

9/2/20 - Workshop Business Meeting

Present - Patrick D. McCabe, Roxanne Rebmann, Jim Grant, Cynthia Tretter, Phil Kenline, Erik Polkowski, Robert Masse, Heather Cayea, Deborah Forrestel, Jody Brege, Todd Esposito

Jim - It's 7pm, let's call the meeting to order. Pledge to the Flag. Item #2 is Hearing of Individuals and Delegates. Mrs. Rebmann, do we have any comment sheets?

Roxanne - No, we do not.

Jim - We're going to move on to Committee Reports. Nothing to report. Item #4 Superintendent's Report.

Pat - Good evening, everyone. Quite a bit to share, as you can imagine now that September has rolled around the corner. I wanted to just start by informing the Board and expressing my appreciation for all that you did. Really since March, it's been a long six months. Somehow or another we have managed to find our way through it and ready for the 20-21 school year. Likewise, I'm so grateful to our administrator staff for the tremendous amount of work that they have done and continue to do. When you think about it, we finalized our information from the Department of Health and the Governor only just a few weeks ago. Had the wonderful opportunity for the community forums. We had additional input from parents and our teachers. Responding to the various surveys, including the probably most importantly, the survey in which families identified to us whether or not they wanted to be in a fully remote model. Given that there were approximately 19% of our families choosing that model, it required a full force of effort to get the scheduling done relative to Cohort A, Cohort B, and then finding ways to schedule children in knowing that they could be families representing three buildings in a way not to exceed our maximum capacity in classrooms with the six foot of social distancing. Beyond just the mere numbers, there were logistical barriers to the classroom sizes that the middle school and high school had to do that resulted in a tremendous amount of hand scheduling. I want to thank our guidance counselors as well and all of our teachers who led us through that process. Talking to colleagues around the region, we're not alone in that. One of the things that we're so proud of is the uniqueness of our size, sometimes it makes us agile and switch gears rather readily. One of the drawbacks is when you're a small school, you only have so many places that you can schedule kids. Some of those larger districts, I talked to a superintendent today in fact, that has twenty 4th grades in one building, so scheduling kids for remote with twenty teachers is a lot easier than our situation. We are ready. We are ready for kids and appreciate the flexibility of allowing us an additional day without children so that Tuesday and Wednesday are fully remote. Thursday is our first day with kids back. I shared with the teachers on opening day on my opportunity to present to them, kind of a fun fact about reopening. It's that when we submitted our reopening plan, which you know was a living document, I had to attest to 19 pages of assurances. In total there were 89 statements that I had to attest, confirming yes the district will do these things. Of those 89 represented things, like transportation, food service, educational programming, digital equity, obviously health services, screening, reporting. I can go on and on. I did share with our teachers and our faculty who joined me of those 89, and they're all important, we will comply with all of them of course, I did identify four that I think really have to be the foundation of everything we do. I just want to share those with you this evening and for any community members watching, and that is we will support the mental, behavioral, and emotional health of our students and our staff. I added staff in there, it's actually not one of the assurances. This is a time when people are feeling especially vulnerable. There's a lot of uneasiness. We know that our kids, school's going to look and feel very different. If we focus on that, if we make a commitment to making school a place where they still feel as warm and welcoming despite these additional structures and changes to how education is delivered and how they ambulate around the building. That has to be our logical starting point. Likewise, the second assurance that I think is critical for our success is engaging in a rigorous professional development model and collaboration in support of our faculty and advancement of student achievement. I will tell you that the learning curve since the spring has been steep. We were in almost a survival mode. From this point though, we know that we have to provide our kids with first-hand learning experiences that are meaningful and interactive. Doing so requires a unique skill-set, particularly digital literacy skill-set our teachers need to acquire, and they've been working very hard at doing that, but we have to maintain a level of commitment for them. We also have to maintain a commitment to our families because this is new to them as well. We already have planned some family workshops around some of the digital tools that their children will be using. The third one

was multiple pathways for students to participate in learning and demonstrating mastery of our learning standards. It's going to need to be different for different children. We know that younger children in particular cannot sustain long periods of time focused on a screen. The teachers are going to need to be creative in doing that. Some of our older children through traditional instructional delivery models and assessment models simply don't work in this new platform. It might be more project-based learning for many kids. We need to think about, and we will be thinking about throughout the year, how to build those platforms. The final one that I'd like to share was just creating and implementing a program that allows for regular and substantive interactions with teachers and students. One of the biggest concerns, and I know you all heard and I certainly heard it, was a feeling that because of some of the digital challenges that the interactions between teachers and students weren't at the level that we know we'd like them to be. I will tell you that I'm glad that our kids are with us in a hybrid model. I'm glad that they're with us for part of the day, but in my estimation it's always going to be a compromise. Digital learning is never going to be the same as in-person instruction. We have to make sure that we're finding ways for interactions. I'm particularly concerned for our fully remote kids. I entirely respect the parents' choice in that matter, and that's not the point. The point is we have to find ways to teach, engage, and interact with those kids. I worry, quite frankly, that children will think that it's a return to the spring and it's just to continue to participate. You have to acquire the learning standards. That's going to fall upon not only our teachers, but our guidance counselors, and our building administrators. Just wanted to share those four things with you because I do think they are substantial priorities. Kind of a segway, is addressing the issue of lack of reliable internet connectivity. I've given the Board a quick update on some things that we have done to address that issue. In particular I want to commend Mr. Dailey and Dr. Farrar and our building principals, but particularly Doug and Pon, who have been working tirelessly on this since early this spring. As I've shared I believe with the Board, we have 44 children who have chosen the remote option but do not have reliable internet. That became a priority for us. We need to engage these kids. We have been exploring and now are in the process of purchasing and securing 24 Wi-Fi hotspots. Those 24 hotspots will go and serve obviously 44 kids. It's multiple kids per household in some cases. It will be a bit of a trial run, quite frankly. We know some of the roads there is no internet connectivity even with a hotspot. That family may need to use the hotspot and drive to a location where they connect to a tower where it will connect. These devices are strong enough that they should be able to run multiple household computers off a single hotspot, provided that the signal strength is strong enough for the hotspot. That's I think a positive step in the right direction. We are in the process of working out the hybrid children. We know that on days that they're in, teachers are working on creating lessons that they can download and engage in, asynchronous learning as it's called on their remote day. We're also looking at identifying children in the hybrid model who don't have reliable internet and transporting them to schools on Wednesday. Our teachers will be engaged in providing synchronous instruction. These kids would come in and be in a place, such as this cafeteria, almost in a supervised study hall experience where they can utilize their Chromebook, have full connectivity, download materials. We're thinking about potentially doing two runs, an AM and a PM. We're not thinking that these kids are going to be here all day, but maybe rather two hours, two and a half hour increments and then another run. Just another out-of-the-box, if you will, way of addressing the issue. Finally, we still have the means, we have been using our Google Meets to have kids who at least have a cell phone or a landline phone to join Google Meets and at least have a conversation with the teacher, not a video.

Phil - For those students whose numbers are smaller, if they desire to stay for the morning and afternoon session, could that be a possibility?

Pat - Yeah, once I think we get a stronger handle on, we're still in the process of identifying those kids, quite frankly, and building the structure. This probably won't get launched until at least until the second or third week of school. A portion of that is coverage. Mr. Kenline, I don't want to commit to saying that they can stay all day until we have a better handle on how few those kids might be. Not ruling it out, either. With that, I also wanted and I know I alluded to it, the survey. There are approximately a little over 1400 kids, Akron students. Some of them are attending school in our brick and mortar building, some of the children are attending out of district placements and services, but there are approximately 1279 kids that come to this physical campus in a typical school year. Of that almost 1300 kids, about 1000 of them, their parents indicated that they wanted some form of in-person instruction. That leaves approximately 251 kids that wanted the hybrid model. As I've mentioned, of those 251, 43-44 don't have reliable internet. Overall, it's 19% of the district who's choosing the remote learning option. I shared with the Board previously, and of course I'm going to forget the number now, maybe I'll rely on Mrs. Tretter and put her on the spot,

but that 19% percent not attending did significantly help with our social distancing, quite frankly. Likewise, as I've shared, we have anywhere from 22-32 children on a bus. 22 represents one child per seat because we can group families together. It's possible two children on a seat if they're in the same family. The reason I mention, Cindy, I'm trying to remember. Mrs. Tretter, was it 400 families that are choosing to drop off? Does that ring a bell to you? It's approximately that number, maybe a little bit higher. That also helps with the density on the bus. Of course one solution creates another problem. Mr. Esposito has worked tirelessly along with Mrs. Kos and Mr. Caprio, making arrangements for a logical parent drop off using the athletic entrance over by the soccer field. Likewise, designate a spot over here on the high school side, by the flower pot. Any questions before I go on? I told you I have a lot to go through. Just briefly then, an update on funding. Many of you I'm certain heard on the county executive's announcement about releasing the CARES Act Funding to school districts. It was based on \$100 per child plus an additional \$50 for children that qualify economically eligible for free & reduced lunch. For Akron, that represents \$162,050. That money is specifically to defray costs associated with COVID-19. Obviously, we've incurred significant costs that weren't initially budgeted for when we were planning our budget in December. PPE, implementing some social distancing issues, essentially internet access, Wi-Fi issues. What the county executive explained in our meeting last week was that generate, and Mrs. Tretter is amazing at keeping very detailed records, detailed records of your expenses from March, from the state of emergency through December 31, 2020. The money can be used for that time period. No expenses beyond December 31. Nothing into January and so on. We recognized that we can utilize those funds from the county to help defray some of the costs. That's wonderful news and we're grateful. We also know some of our costs potentially could go through FEMA. There is some real speculation as to whether or not FEMA will actually have the money at the end of all of the expenses that are occurring. We will keep careful records and receipts. We were told to expect up to a ten year audit on that and to extend our particular retention policies with documents and records. Ultimately, it's state money. The bad side, and I don't have any specific details, we are still certainly hearing about up to 20% reductions in all categorical aid moving forward. It has been shared that some of the formulas used to generate the state budget may no longer be quite as accurate. The revenue screens that the state was anticipating relative to income tax and other revenue screens may have been too high. If your formulas are not accurate and the economy isn't doing as well as the state had thought when they were generating the revenue side of their budget, then that's where those reductions will obviously be triggered. A bit of wait and see. One final thing and this will be breaking news. We anticipate that the county executive is going to announce, I believe it's tomorrow, \$11 million for child care aid. Mrs. Tretter and I are meeting tomorrow morning to talk about what I know about it so far. I know just some preliminary information. It too will be aid driven based on need and it's for the entire county. We recognize that Akron is a very small piece of Erie County, and I would anticipate and rightfully so there's a significant need for child care and child care funding in the City of Buffalo. Essentially, I can describe my understanding at this point is that this money will be for existing child care agencies to expand their footprint. Can you lease out additional spaces? Can you hire additional staff to receive more children? A portion of the funding will be directed to families that cannot afford child care given the fact that they now need it, schools are in this hybrid model. While I anticipate that it's possible, highly probable, the clerk county exec will say this money is going to schools, it is in fact not going to schools. It is working in collaboration with schools. The surveys that our families put out, to help the schools partner with child care agencies to communicate: there's child care agencies within our area, let them know that you may be in need. The money is not coming into Akron first and then going out to child care agencies for families. Should we choose, again Mrs. Tretter and I have a little bit more exploration to do, should we choose to participate in a co-ser with Erie 1 BOCES. Erie 1 BOCES will act as a third party doing essentially all the leg work. They recognize that schools need to be focused on educational programming and health and safety. Erie 1 BOCES will represent the component districts as a liaison between the county and the child care entities. What we would hear then is information and I'll let you know we will be pursuing it to support our families to an extent that we can. It is unlikely other than some informational relay that we'll have a deep hand in it, nor will we have any money being transferred. It will be through the county and the child care agencies and families. Want to talk sports? I just wanted to give an update as to what I know as of this evening. That is and you are well aware that the Governor did approve low risk sports beginning on September 21, 2020. Those will include tennis, soccer, cross country, field hockey, and swimming. Some other sports wrestling, hockey, football would be allowed to practice but not engage in a game of scrimmage play. The Governor has, just like he did with schools, said schools will reopen if the schools are ready to do it. Sports may resume if the sections in the districts are prepared to do it. The NYS Council of Superintendents issued a letter to the Governor urging him to reconsider, saying that schools should focus

on reengaging their children in the academic, the social-emotional, health and well-being. He said thank you very much for your letter, I'm clearing sports to resume. Since that time NYSPHSAA has been doing tremendous work with their stakeholder groups and their forums. It's my understanding after their meeting on Monday they issued, and I apologize, I can't remember if it was a 40 or 60 page document to the Department of Health with their recommendations for sports to resume. They want that document to be vetted by the Department of Health to see whether or not it's sufficiently safe for the resumption of interscholastic athletics. We do know in talking, some Sections have opted out already downstate in Nassau County. There was conversation in Section 6, our executive director just announced his retirement since late, as to what section they choose to do and then what individual conferences they do. We know that there can be no travel beyond one county line. You have to participate in any kind of athletic competition to adjacent towns, you can't go across multiple lines. Should they resume, the focus is really going to be on student play and participation and less on competition with traditional play. The heavy focus on winning and losing may not be there because the alignments may be off and so on and so forth. There's also some concern as to whether or not within communities whether parents feel comfortable having their children participate. So again, we expect something more on Friday this week. The issue, not entirely sure what that will be, quite frankly. Questions?

Jim - I'd like to just comment on that because we do have an agenda item coming, we're doing the coaches. I want to have a discussion on that tonight on whether you act on that or whether you wait until some additional guidance comes. Just to give a little bit of time to think about that and we'll hold that discussion at that point and time. We can go from that.

Pat - It has been an ongoing topic of conversation amongst the superintendents. We're very fortunate our neighbor in Alden, Mr. Stoldtman, Akron resident, in Section 6 and he's got first-hand information and quite frankly he says we don't know yet, we're waiting. So that's kind of where we are. Just very briefly on the transportation project schedule. I just wanted to share design documents were targeted for delivery on September 1. Honestly, I have not received them as of that date, but they might recognize that we're busy at this point. I'm referring to again addressing the fuel island and the fuel delivery systems. A tentative outline would be we would try to get our submission documents to SED October 1st, then Campus Construction would go in with their second estimate to review. We're hearing right now that it's a 2-4 week review period, which is really favorable that it could be that quick. However, in the initial conversation we'll still plan for a 12 week review. It could be delayed. If SED approves by January 2021, we could be looking at a position to bid in February. We know that this is a time sensitive issue. We know that the lifespan of the fuel appliances is not limitless and based on some of the testing that's been done and some of the interior corrosion that this should remain a priority for health and safety, not only for us and the transportation of our kids, but for the town and village for the fuel distribution for their vehicles.

Jim - Just one question on that. The estimate is within the remaining dollars of our initial capital project?

Pat - Yes, thank you for asking. As you recall, we had a favorable bid day and this fell within the scope of the work and we initiated the procedure. Yes, it's not an additional proposition. The last thing that I had and I know there will be some conversation on this topic and one reason why I asked Mrs. Tretter to attend in person this evening, the last Board meeting the Board requested that we seek legal counsel and get a review of the proposed pilot for property on McNeely Road in Newstead. Also, to do a comparative analysis to the pilot that was entered in Genesee County. An individual by the name of Robert Ryan who specializes in this. I think he's actually in Albany, but he works for Harris Beach. We forwarded him the documents, the Genesee Pilot, the proposed pilot for Newstead, as well as the packet that we have here in Akron. One of the questions we had is: is it fair and reasonable? In particular, we asked about the economic package that the Board would consider should they choose to opt back into RPL 487. A couple of things that I'll share, and then Mrs. Tretter if you don't mind sharing? He did say that the pilot, the language in and of itself is fairly standard. It's kind of a document, a boilerplate, that was created by NYSERDA and he didn't see any glaring issues with the overall construct of the document. He does however, have some proposals for some modifications. Particularly, summation as well as the initial start-up and some math calculations. I think the biggest thing is the Board should get an understanding of the difference in the dollar amount on megawatts and the reason behind that as well as the distribution payments on those megawatts. They're not exactly the same as comparing apples to apples. With that Cindy, I could probably go on, but you are the pro.

Cindy - I think Erik's the pro, but I will give it a shot. We found it interesting that the town and county have already opted and collaborated with Berrago and they had their own pilot but not with us, but you know. He did say that he would change a few different things of the pilot so it aligned with the exemption. In other words, for you to have a pilot, you have to opt back in. We cannot negotiate a pilot without opting back in. If you opt back in, you want the pilot and the exemption to align. So that was the first thing. And he also advised the termination portion of the contract because each party has been given the opportunity to eliminate the arrangement. If we come to an agreement, in fact determining an exemption for us. In other words, they determine the pilot with the exemption. They made it if we terminate the pilot, then you also terminate the exemption in the state. So that was good for us. He also found a mathematical error with the tax payments. It is a very good thing rates in comparing our graph and the pilot with Genesee County. Genesee County prorate share of \$3500. He said that's fair. He said a range of \$3k-\$7k is fair. We will generate profitability with that project. So other than that, he did say there are risks. We can't opt back in. If we don't opt in they can in fact challenge the exemption. In which case negotiating generating revenue. Again, currently the property is agriculturally exempt, so it does not generate a lot of taxes. If the company is to walk away, it's not fully taxable. There really is some slight risk, choosing to stay opted out we're probably not going to be successful. Although, our attorney did say it could be a scare tactic for them. We're going to walk away to see if they could sort of strong arm you a little bit into agreeing to walk back in the 487.

Pat - I just wanted to reiterate one part that you may not have heard and that is the difference between the megawatt value. In the case of the Genesee County Pilot, those payments are distributed to each tax jurisdiction. So they take the \$5500 and some goes to the school district, some would go to the town I'm assuming, and so forth. In our case, the pilot has already been negotiated, the only outstanding party is the district, that's the difference in the funds. His example was assuming in Genesee County that a school district represented 60% of the taxes collected, then that district would probably get about the equivalent of \$3500. Again, this proposed pilot at \$3500 is just for Akron. It's not to be split to any of the other taxes jurisdiction and I'm not sure if you heard Mrs. Tretter, there's a 2% escalator, which Mr. Grant pointed out is in keeping with our tax cap.

Bob - Thank you for clarifying, I didn't hear that.

Jim - Questions or comments from the Board? Mr. Polkowski, your thoughts?

Erik - No, but it's nice to hear that we get professional help and assistance in regards to what was going on, even catching a mathematical error, changing the language. Again, every town can utilize this formula and to have someone that can review it based off their particular situation is good. And again, just to reiterate, you have to look at it as the same pilot. In the case of Genesee County, the full pilot is different than the full pilot negotiated based on that. In the case here, the pilot's already been separated, so that's why there's three separate agreements. In Genesee County there's one agreement and it's distributed based off of that. The percentage with the lower megawatt is exactly the right percentage, it's just a smaller piece of the pie because of the way that it's been separated. Each one has their own independent percentage.

Phil - We need to opt back in before we negotiate this? That means what we've been given as far as the pilot has not been presented to the-

Pat - That's correct.

Phil - They will agree to these changes yet.

Pat - That's correct. The Board was provided with the red-line copy recommending changes by Mr. Ryan. In considering this, if the Board were to elect to go back into the RPL 487, we would in all likelihood engage Mr. Ryan to negotiate on behalf of the district with those. Did want to share and I don't know if it was covered or not, Mrs. Tretter asked some really critical questions regarding under what conditions can the pilot be terminated as well as what protections does the district have for late payments. Mrs. Tretter, my recollection, the only way to terminate is if they go into default am I correct?

Cindy - Right and there's a 30 day window. If they have failure to pay, we can terminate and there's protection built-in into the language to provide for that to happen as well to exit the exemption as well. Some of these pilots that the county has negotiated, we've worked with, and people were on a pilot and they just don't pay. That can go on for years that they don't pay and the county won't do anything. It's very important that there was language that would protect the district. He did also say if the Board chooses to opt back in to RPL 487, they do have to do a Board resolution and they do have to follow the NYS tax department and NYSEDA. However, you can always opt out again at a later time and then file the same paperwork to pull yourself back out to preserve your ability to assess these proposals as they come. If you felt this was fair and reasonable and you wanted to pursue it, you can opt in, accept the pilot, and then a month or two down the road or whenever the Board thinks it's appropriate, you can opt back out and that would preserve your ability to not just feel like you're gonna be every time something comes before you. Generally, they'll follow the actual schedule that's attached with the exact pilot payment based on the numbers for the project. I believe if they were going to change it, they would amend that.

Jim - I think based on the research that's been provided by legal counsel. If he feels it's reasonable, it's probably to the benefit of the district for us to reconsider our decision and opt back in, which we'll have to do at our next Board meeting. Thoughts?

Phil - Getting this is perhaps, like you said, better than not getting anything. Getting whatever tax revenue we can generate.

Jim - If I read his comments, this is above and beyond the underlined land, so we would still receive whatever current tax we are receiving. This is an improvement that is separate from the land.

Cindy - What he clarified for us is that generally when the county drafts the IDA, the IDA is structured in such a way that it's based on the land and the improvements. Our pilot is simply on the improvements. The land is separate.

Jim - So this is all implemental. I believe Mrs. Tretter, you used the \$1000 roughly we would be receiving from the land now, we still would receive this. Mr. Masse, any comments or thoughts?

Bob - Yeah honestly, my interjection from the get-go was only that I didn't want it to be a negotiating tool with us, but now obviously we have comparable county information broken down. I really don't have any questions now, the clarity's there and I appreciate the effort getting the attorney involved.

Jim - Alright, so what I'd ask is that we put on our next agenda for the Sept 23rd to opt back in.

Cindy - Would you like to make sure they will accept the agreements first?

Jim - Yes.

Pat - And can I ask for clarifications with the Board? I think I know the answer, but I want to be clear. Borrego did offer a one-lump payment as an option. I don't think Mrs. Tretter or I feel that's advantageous to the district, but wanted to see how you felt.

Bob - Why isn't it advantageous because sometimes these companies go bankrupt, go under, terminate. I can show you a few window companies that I know.

Cindy - The payments are part of our tax calculation and what that will do is skew that calculation in a way that could limit the Board's ability to generate. We just want a set amount that's kind of incremental.

Bob - Ok.

Jim - We can take the lump sum of \$200k and lose \$200k worth of tax cap.

Bob - I see what you're saying. You see my point though, a bird in the hand, you know what I mean.

Jim - Cash now is always better than cash later.

Bob - Absolutely. Thanks.

Jim - I think we should pursue with the state of intention that we're going to opt back in, pursue a finalized agreement with Berrago, with the understanding that when we reach agreement we will be opting back in and accepting the pilot next week. Item #5 Probationary Appointment. This is an individual motion. Our recommended action is that the Akron Central School Board of Education, upon the recommendation of Patrick D. McCabe, Superintendent of Schools, hereby appoints Holly Bona, who holds professional certification in the Childhood Education (Grade 1-6) area to a probationary position in the Elementary Education tenure area for a probationary period commencing on September 1, 2020 and expiring on September 13, 2024, unless extended in accordance with the law. This expiration date is tentative and conditional only. Except to the extent required by the applicable provisions of Section 3012 of the Education Law, in order to be granted tenure the teacher must receive composite or overall annual professional performance review ratings pursuant to Section 3012-c and/or 3012-d of the Education Law of either effective or highly effective in at least three (3) of the four (4) preceding years, and if the teacher receives an ineffective composite or overall rating in the final year of the probationary period the teacher shall not be eligible for tenure at that time. Salary for the school year 2020-2021 will be in accordance with the District/AFA Collective Bargaining Agreement based on Schedule II, Step 2.

Roxanne - Excuse me, her end date is August 31, 2024. We changed her start date.

Jim - Gotcha. So that is amended to August 31, 2024.

Roxanne - Correct.

Phil - Moved.

Jody - Second.

Jim - Any questions or comments on this item?

Bob - What position is she filling?

Pat - She will be a probationary appointment as a grade 3 teacher and you'll note that I provided the Board a note that her district was holding her, but Mr. Esposito am I correct, she is now with us and that note is no longer effective. She is very excited to be here in Akron.

Bob - Great.

Jim - Thank you. Any other comments? Vote please.

Roxanne - All were in favor, motion carried.

Jim - Thank you. Item #6 Personnel Instructional. Our recommended action is that the Akron Central School Board of Education, upon the recommendation of Patrick D. McCabe, Superintendent of Schools, does hereby approve the following instructional items, consent items #6A-6H.

Bob - Moved.

Erik - Second.

Jim - Any questions or comments on these instructional items?

Roxanne - All were in favor, motion carried.

Jim - Item #6 Personnel Non-Instructional. Our recommended action is that the Akron Central School Board of Education, upon the recommendation of Patrick D. McCabe, Superintendent of Schools, does hereby approve the following non-instructional items, consent items #7A-7N.

Heather - Moved.

Phil - Second.

Jim - Questions or comments?

Bob - Yeah I have a question about the extracurricular appointments for athletics. I'm just very curious why we're approving the high-risk coaches now when that hasn't been approved to happen yet. Coaches, bookkeepers, anything involved with the sport that weren't approved yet.

Phil - Based on some additional information coming out later in the week, would it be a better idea for us to not vote on this at this time to obligate us to find funding for those positions until we see what kind of guidance comes out as far as the sports that Mr. Masse is concerned with as well as the overall feel of what's going to happen next?

Jody - If we do that, our Board meeting is after the date sports is supposed to start.

Jim - One of the concerns, and that's on the agenda today, is to approve it and originally the agenda was to approve it effective then. Mr. McCabe indicated that there is required for the Board and coaches the need to do before the approved start of the season on Sept. 21st. I recognize that there are significant concerns, decisions that I know will be made, clarifications that will be made Friday. I also know from a timing standpoint, our next scheduled meeting is three days after that date. If we choose to table this, we do have the option of having a special meeting in advance of the 21st to simply discuss this item, based on ongoing changes. We do have the option of meeting here. We also still I believe have the meeting via Zoom under the governor's guidance.

Roxanne - That could change because I think he extended it through maybe Oct. 8th.

Jim - If Mr. Kenline's proposal, being tabled this decision to a later date, I ask the Board to meet on Sept. 16th.

Pat - While the Board considers that, I just would like to respond to Mr. Masse's point and well as Mr. Kenline's, to give the Board some more information to consider. Mr. Masse, to your point about high-risk sports. It's a current understanding that they can practice but not compete. I'll use football specifically. The students can engage in conditioning and practice drills, but not scrimmages or competition. They were cleared to begin the conditioning things they need to prevent injury prior to a regular, traditional season. That gives you some recent information there.

Bob - Sure does. I'm saying that because of the stuff that came out from the Erie County Board and few other things like that, but we haven't seen that yet. I think that this blanket approval of all of us, I just question, I think we need to look at it a little bit. I mean, and it's only for the financial part of it Mr. McCabe. That's why I asked about it. I'm concerned about our financial situation, and I hate to see us spending money for no reason. By approving these, we have money.

Pat - I understand. To that end, I also wanted to comment on Mr. Kenline's point. Mr. Kenline made a recommendation that maybe we should wait for the guidance to come out from NYSPHSAA. That guidance document first has to be vetted by the NYS Department of Health and then the Governor's Office because they're not going to put out guidance that the Department of Health won't endorse. Secondly, after that process is complete perhaps concurrently, then each section needs to make a decision as to whether or not they're going to have athletics, then each league needs to make a decision. To both your point and Mr. Kenline's point, there is some advantage to waiting. That advantage being, I believe Section 8, Nassau County has already decided regardless of other information forthcoming, they're holding off until January. Section 6 is not at that point yet, but even if Section 6 agrees to pursue interscholastic sports, the leagues and districts have to determine. Theoretically, the section to go forward, the N-O to go forward, but you can have a district with low participation rates say we're not going to go forward. That's kind of the domino effect.

Bob - And also, Mr. McCabe, we haven't even seen school start yet and we don't even know where we will be in two weeks. With other districts talking about different things that are going on right now, I don't know what the total numbers are on all this, scorekeepers, clock operators, ticket sellers, just some of those things that even if we started going, they should be broken out if we're not going to have competition. We should really look at that. It's just my concern. I don't know if anybody else sees it that way.

Jim - Clarification on the guidance. Earlier you said schools wouldn't be able to cross county lines. Ok, you can cross one county line. We can cross into Niagara County, but we couldn't necessarily get to Albion?

Pat - That's my understanding. They're trying to space the districts. Again, this is all preliminary information and what you're hearing on a state level, a local level, it's going to be up to leagues to do a schedule.

Jim - Ok. Without there being a formal motion to table the discussion, I guess I'll ask is there a motion to table this item?

Phil - Moved to table this Item N, Extracurricular Athletics, until a future time.

Jim - Alright. Could you modify that to include a requested specific time?

Phil - Until September 16th.

Jim - Do I have a second to that motion?

Debbie - Second.

Roxanne - We'll have to take a roll call vote because it's not in BoardDocs.

Jim - Ok. Any questions or comments on that motion? Since there's no questions or comments on that motion, I'm going to take a roll call vote. Mr. Kenline?

Phil - Aye.

Jim - Ms. Forrestel?

Debbie - Aye.

Jim - Mr. Masse?

Bob - Aye.

Jim - Mrs. Brege?

Jody - Nay.

Jim - Mr. Polkowski?

Erik - Nay.

Jim - Mrs. Cayea?

Heather - Aye.

Jim - Aye. The motion carries 5-2. This item is tabled until the meeting on September 16, 2020. Back to the original consent items. We now have a motion on the table to accept consent items 7A-7N, that will be modified to accepting 7A-7M with the exclusion of consent item 7N, which has been tabled. Just voting on that modified agenda.

Roxanne - Motion carried.

Jim - Modified motion carries. Item 8, District Items. There is the school's distribution agreement. Our recommended action is that the Akron Central School Board of Education, upon the recommendation of Patrick D. McCabe, Superintendent of Schools, does hereby approve the following District Items, consent items 8A-8G.

Phil - Moved.

Debbie - Second.

Jim - Any questions or comments on this item?

Roxanne - All in favor, motion carried.

Jim - Thank you. Item #9 Special Education. The recommended action is that the Akron Central School Board of Education, upon the recommendation of Patrick D. McCabe, Superintendent of Schools, does hereby approve Special Education consent items #9A and 9B.

Heather - Moved.

Debbie - Second.

Jim - Any questions or comments on this item?

Roxanne - All in favor, motion carried.

Jim - Item #10 is School Board Correspondence. ECASB Delegate Assembly is at Erie 1 BOCES on Thursday, September 10th from 6:30-8:30pm. Thursday, September 17th, is the NYSSBA Meet & Mingle at Erie 1 BOCES from 6:30-8:30. Upcoming Dates. Thursday, September 3 is Freshman Orientation, which is being held virtually. Friday, September 4 through Monday, September 7 is no school. Tuesday, September 8 is the first day of student attendance and it is virtual. Thursday, September 17 is the elementary open house. Still working on that, Mr. Esposito? Alright. We will be adding the Special Board Meeting on September 16, I'm assuming 7pm. Wednesday, September 23 is our regular business meeting. It does say the format to be determined, but I would assume it's going to be a modified format where we'll be here and the public will be via Zoom. Item #12 Hearing of Delegations and Non Agenda Items. Anything from the public? Yes, that meeting still is taking place. Mr. Esposito, anything? Board Discussion, anything else from the Board?

Bob - Yes, I do have a quick question. I just wanted to ask regarding the extracurricular. I guess I'd ask Mr. McCabe. He'd be the one to ask. How is our decision tonight going to affect the approved low-risk sports. Because we're basically saying they can't do anything until the 16th, correct?

Pat - They can't. Technically, they cannot do anything. There can be no organized practices, anything of that nature, until the 21st. However, the only impact on coaches because they're not approved, it will give them less time for their planning or any meetings that they may have. That will be something I'll be talking to our athletic coordinator about the impact.

Bob - That was my biggest concern, the approved sports. Hate to see us put them behind, but if they're not practicing yet until the 21st, then I guess it won't matter.

Jim - Anything else? Item #13 Executive Session. We do have a need to go into Executive Session to discuss the employment history of a particular person.

Phil - Moved.

Heather - Second.

Jim - Questions or comments?

Roxanne - All in favor, motion carried.

Jim - We do not anticipate conducting coming out of Executive Session. We are in Executive Session at 8:01pm. Thank you everyone.