

**RYE SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
School Administrative Unit 50  
48 Post Road, Greenland, New Hampshire 03840  
Phone (603) 422-9572 Fax (603) 422-9575

*To be approved by the Rye School Board at the November 18, 2020 meeting.*

**RYE SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**RYE, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

A special meeting of the School Board of the Rye School District was held via Google Meets on Tuesday, October 27, 2020 at 4:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:**

School Board Members: Margaret Honda, Jeanne Moynahan,  
Matt Curtin, Scott Marion, Heather Reed

Administrators: Salvatore Petralia, Superintendent  
Kelli Killen, Assistant Superintendent  
Brian Grattan, Director of Technology  
Maria Soucy, Principal  
Suzanne Lull, Principal

Visitors: Andrea Papoutsy, Kelsi Sullivan, Krista Atwater,  
Meagan Facella, Sarah Holmes, Stephanie Driscoll, Stephanie Tabbitt,  
Tasha Benson, 865 area code

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Honda announced that due to the State of Emergency, declared by the Governor as a result of COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with Emergency Order 12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body was authorized to meet electronically. Ms. Honda noted that there was no physical location for the public to attend, however there was public access provided through telephone and video electronic means.

Ms. Honda noted that this Board meeting was being conducted on Google Meets with a phone-in option.

Ms. Honda explained that the information was provided to the public through the website and added that there was a mechanism for the public to communicate issues accessing the meeting through e-mailing Kelli Killen. Ms. Honda said in the event the public was unable to attend the meeting would be adjourned and rescheduled.

Ms. Honda explained that votes would be taken through roll call voting. Ms. Honda took a roll call attendance of the Board, including whether others were present in the room with the Board Member. All Board Members were present with no additional people in the rooms with them.

**TECHNOLOGY**

Ms. Honda explained that the special meeting was called to review the school's technology status, needs and future planning regarding networks and hardware.

Tthe Board would also engage in additional discussions regarding scenarios for remote learning due to COVID.

Mr. Grattan mentioned he had been developing a technology strategy for the District, when COVID hit. The plan is almost complete however still requires some changes.

Mr. Grattan said the plan provided the District with a guide as to how technology was being used, as well as direction and budgeting needs. The strategy is to ensure the students have working devices, good bandwidth in the buildings and that systems were compliant with laws.

Mr. Grattan invited Ann Hoyt to the meeting to provide technology history, but she was unable to attend.

Ms. Killen suggested reviewing the requirements for the technology plan and data plan law for the new Board members.

Ms. Killen explained the Technology Committee decided it was important to continue creating a plan, even though no longer required by the State. Ms. Killen explained the process of reviewing the plan last year, prior to Mr. Grattan being hired.

Ms. Killen said Mr. Grattan's first focus had been to review firewalls and safety.

Mr. Grattan noted that all though the plan was not required by the State, it was still required by E-rate Funding.

Ms. Honda explained that through the COVID process they had noted areas of opportunity.

Ms. Reed asked for an overview of the structure of Technology from Mr. Grattan. She asked if Mr. Grattan and Ms. Hoyt were the only technology staff. Mr. Grattan explained at one time there was a Technology Integrator but now it was just his position and Ms. Hoyt.

Mr. Curtin asked what Ms. Hoyt's role was.

Mr. Grattan reviewed Ms. Hoyt's role to support all aspects of technology within the building, but not to integrate systems or serve as a network administrator.

Ms. Reed asked if anyone was covering best practices or technology use or integration.

Mr. Grattan explained that he had a question and answer session with the staff requesting they forward some topics or training needs that he could assist with, but nothing had been requested yet.

Mr. Grattan noted that the Technology Director could train or answer question but typically integration was not part of the role.

Dr. Marion explained that the staff felt the integration needs had been met and the position was eliminated a few years back, as it had fulfilled its usefulness.

Ms. Reed voiced understanding the reasons for eliminating the role but now times had changed.

Mr. Curtin expressed that a Technology Integrator should create value through developing new goals.

Ms. Honda added that there seemed to be more obstacles now, due to legislation, and mentioned the issue for staff accessing some applications.

Mr. Curtin said he felt there were discussions needed for long term planning, but the immediate focus should be on addressing functional problems for the staff and how to remedy the problems.

Mr. Grattan explained that he and Mr. Curtin had both walked through the buildings on separate occasions and reviewed the problems. Mr. Grattan explained that he identified 3 areas.

Mr. Grattan noted the need to budget for replacement technology for the teams every 4 years and emphasized the importance of researching that technology, so the systems would not need additions or adjustments. Mr. Grattan reviewed challenges with connectors and specs, which resulted in the need for mini docking stations.

Mr. Grattan said that Apple and Smart did not work well together and required time to resolve. Mr. Grattan mentioned the possible need to shift the type of devices used to eliminate issues.

Mr. Grattan noted how rotating classrooms complicated technology issues since team systems, devices and technology solutions varied from room to room.

Ms. Lull said Mr. Grattan summarized the issues perfectly.

Ms. Honda explained that the Board should consider how long teachers would rotate and consider how much to invest in solutions for those problems.

Mr. Grattan reviewed the process they followed at the Elementary with the newer devices in which they decided to connect devices to a classroom and not rotate the device with the teacher.

Ms. Honda asked if the Junior High was needing the same assessments and solutions. Ms. Soucy confirmed that they did.

Mr. Curtin mentioned that the 10 new laptops resolved the issues for those classrooms but asked what else was needed.

Ms. Lull explained that they were getting 5 devices for this year and 10 were in next year's budget.

Ms. Reed explained that using cloud-based technology could assist.

Mr. Grattan noted that the conflict between the two systems connecting was the concern and he did not see how the cloud could assist.

Ms. Lull explained that the idea was for teachers to create work through the cloud so they could access the work from any device verses needing to have access to their individual smart notebooks.

Ms. Lull and Mr. Grattan discussed the costs of \$600 annually for the building through Smart.

Ms. Curtin asked if Mr. Grattan felt issues could be resolved quickly. Mr. Grattan reviewed his plan to be on site and process.

Ms. Reed asked about the Junior High Wi-Fi. Ms. Soucy said it was an issue and noted that locations and volume of use seemed to impact connection.

Mr. Grattan explained that there was some network work done around 2012, but he wasn't sure if a wireless analysis had been done. Mr. Grattan reviewed the process for analysis and mapping solutions.

Ms. Lull explained that an analysis was done several years ago, but many devices had been added since then.

Ms. Honda said the analysis was certainly an item for more long-term technology planning and asked if there was an immediate solution.

Mr. Grattan mentioned the option of running wiring.

Mr. Curtin suggested scheduling the process on a regular basis for budgeting.

Mr. Grattan explained that in general a full analysis would not be needed on a regular basis.

Mr. Grattan reviewed how the types of devices impacted the connection.

Dr. Marion suggested creating a technology reserve fund to avoid surprises.

Mr. Petralia said the funding should not be an issue and asked if the funding could come from Cares Act.

Dr. Marion explained that they should look into funding options, but the reserve fund should be considered for the future needs.

Ms. Moynahan said creating a reserve fund should not be an issue and reviewed how the wording of the fund was important. Ms. Moynahan mentioned funding options.

Dr. Marion explained the need for reserving funds due to inability of the Board to carry over a fund balance.

Ms. Reed said she would want to see enough of an investment to maintain and keep up with technology changes.

Ms. Honda explained that the fund would be part of the technology plan and that the Board would be incorporating technology into the budget.

Mr. Curtin mentioned that there was a hardware piece, the provider options, but also the need to be able to adopt technology into the classroom and incorporate the academic piece.

Mr. Curtin suggested reviewing capital improvements like updating the Library into a more modern media experience.

Ms. Honda noted it was something to consider and incorporate into the plan.

Ms. Honda mentioned concerns with access to applications, specifically the debate between Google Meets versus Zoom.

Mr. Grattan explained that Google had added breakout rooms, polling and continued to add enhancements.

Dr. Marion asked about document sharing on Google.

Mr. Grattan explained that there could be a lack of knowledge on how to use and he reviewed his experience.

Ms. Reed asked about sharing and seeing participants. Mr. Grattan said that they worked in similar fashions.

Mr. Grattan explained that he had provided links for training and could resend the links.

Ms. Honda asked for additional staff concerns.

Ms. Lull noted that they had had many challenges during the first month and had not had time to review Google Meets.

Ms. Honda suggested having a Friday training.

Ms. Lull said she had the links that were forwarded but noted that the staff preferred the in-person training which they were having.

Mr. Curtin asked if all the needs were being addressed.

Mr. Grattan reviewed the pressing issues with the interaction between the Macs and Smart Boards as well as the docking stations for teachers to use multiple devices.

Ms. Soucy noted a lot of day to day issues, mostly relating to accessing certain applications impacted by the new House Bill.

Mr. Grattan reviewed how sites needed to be vetted before use and the need for a list of alternatives.

Mr. Grattan explained the challenges with YouTube access and the process of categorizing, reviewing, and approving. Mr. Grattan noted how the staff and students had different filters which impacted what they saw.

Ms. Moynahan asked if an additional position was needed to assist with the technology needs. Ms. Honda said it should be discussed more during budget planning.

Ms. Reed clarified the YouTube process and asked if the ads or other items were impacting the access.

Ms. Lull reviewed the need for teachers to place videos in SafeShare TV and noted that they were limited on space.

Mr. Grattan explained that there were ways to download videos into Google. Mr. Grattan noted that the SafeShare TV was costly.

Ms. Reed suggested looking into I-Learn New Hampshire as a learning management system along with Google Classroom.

Ms. Killen explained some of the history, in which a Sub-committee of the Technology Committee reviewed 4 systems and they decided to pilot Schoology. Ms. Killen said they decided not to introduce a full learning management system, after the pilot.

Ms. Killen said the implementation process would take three years for training and integrating any system and that was a deterrent.

Ms. Killen noted that there were more management systems available now but discouraged introducing a system at this time.

Ms. Reed said she understood that this was not the time to implement a system, but she noted the benefits of the ilearn system as it was an initiative through the DOE and it was a canvas learning system linked UNH and the State learning systems.

Ms. Killen mentioned that they use caution with programs provided through DOE based history and the experience of others.

Ms. Killen said they had investigated the system but based on what was involved decided not to move forward.

Dr. Marion said he agreed that this was not the time, but they should consider a new system including the canvas and he mentioned it could be beneficial for the future.

Ms. Reed added that if remote learning continued it may be worth looking into because more can be done with it.

Ms. Killen said Google had added some modules that were similar, but it would be good to review the best ones available.

Ms. Honda echoed Ms. Reed's point that it should be revisited for the future.

Ms. Reed noted these systems could assist from an efficiency standpoint.

Ms. Honda said this should be part of long-term planning needs.

Dr. Marion urged the Administrative team to think about what they might want to bring forward so it could be considered during the budgeting process.

Ms. Honda backed Dr. Marion regarding the budget and added that a 3-to-4-year plan was needed.

Mr. Curtin asked if there was a return to remote learning, was everyone comfortable with the technology at this time, based on what had been discovered and learned.

Mr. Grattan noted that aside from some hiccups the technology worked to the degree it was needed. Mr. Grattan reviewed upload and download limits.

Mr. Petralia said he and the principals had productive preliminary budget discussions including some technology needs.

Ms. Honda asked for final comments.

Dr. Marion asked when the budget materials would be distributed, and Mr. Petralia said Friday by 2:00 p.m. Mr. Petralia explained that binders could be left at the Junior High.

Ms. Honda moved on to remote learning and the movement between in person and remote learning.

Mr. Petralia said the Principals created re-entry changes based on updates provided at the Administrative Council Meeting.

Ms. Lull reviewed the suggested plan changes regarding a student move into remote learning.

Ms. Lull read through the first change that any student that must quarantine due to travel or health would utilize Google Classroom to complete assignments. Ms. Lull added that students out for longer than 14 days could join the remote class and depending on timing, they may need to complete the quarter remotely.

Ms. Honda asked for clarification for the number of days. Ms. Lull reviewed the cut off days and reasoning.

Ms. Reed asked if those under the 14-day period, would have a time to connect with the teachers.

Ms. Soucy explained that connecting for advisory and morning meeting would be difficult, but they could e-mail and connect with the teachers.

Ms. Lull explained that they were trying to keep teachers from having to run a morning meeting and run remote learning at the same time.

Ms. Reed asked if the teachers that were teaching remotely would also be working with those in quarantine.

Ms. Lull said they would be consistent. Ms. Soucy explained that the language classes would work for those remote.

Dr. Marion reviewed the language in the drive and noted that they would not always know about longer cases.

Ms. Lull explained that they could predict the time out based off of what they have learned.

Dr. Marion suggested adding that these were calendar days verses school days.

Ms. Honda explained that they were reviewing the wording due to the upcoming holidays and the need for clarity. Ms. Honda asked that the community be honest about their choices with travel.

Ms. Honda said the suggested language seemed clear.

Mr. Petralia added that the plan and site would need to be updated and other documents needed to be consistent.

Ms. Honda confirmed that they would double check everything.

Dr. Marion said this would be revisited as more was learned.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Honda opened the meeting to public comment.

Ms. Stephanie Driscoll, parent, and Rye resident on Clark Road, thanked the Board for all their work giving the students the chance to attend school.

Mr. Curtin noted that the public could add comments to the chat.

Ms. Meagan Facella asked if many of the students were to move into remote, would that change the structure.

Ms. Lull said she would not want to see the school close, but they might need to restructure. However, she did not believe that things would change much.

Ms. Honda reminded the Public that everyone needed a plan B because environmental factors could cause a move into remote.

Mr. Petralia explained that there were always many factors.

Ms. Honda thanked the Administration for their work preparing for tonight.

**OTHER**

Mr. Petralia mentioned the need for a transfer of funds request for hardware purchases.

*Dr. Marion made a motion, seconded by Ms. Moynahan, to transfer \$27,460.40 from the Health Insurance line equally into the Technical Hardware and Technical Hardware New lines. Discussion.*

*Roll Call Vote: 5-0*

**ADJOURNMENT/NON-PUBLIC SESSION**

*Dr. Marion made a motion, seconded by Mr. Curtin, to adjourn the meeting at 5:56 p.m. Discussion. Roll Call Vote: 5-0*

*Respectfully Submitted,  
Samantha Panek  
November 3, 2020*

***Approved by the Rye School Board at the November 18, 2020 remote meeting.***

\_\_\_\_\_  
Matt Curtin, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date