

MINUTES
of the meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS of PINECREST ACADEMY OF NEVADA
September 29, 2020

The Board of Directors of Pinecrest Academy of Nevada held a meeting on September 29, 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 12:05 p.m. with a quorum present. In attendance were Board members Kacey Thomas, Craig Seiden, Marni Watkins, Coby Sherlock, and Travis Keys.

Board member Jeff Cahill was not present.

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 Trevor Goodsell and Ryan Reeves.

2. Public Comment and Discussion

Public comment was made by Daniel Freeman regarding the Inspirada campus pilot program and whether the other campuses would roll out an AM/PM or hybrid model.

3. Approval of Minutes from the September 8, 2020 Board Meeting

Member Watkins moved to approve the minutes from the September 8, 2020 board meeting. Member Keys seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

4. Review of the Inspirada Campus Pilot Program and Possible Action Regarding Changes in Educational Delivery (In-Person/Hybrid/Distance)

Principal Michael O’Dowd addressed the Board and expressed his gratitude for allowing the Inspirada campus to pilot the program; adding that he had hoped the Board had been receiving his weekly updates of the happenings with the program. He stated that, once permission had been granted by the Board to pilot a reopening with grades K-1, they had immediately contacted families to inform them of their child’s AM/PM or virtual placement; adding that the option had been given for families to change their initial option if needed. Principal O’Dowd explained that the AM schedule had been the more popular choice for families, and that a schedule was built to allow as many AM sessions as possible.

Principal O'Dowd reported that there were 125 kindergarten students, of which 79 were currently participating with in-person instruction and 46 were participating fully virtual; adding that, of the 79, 55 were participating in the AM classes and 24 were participating in the PM. Principal O'Dowd reported that there were 150 first graders, of which 111 were participating in person and 39 were fully virtual; adding that, of the 111, 63 were participating in the AM classes with the remaining 48 students attending in the PM. He also reported that, to date, there had not been any cases of the Corona virus on campus; adding that two students had been sent home from the health office, one for an upset stomach due to a dairy intolerance and the other for a headache due to allergies.

Principal O'Dowd stated that he attributed the good health of the students, teachers, and staff while at the school to the extensive cleaning procedures, social distancing reminders and indicators, daily temperature checks, hand sanitizing stations throughout the campus, and utilization of face masks; adding that the students had been doing a great job of wearing and keeping their masks on. Principal O'Dowd also stated that all students were required to go through car loop during arrival time, and that temperature and mask checks were being conducted before the student exited their vehicle; adding that, in the event the student had a fever, the student could be taken home by their parent immediately. He also stated that they had been receiving positive parent support.

Principal O'Dowd stated that, according to the CDC, the rate of infection among younger school children, and from student to teachers, was very low especially when proper precautions were followed. Principal O'Dowd continued that there had been only a few reports of children being the primary source of Covid-19 transmissions among family members; adding that this had been consistent with the data that had been collected from the virus and the anti-body testing that suggested that children were not the primary drivers of Covid-19 spread in schools or in the community. Principal O'Dowd explained that, based upon the data, they had taken more precautionary measures for the safety and well-being of the staff; adding that staff members participated in daily temperature checks, utilized a health screening questionnaire, disinfected and sanitized all surface areas every day in every classroom, removed unnecessary furniture to reduce surface areas, spaced desks as per CDC guidelines, participated in mandatory mask and shield wearing, and socially distanced themselves during breaks and meetings.

Principal O'Dowd reported that the academic benefits that had been observed in the past two weeks included teachers being able to better assess the student's knowledge and understanding; adding that the teachers were being able to clearly hear the students and assess as to whether the student was saying the proper letter or letter sound. Teachers were able to assess how their students were actually performing without the promptings of their parents. He also reported that there had been a faster pace of instruction seen with in-person compared to online; adding that there were fewer delays due to technological issues which had allowed the students to be more engaged and teachers could be more spontaneous with instruction and classroom discussions. Also, with the AM/PM model, class sizes were smaller with only 12 to 13 students in the classroom at a time allowing teachers to better differentiate for their students. Principal O'Dowd continued that the social and emotional well-being of the students had increased since being in the classroom,

and that SPED students had been benefiting from the increased social interaction; adding that there had been an increase in language growth and social skill development.

With only two weeks of time, Principal O'Dowd stated that he had been surprised by the amount of data that had been collected. He stated that, as of last week, the kindergarten teachers had taught eight different letter names and sounds; adding that 78% of in-person kindergarten students had mastered both the letter name and sound of the eight letters that had been introduced up to that date, compared to the 58% of virtual students who had mastered the letter name and sounds of the same eight letters. 72% of in-person students had mastered the ten sight words that had been introduced so far, compared to the 40% of virtual students. Principal O'Dowd also wanted the Board to know that each Pinecrest campus had been able to send at least one administrator to the Inspirada campus to talk about the pilot program and to observe the safety measures that were in place in order for future implementation at their campus.

In conclusion, Principal O'Dowd reported that they had been able to fully implement the Governor's mandates for in-person teaching, including social distancing, wearing a mask, 50% occupancy, screening of students and employees, promoting healthy hygiene procedures, intensifying cleaning procedures, encouraging those who were sick to stay home, and developing plans to take care of sick staff and students while on campus. There had been zero confirmed, or suspected, cases of Covid-19 among students and staff, and students were more engaged, attentive, and learned at a faster rate during in-person instruction compared to students learning virtually at home.

Principal O'Dowd stated that his recommendation would be to continue in-person learning using an AM/PM model at Pinecrest Inspirada for K-1; expand the pilot program at Inspirada to grades 2-3 using the AM/PM model; expand the pilot program at Inspirada to also bring back one 6th grade class from 8:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. to take their core classes in the building and their electives virtually from home. Principal O'Dowd explained that those who would be participating had been identified as struggling students due to virtual learning and the changes, workload, and expectations from elementary school to middle school; adding that the group consisted of sixteen IEP students, five 504 students, two SBAT students, and nine general education students. Principal O'Dowd stated that Board approval would be needed to bring back the SBAT and general education students since they were not approved with the SPED and 504 students. Principal O'Dowd also recommended that the pilot program be expanded to all Pinecrest of Nevada campuses.

Members Thomas and Keys expressed their gratitude to Principal O'Dowd for his report and for all the hard work that he and his staff had put into the pilot program. Member Keys addressed the concern presented by Principal O'Dowd that the Board had not approved for SBAT and general education students to be included in the return to in-person instruction. He stated that, after reviewing the minutes from the previous meeting, students that were struggling regardless of their designation would be allowed to return; adding that principals had been given autonomy in deciding which of their students were at the most risk educationally due to virtual instruction and would need to return to in-person instruction. Member Sherlock stated that the motion read that it had been deemed necessary by each campus principal as to which students would be allowed.

Principal O'Dowd thanked members Keys and Sherlock for the clarification; adding that he wanted to make sure the directives were being followed.

Member Seiden asked how many students would be on campus should the 2nd and 3rd graders be allowed to enter. Principal O'Dowd replied that 298 students would be on campus; adding that 25% of his total student population was 300. Principal O'Dowd explained that SPCSA Director Rebecca Feiden had communicated that they could grant a particular school, or system, up to 30% of in-person instruction once they could demonstrate that they were doing well and making progress; adding that he did not know if they would need to ask for the additional allowance at this time.

Lead Principal Lisa Satory addressed the Board and stated that she had had a lengthy conversation with Director Feiden last week; adding that Director Feiden had been receiving the updates from Principal O'Dowd and had been very pleased with the progress and success of the pilot program. Lead Principal Satory continued that Director Feiden had said that, based on Pinecrest showing success with the pilot, once they had met the 25% Pinecrest would be in a good position to be granted an exemption up to 30% and possibly beyond. Member Thomas asked to hear from the other principals regarding their thoughts and concerns regarding the pilot program and what they would want to set up at their campuses.

Lead Principal Satory stated that her staff had been very encouraged and were excited at the prospect of bringing students back; adding that she had met with staff on the discussion of the AM/PM model versus the hybrid model that had originally been planned. She stated that the AM/PM model gave teachers time to focus on core subjects and having students attend five days a week; adding that teachers felt they could maximize on their instruction while not having to juggle instructing students in-person and virtually at the same time. Lead Principal Satory stated that one of the concerns of the AM/PM model included the possibility of students being on different schedules than their siblings when the middle school opened, which would require parents to drop-off and pick-up several times a day. Overall, after discussion of both models, Lead Principal Satory stated that her staff had voted to begin with an AM/PM model for grades K-5; adding that they would begin with grades K-2, then add grades 3-5 a few weeks later, and continue to roll up from there. Lead Principal Satory stated that the Sloan Canyon campus was prepared to open; adding that hand washing stations had been ordered, social distancing stickers were in place, duty stations, cleaning responsibilities, and procedures for car loop had been discussed.

Member Thomas asked what the principals were doing for those teachers who did not feel comfortable teaching in person yet. Lead Principal Satory replied that there were a few teachers at Sloan Canyon that were not comfortable coming back yet due to health concerns, and that she would be working with them to either incorporate them as virtual instructors, or to make sure that they were able to work in a safe environment.

Principal Wendy Shirey addressed the Board and stated that, when they had initially designed their schedule, they had at least one teacher per grade level that would only be teaching virtually. She explained that, at the time, 5th grade did not have the numbers to support a virtual class and a teacher had not been designated; adding that every other grade level had at least one designated virtual teacher. Principal Shirey stated that they had recently surveyed their parents,

and out of the 75% who had responded, 56% indicated that they would like the half day option, 15% wanted virtual, and 29% asked for hybrid instruction. Principal Shirey stated that, out of the 29% who had asked for hybrid, 7% indicated that they would choose the fully virtual model if the AM/PM model was the only option, which would bring virtual to 22%; adding that the remaining would make the AM/PM schedule work.

Principal Shirey also stated that a focus group, comprised of a few parents, had been created to ensure that parents input had been taken into consideration; adding that parents had voiced strong concerns regarding having three different schedules to maintain. Principal Shirey stated that, if they were allowed to come back, the Horizon campus would likely work under the AM/PM schedule for in-person instruction with a fully virtual option for those families that could not work within an AM/PM framework. She also explained that, out of the kindergarten and first grade students, 37% had a sibling in another grade level that would have to coordinate a different schedule; adding that they were already in the process of placing students in the same household in the same schedule.

Principal Shirey continued that the teachers were excited to teach the students in the building again; adding that there was a feeling of hope that they would be able to bring the students back to teach, help, and do what was best for them. She expressed her gratitude to Principal O'Dowd for taking on the pilot program so that they could see that it would work to bring back the students; adding that it had been seven months since students had been in the buildings.

Principal Jessica LeNeave addressed the Board and stated that the Cadence campus had initially prepared to come back in a hybrid model, including putting safety measures in place for teachers to have some form of live instruction; adding that now she did not know if it would be possible for every teacher, who wanted to remain virtual, to remain virtual. Principal LeNeave explained that an inquiry had been made to legal counsel regarding the conversations that would be made to teachers who would not be able to remain virtual due to numbers.

In regards to bringing students back, Principal LeNeave stated that she would like to be allowed to go up to at least the 25% and to give the principals autonomy of how to bring in the students; adding that 25% of her student population would be equal to 500 students that could be brought on campus at any given time. Principal LeNeave stated that, for Cadence, grades K-4 would be the best grades to give the community an AM/PM or hybrid option to choose from; adding that 5th grade and up would not be suited to an AM/PM schedule since they ran on a secondary schedule. She reported that around 65% of the Cadence elementary teachers had voted for an AM/PM model while 25% had hoped for a hybrid model; adding that 10% had no preference.

Principal LeNeave stated that they had around 70% of their kindergarten and 1st grade students who had siblings at the school; adding that siblings were a big deal at Cadence and they spread throughout the entire school. Principal LeNeave stated that, when there was not a way for 5th graders and above to come back in an AM/PM setting, she wanted to give the K-4 community a voice; adding that a survey based upon the results of today's Board meeting would be sent. Principal LeNeave stated that, if the majority of families requested AM/PM, knowing that when secondary came back that their children would be on a separate schedule, Cadence would be happy

to entertain an AM/PM model. If the majority selected hybrid then serious thought would be given; adding that the priority was for students to be able to come back to in-person instruction, and that it would be irresponsible to choose an option that did not allow students to attend in person because it was not conducive for families.

Principal LeNeave concluded her remarks by stating that Cadence would be hosting a parent impact meeting in the morning to discuss the results of this meeting and to launch whatever survey would be in accordance. She also clarified that she had asked for autonomy in breaking up the 25% in order to, not only bring in the elementary students, but to also bring in SPED students, seniors who were struggling to meet graduation requirements, 6th graders who were struggling with their transition into secondary, and/or 9th graders who were not off to a great start in their first year of high school. Principal LeNeave also asked for clarification as to what types of special groups would be deemed appropriate to bring back onto campus.

Member Thomas stated her thanks to Principal LeNeave; adding that she had gone back to the previous meeting's minutes and confirmed that the Board had motioned that those students who had been deemed necessary by each campus principal would be allowed to return to campus; adding that she did not feel that motion would change once all the principals had reported and the Board could further discuss the item at hand.

Principal Jon Haskel addressed the Board and stated that he had appreciated the opportunity to observe the pilot program and that it had been good to see the students physically in the building. Principal Haskel stated that, although he had teachers that were more comfortable teaching virtually and were enjoying the consistency, he also had a lot of teachers who wanted the students back physically in the classroom. He also pointed out that the State's metrics had been going down, which would make it safer to be in the building.

Principal Haskel stated that St. Rose had initially planned to bring back only kindergarten students; adding that a survey had been sent to the kindergarten families and 73 of the families wanted to return to in-person instruction while 26 wanted to remain virtual. Out of the 73 families, 40% had chosen a hybrid option, 30% chose an AM/PM option, and 30% chose fully virtual. Principal Haskel explained that, after recent discussion, their plan had now changed to focus more on an AM/PM model; adding that it would be more affective and his teachers were overwhelmingly in favor of it. He also explained that teachers felt that they would not be able to be affective while trying to manage students online and students in the classroom at the same time; adding that the elementary teachers were the most concerned due to the younger ages and abilities of their students. Principal Haskel stated that he would like to roll out K-1 in an AM/PM model, adding grades 2-3 a week or two later, and following shortly after that with grades 4th and 5th if the numbers allowed; adding that he would like to incorporate the 5th graders in an AM/PM model, if possible, to accommodate families.

Member Thomas asked staff if there had been any updates from the State. Mr. Trevor Goodsell addressed the Board and replied that, yesterday, Clark County had been placed into a baseline category; adding that, if the county stayed at that level for at least two weeks, businesses would be allowed to go to a 50% model, knowing that if the level should increase again everyone would automatically be moved back into the 25% model. Member Thomas asked if, based upon

Clark County's baseline level, staff's recommendation would be to stay at a 25% model for a while to avoid the possibility of jumping back and forth between 25% and 50%. Mr. Goodsell replied affirmatively.

Member Seiden stated that everyone would agree that in-person instruction was best for the students, and that no one needed to try to convince the Board that being in-person was what was best for everybody. He continued that the issue was more about trying to keep everyone as safe as possible rather than what would be the best way to learn. Member Seiden stated that one of the components with Covid-19 was contact tracing. He asked the principals what their plans were for informing the 400+ individuals that would potentially be in their building on a particular day should a case occur. Principal Haskell replied that the SNHD had given guidance regarding contact tracing should a case occur; adding that, if a student had a confirmed case of Covid-19, any student, or adult, in the same room as the infected student would be required to quarantine for 14 days. If a child was sent home with Covid-19 symptoms the student would be required to quarantine for 14 days, or receive a negative test, without being confirmed positive to be allowed back into the building.

Member Seiden clarified that he would like to know what mechanisms were in place for the principals to know who exactly to contact for contact tracing purposes should an individual on campus test positive for Covid-19. Principal Haskell replied that only the individuals in the direct classroom would be notified; adding that the SNHD did not require a secondary contact trace. Principal Haskell continued that, in the AM/PM model, there would not be any movement out of the classroom; adding that the contact tracing would not be a chain of contacts. Member Seiden asked if a PM class would need to quarantine if someone in the AM class tested positive since the teacher would be the constant between the two sessions. Principal Haskell replied that, at that time, the teacher would be quarantined and the PM class would be required to go virtual. Mr. Goodsell also replied that staff would reach out to the health district for clarification on who would need to be contacted; adding that the principals were following all the guidelines from the SNHD.

Principal O'Dowd stated that, should an AM class be required to quarantine, then a substitute would be needed for the PM class or quarantine both classes; adding that the principals would need to be prepared to do that should that situation arise. He also stated that, with the AM/PM schedule, there were no lunches, specials, or transitions that would bring a cross contamination from one class to the next; adding that the contact tracing would be specific to the classroom since there was a fifteen minute contamination period. Member Thomas asked if the principals had thought about who would be teaching a class whose teacher had to be quarantined. Principal O'Dowd replied that a building substitute would be called in to cover the class; adding that, if the teacher wasn't sick, they could still teach their class virtually.

Principal O'Dowd stated that, now that teachers had had time to teach virtually, they did not know how they would be able to juggle instructing in-person students at the same time as virtual students; adding that they feared that the students online would be left behind or forgotten. He explained that the AM/PM model made sense for the elementary and that he did not know how secondary would work yet since there were numerous features to consider such as elective classes; adding that what would work at his campus might not work at the others. Principal O'Dowd stated

that he was in support of the Board granting the principals discretion with up to the 25%. Principal Haskell added that St. Rose would be looking to finish the semester virtually and then reassess how to bring back the middle school students and at what capacity.

Member Sherlock stated that, based upon the principal's comments, the AM/PM model looked like it would be the model that the majority of the systems would follow. He asked Principal LeNeave how long it would take Cadence to implement the students back in to the classroom once their survey had been conducted. Principal LeNeave replied that they would prioritize elementary school first and open in the second quarter with the addition of small groups of secondary students as needed; adding that, whether they chose the AM/PM or hybrid model, their timeline would not change, only the time of day the students would be on campus. Principal LeNeave also stated that she did not see a clean way of bringing all secondary students back on an AM/PM model.

Member Thomas stated her thanks to Principal O'Dowd for running the pilot program at his campus; adding that safety was the Board's top priority and staying within State guidelines. She also stated that it would be important to keep autonomy at each of the campuses due to the respective issues that each campus had as either a K-5, K-8, or K-12. Member Thomas stated that her recommendation to the Board would be to grant autonomy to each principal for how they would bring their students back; adding that struggling seniors were just as important as kindergarteners who did not know how to get on a Zoom call. She also recommended that the schools be allowed to bring back up to 25% of their student population in conjunction with State and health guidelines.

Member Keys stated that he would recommend for a motion that included following State recommendations and allowing the schools to go to 25% capacity, specifically allowing each principal to decide how that would work for their respective campus. He continued that each campus would strictly follow the plan that had been created and successfully tested at the Inspirada campus. Member Keys also recommend that core subjects be prioritized at this time, saving elective courses and clubs until the second semester. For designations of IEP, 504, ELL, and anyone else who was seen as high-risk, Member Keys recommended that each principal be able to decide which groups, or individual students regardless of designation, needed additional support in-person. He also recommended that the Board meet again to discuss going to 50% capacity when the State gave guidance and were under the benchmarks; adding that the Board needed to wait at least a month before meeting again to avoid any unnecessary changes that would directly affect families. Member Watkins stated that she supported member Keys' recommendations.

Member Keys moved to keep in line with State recommendations of attendance requirements and the bench marks that would need to be met; and for now, allowing each school to go up to 25% occupancy, and that each principal could decide for their own campus which grades and students and how they would like to implement that. Also, that each campus would strictly follow the plan that had been created and that Inspirada had tested in the pilot program, and that principals could also decide what designations they would like to use to consider at-risk students, and that the Board meet again, when recommend, to talk about going to a 50% capacity but waiting at least 30 days before having another meeting to decide that.

Member Thomas stated that she wanted to clarify that the principal's autonomy could include the choice between an AM/PM or hybrid model depending on their community. Member Keys replied affirmatively; adding that, at that point, he was satisfied that the principals were communicating with their teachers and community, and that they would follow what the consensus was. Member Seiden asked for clarification that the motion would be for core subjects and not electives. Member Keys replied that his personal opinion would be to leave that up to the principals as they moved forward with the recommendation that the schools focus on core subjects before any electives due to the fact that they were still in the first benchmark period with the 25% capacity.

Member Watkins asked when the campuses would start their in-person instruction. Member Keys replied that they would start the first day of the 2nd quarter, October 12th. Member Sherlock stated that his concern was that he did not want the wording regarding the plan, "...as laid out by Inspirada..." to limit, or conflict, with the autonomous move for the principals. He recommended using wording that would suggest a plan based on safety and cleanliness rather than that of instruction. Member Keys agreed with member Sherlock and restated his motion to provide clarity regarding the plan.

Member Keys moved to keep in line with State recommendations of attendance requirements and the bench marks that would need to be met; and for now, allowing each school to go up to 25% occupancy, and that each principal could decide for their own campus which grades and students and how they would like to implement that. Also, that each campus would strictly follow the plan that had been created and tested at Inspirada: meaning as far as cleanliness, taking care of the campus, social distancing, and contact tracing if necessary; all the details that the principals had met with initially and had decided together and then were implemented at Inspirada, and not including the areas that were to remain autonomous such as instruction and grades. Principals could also decide what designations they would like to use to consider at-risk students, and that the Board meet again, when recommend, to talk about going to a 50% capacity but waiting at least 30 days before having another meeting to decide that. Member Sherlock seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

11. Public Comment and Discussion

Public comment was made by the following individuals regarding TEAMS, contact tracing, the pilot program, and the reopening plan: Georgia McCoy, Alessandra, Gabrielle Peterson, Ashley Muehlen, and Carlos Lopez.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:22 p.m.

Approved on:

Dec 1, 2020

Kacey Thomas

Kacey Thomas (Dec 1, 2020 07:57 PST)

Secretary of the Board of Directors

Pinecrest Academy of Nevada






PAN_Aproved Minutes_9-29-20

Final Audit Report

2020-12-01

Created:	2020-12-01
By:	Annette Christensen (Annette.Christensen@academicanv.com)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAJh5Od4NxZGFewHbKOQaNW8ZIhBMeR8Zf

"PAN_Aproved Minutes_9-29-20" History

-  Document created by Annette Christensen (Annette.Christensen@academicanv.com)
2020-12-01 - 0:29:15 AM GMT- IP address: 70.165.14.114
-  Document emailed to Kacey Thomas (kacey.thomas@american-national.com) for signature
2020-12-01 - 0:29:40 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by Kacey Thomas (kacey.thomas@american-national.com)
2020-12-01 - 3:57:32 PM GMT- IP address: 71.38.126.234
-  Document e-signed by Kacey Thomas (kacey.thomas@american-national.com)
Signature Date: 2020-12-01 - 3:57:57 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 71.38.126.234
-  Agreement completed.
2020-12-01 - 3:57:57 PM GMT