate the pilot program. Member Thomas replied affirmatively. Member Cahill stated that the Board would be relying on only two weeks of data instead of four; adding that the whole situation felt rushed and that it would not be a good idea.

Member Sherlock moved to allow in-person instruction for IEP, 504, and ELL students as deemed necessary by each campus principal, and to allow in-person instruction for grades K-1 at Inspirada campus for a 4-week pilot program period to begin on September 15th. By September 30th the Board would meet to review the success of the pilot program and make decisions regarding additional in-person instruction to begin on October 12th. Member Watkins seconded the motion, and the Board voted 5 to 1 to approve.

11. Public Comment and Discussion

Public comment was made by the following individuals regarding the pilot program and the reopening plan: August Binelli, Jill Wojevodzic, Tammy Kellen, and Kori Detmer.

Member Watkins stated that a parent had requested that she raise an issue to the principals regarding Project Exploration, the company that had collected money for last year's field trips. Member Watkins explained that Project Exploration had not issued any refunds and were not returning phone calls; adding that the parent had asked if the Board could intervene or request that the company not be used in the future. Mr. Reeves stated that Academica was aware of the situation and was currently assisting the schools with securing as many refunds as they could.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Approved on:

Sep 29, 2020



Marri Watkins (Sep 29, 2020 15:55 PDT)

Secretary of the Board of Directors

Pinecrest Academy of Nevada

PAN_Approved Minutes_9-8-20

Final Audit Report

2020-09-29

Created:	2020-09-29
By:	Annette Christensen (Annette.Christensen@academicanv.com)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAkjZCZIZBlzxAJ_3aa7lxJ1TpQLkIAOL1

"PAN_Approved Minutes_9-8-20" History

-  Document created by Annette Christensen (Annette.Christensen@academicanv.com)
2020-09-29 - 10:48:41 PM GMT- IP address: 70.165.14.114
-  Document emailed to Marni Watkins (marni@battleborn.vegas) for signature
2020-09-29 - 10:49:07 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Marni Watkins (marni@battleborn.vegas)
2020-09-29 - 10:55:25 PM GMT- IP address: 98.182.195.241
-  Document e-signed by Marni Watkins (marni@battleborn.vegas)
Signature Date: 2020-09-29 - 10:55:55 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 98.182.195.241
-  Agreement completed.
2020-09-29 - 10:55:55 PM GMT