



Endeavor Board Meeting Agenda: July 14, 2020

7:00 PM Zoom Conference

Log-in Info:

<https://us04web.zoom.us/j/77212913669?pwd=QjF6eXNFZU94NXc1VWloazhzMzd6UT09>

Present:

Board Member	Position	Term Start	Term Ending	Present
Amy Tharrington Start: July 1, 2016	Member	July 1, 2019	June 30, 2022	Yes
Jaclyn Parks Start: April 8, 2019	Member	July 1, 2019	June 30, 2022	Yes
Bill Kroll Start: May 19, 2016	Chair	July 1, 2019	June 30, 2022	Yes
Tracy DeMarco Start: June 15, 2017	Secretary	July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020	Yes
Ashley Hicks Start: June 15, 2017	Member	July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020	Yes
Kim Keith Start: May 25, 2017	Vice-Chair	July 1, 2017	June 30, 2020	Yes
Nick Cerullo Start: March 19, 2018	Member	July 1, 2018	June 30, 2021	Yes
Israa Kanfoud Start: July 12, 2018	Treasurer	July 1, 2018	June 30, 2021	Yes
Jon Fowler Start: July 12, 2018	Member	July 1, 2018	June 30, 2021	Yes

Call to Order:

Bill Kroll

- Bill Kroll called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.
- Mission Statement: Endeavor Charter School’s mission is to engage K-8 students by integrating a challenging, hands-on academic program with multi-faceted fine arts courses in a familial environment.
- Vision 2018: Endeavor Charter School’s vision is a community of educators and families working together to graduate students who are motivated and curious, capable and confident, and prepared to make a positive impact on the world around them.

Approval of Agenda:

Tracy DeMarco

- Tracy DeMarco moved to approve the July 14, 2020 Agenda. Kim Keith seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes:

Tracy DeMarco

- Tracy DeMarco moved to approve the June 2, 2020 and June 23, 2020 Minutes. Bill Kroll seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Purchase of Tech program for Assessment and Remote Learning:

Christi Whiteside

- Christi Whiteside explained that Board approval is needed for the purchase of tech programs that will be utilized for assessment in both remote and in person instruction.
- Christi explained that this purchase was not included in the 2020-2021 budget because we were not sure we would need it or be able to fund it. However, the need is now clear for three reasons:
 - First, North Carolina ended its relationship with Istation for the Read to Achieve assessment for K-3 readers. In lieu of Istation, the State has approved four programs that schools may select as a replacement. ECS will receive \$4800+ from the State to pay for the program we select.
 - Second, given the remote instruction offered in the spring and the lack of any end of year standardized assessment data, teachers need data to best plug holes and help each child grow this year. The difficulty in assessing a student remotely cannot be overstated.
 - Third, Christi acknowledged that all students are developing holes in their learning due to the remote instruction. All teachers are challenged with meeting a variety of needs under difficult circumstances. These tools will help identify areas of student need and to help meet those needs.
- iReady is a K-8 reading program approved to meet the state's requirements for Read to Achieve legislation as well as meet our needs for all students K-8. Dreambox Math is a math program which provides the same type of data for K-8 math students while helping our students learn math conceptually rather than formulaically. Both programs were explored by our staff leadership team during the 2019-2020 school year. Both tools gather data, assess areas of need, and provide practice. Together, they will cost approximately \$23,570.
- To fund this purchase, the state will provide \$4800+ toward the purchase of a Read to Achieve assessment program. In addition, our budget allocated \$5,500 toward the purchase of a similar program which we have now cancelled. Finally, Christi learned today that ECS will receive approximately \$24,300 from the CARES Act for charters who did not previously receive any of these funds.
- **Bill Kroll moved to approve the purchase of iReady and Dreambox Math for a total for \$23,570. Kim Keith seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Discussion of Plan B Options:

Board

- Christi began the discussion by noting that the school's selection of a Plan B will have a tremendous impact on planning for both teachers and families. Even though Governor Cooper has not yet made his announcement on whether schools may open on Plan A, B, or C, Christi urged the Board to make a decision on Plan B so that all parties could proceed with planning. In particular, the following decisions depend on the Board selecting a Plan B:
 - Families cannot be asked to decide whether to return to campus or remain 100% remote

- Until we know who will remain 100% remote, we don't know whether we can offer 100% on-campus childcare to staff kids, emergency responders' kids, etc.;
 - Families who are debating about leaving ECS can't make a decision until they have this clear picture. Late decisions means less chance to fill seats. Open seats means lost funds;
 - Staff childcare needs can't be established and staff available to help with staff childcare can't be finalized;
 - Fine arts cannot be planned for;
 - Lunch/recess may or may not need plans (which may impact fine arts plans and certainly impacts office staff plans) and this is a huge question for the teachers and whether or not they have lunch coverage impacts their opportunities to provide remote support;
 - Whether we offer live fine arts impacts the classroom teachers' time to provide remote support during the paid work day;
 - Who is able to offer remote support impacts what we do with our staff who cannot be on campus and who has to cover their in-person classes; and
 - Whether we offer in-person fine arts impacts whether we could consider offering all K or all 1st graders to be 100% on-campus because their rooms may or may not be available.
- Tracy DeMarco noted that NCDHHS today released new guidelines that discarded the 50% capacity requirement from a school's proposed Plan B. Instead, the State's guidelines now simply require that there must be six feet between seats/desks when students will be stationary—regardless of whether this means a school can accommodate more or less than 50% of its population on site at one time.
 - Christi explained that the administration, over the course of the summer, has prepared several potential Plan B options, but has narrowed it down to two options they believe to be the best course for the School:
 - In Option 5, approximately half of the students would be on campus until 1:00 p.m. Monday-Friday on alternating weeks.
 - Christi explained that this plan allows teachers and students to work together in person for a full week, enough time to learn a skill and gain traction in moving forward and assessing needs. The shortened day would eliminate the need to hold a distanced lunch, offer a modified recess block, or seek lunch/recess coverage within our already stretched staff.
 - In addition, teachers could respond to emails from remote students during “on the clock” time in the afternoon; no students would be exposed to another group's germs because the building could be deep cleaned each weekend; students would be off-campus for 9 days, almost the entire wait time for symptoms to develop; a lunch-hour pick-up time may be convenient for families.
 - Drawbacks of the plan include that it is not our norm; slightly less than 50% of the academic time would be in-person; each entire family must be on same schedule which will be difficult to arrange; it is a long day with no significant break; a different pick-up time may be challenging for families; any 50% plan creates a scenario where the teachers are planning for in-person and remote instruction. While we're working on a plan we believe

will be the best, the strain will still be significant to plan and assess for both settings, post digital work, and respond to a plethora of emails. Finally, this Plan would be difficult for staff members whose own children will be out of school for 50% of the time.

- In Option 7, approximately half of the students would be on campus for full days Monday through Thursday on alternating weeks.
 - This plan allows teachers and students to work together in person for almost a full week, enough time to learn a skill and gain traction in moving forward and assessing needs. The 3 days transition between groups would allow germs to die and the 10 day remote period would allow enough time for symptoms to develop before returning to campus.
 - In addition, the three day transition period allows any germs which survive a Thursday evening deep cleaning three days to die. This is the timeframe for the types of materials such as paper in books that we'd have a difficult time sanitizing, but use frequently. The 10 days off campus is the incubation period for students so if they were exposed and not symptomatic, it would be safe for them to return. Enough time for real teaching moments. Fine arts could be offered in person M-Th and/or virtually on Fridays. Fridays would be remote learning for everyone, not a day off. It could be a day for skill practice, digital programs, collaborative virtual tasks, video lessons, etc. Teachers could respond to emails from remote students and/or hold review groups through lengthier office hours each Friday. No students would be exposed to another group's germs because the building could be deep cleaned each weekend. A regular pick-up time may be convenient for families
 - Drawbacks of the Plan include that it is not our norm. 40% of the academic time would be in-person. Each entire family must be on same schedule which will be difficult to arrange. It is a long day with no lengthy break. We will need to establish a way to supervise a distanced lunch and modified recess without volunteers. It will be difficult for teachers to respond to emails M-Th after a full day in school. The FA team and office staff would have little time to assist with remote learners during the school day. Fridays may seem like a day off and student response may be lessened. A different pick-up time may be challenging for families. Any 50% plan creates a scenario where the teachers are planning for in-person and remote instruction. While we're working on a plan we believe will be the best, the strain will still be significant to plan and assess for both settings, post digital work, and respond to a plethora of emails. This is difficult for staff members whose own children will be out of school for 50% of the time.
- Christi explained that her first choice for the School is Option 5 because of the tremendous difference it makes in our staffing needs. Our office and fine arts staff will already have to support student and staff screening, remote instruction support while teachers are in class, possibly play a role in staff child care, cover classes for teachers unable to be on campus, and do their usual jobs. Adding in covering 27 homerooms for lunch and helping Josh with recess coverage is a game changer and puts the staff's time on more important tasks. Spreading our staff too thin puts us at risk for having to shut the school down because we can't staff it when a crisis occurs.)

- Kim Keith stated that a full day program would be better for working parents. In addition, she asked whether students would be losing two hours of instruction in the afternoon under Option 5. Christi responded that students would only lose one hour of instruction because there would be no lunch or recess on campus. In addition, the School would offer fine arts remotely in the afternoon. Kim Keith also noted that after school care is generally available for a day that ends at 3, but may not be available if the school day ends at 1. Christi responded that the school is looking at on campus after school care options for both Options. Jaclyn Parks asked whether it would be possible for the school to engage a bus to transport children to and from care centers. Christi responded that it is possible if the care center provides the transportation. Mary Beth Roberson asked whether the school nurse could use the music room or drama room so that the Multi-Purpose Room could be available for after school care.
- Bill Kroll asked each Board member to state his/her initial preference for Option 5 or Option 7. The results were as follows:
 - Option 5: Bill Kroll, Tracy DeMarco, Kim Keith, Nick Cerullo, Amy Tharrington, Ashley Hicks, Jon Fowler, Israa Kanfoud.
 - Option 7: Jaclyn Parks.
 - In addition, Jon Fowler and Israa Kanfoud suggested that the Board should further consider a 100% remote plan for the first quarter. John explained that the data he has seen from UNC Hospitals indicates that the peak will likely occur between September 9-15, 2020.
- *Public Comment.* The Board invited teachers and parents on the Board to share their perspective on the plans being proposed.
 - Molly Meuller stated that her preference is to be back in the classroom. She noted that she believes she is a better teacher in person than online. Of the two proposed plans, she is in favor of Option 5.
 - Carolyn Southard stated that she prefers Option 5 because it would be much easier to implement from an operational and safety perspective.
 - Holly Heasley stated that she would prefer the school to stay 100% virtual until 100% of the community is allowed on campus. She stated that teaching all students in the same environment is the best way to service the kids. Holly also stated that her son has asthma, and she has concerns about bringing him back to the building right now. Finally, Holly questioned how much social interaction the students would have on campus given the distancing requirements.
 - Stacey Clemmons thanked Board for its work throughout the shutdown. He states that the 50/50 plan is very stressful as a teacher because it would require teaching two sets of differently situated students on top of his own two children. He noted that childcare is big issue for his family because he and his wife both work at school. He questioned whether students would thrive in an environment where everyone was required to wear a mask. Finally, he said that his choice would be to stay 100% virtual, but if he had to, he would pick Option 5.

- Barbie Dalton stated that she would choose Option 5. She noted that the volume of email questions teachers received in the spring was constant, and that Option 5 would provide an opportunity to respond to remote students during the school day. Finally, she stated that she would prefer to go into the 50% model rather than stay 100% remote. She noted that the students need to be back and the level of teaching is better in person, in her opinion.
- Kim Keith acknowledged that teachers were responding to emails at all hours in the spring. Jaclyn Parks noted that this dedication is a testament to the quality of the teachers we have. On behalf of the Board, she stated that she hoped all the teachers know that the Board recognizes and appreciates all that they do.
- Christi ended the discussion by noting that we can't undervalue the impact of the varying plans on the staff.
- Bill Kroll asked each Board member to state informally whether we should consider looking at a Plan B schedule in August. The results were as follows:
 - In favor of August Plan B: Bill Kroll, Tracy DeMarco, Amy Tharrington.
 - Against August Plan B: Kim Keith, Jon Fowler, Israa Kanfoud.
 - Ashley Hicks and Jaclyn Parks stated that they were undecided at this time. Jaclyn asked that the issue be revisited on July 29th to look at whether in person instruction to begin on August 17th would be feasible.
- Carolyn Southard asked that the Board allow for at least 2 weeks for the staff to convert from 100% remote to 50% in person. She noted that teachers will need time to adjust their lesson plans and families would need to make arrangements for children. She noted concern for families who would need to find childcare every other week.
- Bill Kroll reminded the group that even under Plan B, families can choose to keep students 100% remote. Accordingly, a decision not to pursue a Plan B for August would prevent parents who want to and are comfortable doing so from giving their children an in person schooling option.
- Ashley Hicks noted that there are risks to the social emotional needs of the students in both the 50% in person and 100% remote plan. She acknowledged that any plan the Board chose would not be 100% ideal for anyone. Ashley stated that teacher buy in is important because otherwise the school could end up losing quality teachers – particularly those that have an underlying condition who may not feel safe coming back into the building. Tracy DeMarco noted that teachers with an underlying condition have a right to a reasonable accommodation to protect them, and the ECS would certainly be providing such accommodations to anyone who qualified for one.
- Amy Tharrington noted that a decision to stay 100% remote has significant implications for all families—particularly those with single parents or two parent working households. She stated that in the spring she did not feel competent to help her children get the instruction they needed. Teaching is not the specialty of most parents, and there is a different instruction level that takes place in class versus at home. Not all parents will be able to adequately support their students to learn from home, and it is not possible to give

them the same level of education that they would receive in a classroom with in person exposure to their teachers.

- Nick Cerullo and Jaclyn Parks asked for more information about how teachers feel about coming back to school and suggested that the administration survey the staff to get a better sense of what the community is feeling. Nick noted that, assuming teacher buy in, he would be in favor of bringing students back to campus, but wanted further information before voting on the decision.
- The Board agreed to meet again on July 28th to reevaluate this issue.

Presentation of Remote Instruction Plan:

Christi Whiteside

- Christi Whiteside stated that the Remote Instruction Plan the School is required to submit to the legislature must be submitted on behalf of the Board. While it does not require a vote, Christi presented the plan for comment before submission.
- Among other things, the Remote Instruction Plan includes the following:
 - Attendance procedure, focusing on the first 20 days for our funding
 - Families choose whether to stay remote 100% once we reopen on campus
 - A prioritized lottery for 100% on campus for students of staff, emergency responders, academic need, economic hardship, etc. for any seats made available by students staying 100% remote
 - Expectations for staff and students in any level of remote learning
 - How we will ensure quality instruction
- A copy of the Remote Instruction Plan is attached as Exhibit A to these Minutes.

Return to Athletics Discussion:

Christi Whiteside

- Christi explained that the state is allowing student athletes to return to campus sooner than Wake County is. However, Christi is not comfortable allowing athletes on campus if we aren't holding classes on campus. She proposed preparing all paperwork so that it is ready and to send registration info and a summer conditioning plan as soon as we know when we can return to campus with socially distanced practices starting on the same day we return to campus.
- The Board agreed that athletics would not return until students returned to campus.

2020-21 Calendar Change (state-mandated 5 Remote Instruction Days): **Christi Whiteside**

- Christi stated that ECS will use its beginning of year remote instruction days to meet this requirement, but then must add 5 additional days to meet the 190 student days requirement. Our contracts state 195 working days and by law we must offer at least 9 workdays.
- We propose making the following changes:
- Taking all 4 workdays within the school year and making them also remote instruction days: Sept 16, Oct 19, Jan 4 and April 12.
- **Bill Kroll moved to modify the 2020-2021 calendar to reflect the additional remote instruction days. Ashley Hicks seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Additional Items:

- Bill Kroll moved to transfer \$45,337.17 to the Foundation Board to pay the BCCG invoice for June. Israa Kanfoud seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment:

Bill Kroll moved to adjourn at 9:02 p.m.

Bill Kroll