

St. Croix Preparatory Academy Board Meeting Ágenda February 2, 2021

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Agenda
- A. Learning Model Transition Plan3. Adjourn Meeting



Covid Response Team & Board School Opening Committee Meeting Dates: January 13, January 20

<u>Attendees</u>: Joann Karetov, Amy Kleinboehl, Andrew Sachariason, Wanda Renner, Candace Westlund, Hannah Sislo, Kelly Gutierrez, Susan Peterson, Drew Melendres, Kristen Denzer, Nicole Donnay, Jake Gottschalk, Jon Gutierrez

Learning Model Definitions:

- Distance Learning: Students receive instruction remotely all day, every day.
- Hybrid: Students receive at least the equivalent of one instructional day in distance learning during the week.
- In-Person: Students receive instruction in the school building all day, every day.
- Note: Students/families always have the option of choosing distance learning.

Important Safe Learning Plan Guidelines (updated on December 21, 2020 - and relevant pages included in board packet)

- Elementary Schools may open an in-person or hybrid learning model, as long as additional mitigation strategies are implemented. Note: On January 7, the Board unanimously approved the in-person learning model for K-4, with entry dates of January 25 and February 8. Transition days approved were January 20, 21, and 22.
- Implement a rolling start no more than three additional grade bands can be introduced into the building in a two week period.
- Middle school and high schools will follow the same protocol and parameters listed in steps one through five of the Safe Learning Plan to determine their learning models. Middle and high schools must either follow the plans they have shared with families about their learning model, or they can choose a more restrictive model. (See separate document).

Important Information Communicated in our Regional Support Team (RST) call on January 6. In our RST call on January 6, H. Hirsch stated that we would have additional flexibility in bringing additional grades back, if we treated each division as if it were in its own building. Brief comments are:

- School districts with multiple buildings can easily bringing back additional grades along with their elementary schools since they occupy separate buildings.
- We are in one physical building and treating each division as a separate building requires detailed analysis/segmenting of all of our common spaces (e.g. atrium, cafeteria, gym, Aux gym, PAC, etc.). There are many scheduling conflicts that are currently being resolved. Note: In some cases, students will have to walk outside to transition between classes due to our inability to share spaces.
- The following proposed option treats divisions as separate buildings.

Learning Model Transition Timeframes (Proposed)

	January 25	February 8	February 22	2 March 8	March 22	April 5	April 19
--	------------	------------	-------------	-----------	----------	---------	----------



Proposed Option	Grades K-2 In-Person (+220 daily) (+1 division)	Grades 3-4 In-Person (+140 daily) (+1 division)	Grades 5-6 Grades 9-10 Hybrid (+140 daily) (+2 division)	Grades 7-8 Grades 11-12 Hybrid (+140 daily) (+2 division)	Grades 5-8 In-person or Hybrid (4 days/wk)	Grades 9-12 In-person or Hybrid (4 days/wk)	
--------------------	--	--	--	---	---	--	--

Covid Response Team & Board Committee Recommendation:

- Strong majority (all but one or two members) favor the entire rollout,
- One or two members desire additional grade rollout on February 8
- One member wants the February 22 and March 8 rollout to be In-person or Hybrid (4 days per week) vs. Blue/Gold schedule.
- The rollout is subject to case rate data not spiking, the ability to staff based on quarantine/isolation requirements, approval of revised Learning Model Transition Plan by the Board, and approval of Regional Support Team (RST) on February 10.

Comments January 25 and February 8 Rollout

- Unanimous board approval on January 7
- Adheres to Governor's emphasis on getting our Lower School into the classroom with the most assurance of success (staggered rollout with two week interval).
- Although not recommended, due to staffing, additional grade rollout on February 8 would have to be US grades; MS needs to wait until February 22

Comments on February 22 ff. Rollout

- Treats MS/US as separate buildings; four grades/two week interval
- The most significant operational risk still relates to the quarantine/isolation rules (albeit potentially shorter).
- Challenges. The schedule/space conflicts of lunch, recess, gym, specialists, are not easy to resolve, especially as our guidance has been to maintain a strong sense of "isolation" during the two week implementation of new student groups into the building.

Recommended Next Steps:

- Approve Proposed Transition Timeframes as a framework.
- Board approve a new Learning Model Transition Plan; new concepts are being introduced at the January 26 board meeting.
- Evaluate rollout of K-2 on January 25
- Evaluate rollout of 3-4 on February 8
- Monitor Positive School Covid-19 cases, quarantine/isolation impact on operations, county case rate data, etc.
- Regional Support Team (RST) on February 10. In this meeting, we will



- Review the above items
- \circ $\,$ Ask for consultation on what approach we may proceed with on February 22 $\,$
- Board meeting on February 11 to authorize next transition for February 22.
- Board meeting on February 11 will also approve transition planning days for MS and US (potential days are February 17, 18, 19).

Return-to-School – January 2021 Work Summary

- Timeline
 - Late Nov-Mid Dec: Focus on returning K-4 back
 - Included: converting large spaces to classrooms (gym/pac/aux gym) & renting additional space (SOV)
 - Dec 16: Gov Walz issues EO which prioritizes bring Elem back in person\
 - Prior to holiday break- focus was on:
 - Interpreting the EO and MDE's updated Safe Learning Plan,
 - Defining the logistics of bringing K-4 back in person,
 - Establishing on-site testing,
 - Communication to all stakeholders
 - Identifying and submitting questions to RST for Jan 4 call
 - Jan 4: RST Call
 - Learned of a change in emphasis in Learning Model selection criteria: Mitigation strategies and In-school Covid rates more emphasized
 - Until this point- only direction we had, per EO was 5-12 must continue to adhere to the Safe Learning Plan or Plan that has been approved by board and communicated to families. In addition
 - \circ $\,$ SCPA staff and board spent the fall creating the current LMTP $\,$
 - \circ $\;$ Vaccine distribution was on the horizon
 - SCPA asked RST if they would support a more aggressive plan to get 5-12 back in-person or hybrid
 - Learned that RST would not necessarily object to SCPA returning MS and US grades to Hybrid in parallel to return of grades 3&4 However.
 - Divisions must be able to function as separate buildings.
 - RST noted that they don't know our building and/or operations- so we would have to identify if this is possible
 - Priority is to get K-4 in the building safely.
 - Must consider how bringing more grades back will affect ability to staff LS absences- because LS is the priority.
 - The entire state is about to open up (bars/restaurants, youth sports, gyms, elementary schools in-person) and case rates don't reflect holiday travel/gatherings.
 - Encouraged us to develop a plan and bring back to RST
 - Timeline to meet again with RST was discussed and was determined that Feb 10 was strategic.
 - Will give school 2 weeks in-person
 - State case rates will reflect the effect of state's re-opening and the holiday activity.
 - RST offered to assist with questions as they arose- and to meet earlier if needed.
 - Emails were exchanged and the Covid Coordinators (Jon/Candace did not support an earlier meeting)

• Return-to-School – January 2021 Work- Cont'd

- Jan 7: School Board meeting
 - Recap of RST Call
 - Board charged Re-opening School committee to bring a proposed updated LMTP and 5-12 return to school timeline to Board on Jan 26

Return-to-School – January 2020 Work- Cont'd

- Jan 13: Re-opening committee and Covid Response Team met together to work on plan and timeline.
 - Learning Model Transition Plan (LMTP) amendment
 - Plan Options discussed and sample of presented:
 - Qualitative approach:
 - Consider all factors: County case rates, in-school covid cases, mitigations strategies, ability to staff, status of vaccine distribution, status of testing processes.
 - Develop LM timeline from discussion, weighing factors and collaboratively deciding on best path forward
 - Bring plan to RST for feedback & guidance.
 - Bring proposal to School Board for approval
 - Quantitative approach:
 - Create matrix- objective and measurable
 - Bring plan to RST for feedback & guidance.
 - Bring proposal to School Board for approval
 - Discussed if team recommends a more qualitative or more quantitative- most preferred the quantitative plan
 - Provides objective parameters for decision making- which makes the decision more defendable to varied stakeholders
 - Captures the three main factors emphasized by RST (Mitigation , In-house case-rate and county case rate)
 - Is in-line with the current LMTP.

- o Jan 13-20:
 - Compiled/Summarized Wash Co and Metro Charter school current learning model data
 - Covid Response team developed quantitative LMTP including.
 - Applying historical data to matrix and comparing w/ current LMTP
 - Consulted w/ Facility Safety consultant re: developing tool to measure safety program
 - Covid Response Team defined what it would take to execute on the requirement that we operate as '3 separate buildings' to accelerate students return to school timeline
 - Identified what can be done to function as 3 separate spaces
 - Building spaces defined see map
 - Identified factors that prohibit the facility to function as 3 separate buildings:
 - LS/US classrooms share HVAC units-
 - Mitigated by Ionization Units and MER-13 air filters on each unit
 - Shared operational programming (incl. staff, facilities, and/or equipment):
 - Shared facilities/Equip
 - Health room
 - Foodservice kitchen
 - US/MS music rooms (band, orch, choir)
 - Special Services facilities (EL & Dev PE)
 - School Buses
 - B4/After School Care w/ US (cafeteria)
 - Gym- LS & US athletics
 - Shared staff:
 - Instructional
 - US/MS Music (orch choir)
 - Special Services (EL, Speech, Dev PE)
 - Non-Instructional
 - Custodial
 - o Exec Dir
 - Sped Director
 - Facilities Director
 - Main Office Staff
 - o Bus Drivers
 - B4 /After school care

- Return-to-School January 2021 Work- Cont'd
 - Programming issue identified:
 - Music classes
 - US will not have in-person music for 4 weeks
 - Impacts approx. 4 classes per cohort
 - Phy Ed
 - MS will not have access to locker rooms for 4 weeks
 - Impacts approx. 2 classes per cohort
 - Transitioning between periods require students to walk outside:
 - MS:
 - o Lunch, PE, Art
 - US:
 - Lunch, Study Hall, Gym, Art and PE
 - Jan 20: Re-opening committee and Covid Response Team met
 - Committee member change: Kristen Denzer replaced Shane Mueller on Committee
 - Timeline options discussed
 - Majority approved MS/US return to Hybrid beginning Feb 22
 - Kristen proposed in-person option.
 - Amended LMTP presented w/ historical data applied.
 - o Comments collected and incorporated to extent possible.
 - Jan 21-22: Covid Coordinators (Jon & Candace) and Kelly further discussed how to roll out the Team's work to the board
 - Issues were:
 - LMTP was incomplete safety protocol assessment tool incomplete.
 - This has been further affirmed based on feedback/comments received from SCPA Staff after distribution of the board packet.
 - Board cannot approve a transition timeline w/o approving a LMTP.
 - All LMTP which are LESS restrictive must be approved by RST (per Safe Learning Plan); therefore, any plan that would be approved would be contingent on RST approval (call not scheduled until Feb 10)
 - Though a meeting prior to Feb 10 could be possible, Jon & Candace strongly oppose finalizing a LM plan prior to Feb 10 for reasons listen in Jan 4 notes (above)
 - It was concluded that what should be presented to the board is a work-in-progress and will be finalized for submission to RST on Feb 10 and submitted to board for approval as soon after that date as possible.

• Return-to-School – January 2021 Work- Cont'd

- 0
- Jan 25: Vaccine availability- 60 doses allocated to SCPA via the Governor's Pilot Vaccination program
 - After this allocation 55% of SCPA staff who work in the building on a regular basis (excludes subs and non-teaching coaches) will have received the 1st vaccine by the 1st week in Feb or have declined the vaccine. This leaves 83 staff that have not yet received a vaccine allocation.
 - If SCPA receives this same allocation in the next two weeks, SCPA staff who work in the building on a regular basis will all have received a vaccine allocation.
 - \circ $\;$ Status of this allocation is unknown currently.
 - It appears. likely that 100% of SCPA staff will be fully vaccinated by April 1.
 - Hopefully this will come into focus in the next two weeks.
 - If this is Likely to occur- How does this change our trajectory
 - o It is becoming clear that the LMTP is controversial and will likely result in the type of community divide that occurred last fall.
 - o Should the 'qualitative' approach be revisited
- Jan 26: Path Forward:
 - I've received direct communication by 6 of 28 non-sped upper school staff- all concerned about abandoning the current plan and bringing people back b4 vaccine
 - Do we continue to pursue quantitative vs. qualitative LMTP
 - ٠

St. Croix Preparatory Academy

Separated Divisions - First Floor



St. Croix Preparatory Academy

Separated Divisions - Second Floor



St. Croix Preparatory Academy

Separated Divisions - Aux Gym





Updated Learning Model Transition Plan Working Group -Board Report

January 30, 2020

Group Participants:

Return to School Committee (School Board appointed at Nov 17 board meeting):

Nicole Donnay, Jake Gottschalk, Hannah Sislo, Shane Mueller, Drew Melendres and Susan Peterson.

Note re: make-up of this committee- This is an all are board members except Hannah- she was invited to join to bring MS & Sped perspective to the committee. We have a perspective for the LS and US with Nicole and Jake, respectively. Shane and Drew are parent-only board members (I added 'only' because Jake and Nicole are SCPA parents as well) and Susan is our School Board Clerk-SCPA parent. Note: Kristen joined meetings in Shane's absence.)

COVID-19 Response Team:

COVID-19 Coordinators: Jon Gutierrez (Exec Director) & Candace Westlund (School Nurse)

Educational Leadership: Andrew Sachariason (Upper School Principal), Joann Karetov (LS Principal), Peggy R Wanda Renner (Principal on Special Assignment),

Operational Leadership: Terri Smith (HR Director), Bill Blotske (Facility Director, Marianne Thole (Food Service Director, Kelly Gutierrez (Exec Director of Operation & Finance)

Recap of Work Accomplished:

In spending more time trying to design a meaningful/defendable decision rubric, the team concluded that our team is not equipped to do that, nor is it prescribed in the MN Safe Learning Plan (SLP). The SLP is MDH and MDE's collaborative guidance based on Walz's orders and public schools' primary Covid-19 guiding document.

So, we looked to The SLP to find specific guidance just as we did when we relied on the 'Case Rate Data' parameters (see page 6) of the SLP to dictate our learning model selection last summer and to serve as an objective framework for our LMTP (approved in November), it is logical and defendable that we continue to use this document (created by public health experts and scientists and statisticians) to guide the updated LMTP. The rub is the Learning Model **selection** guidance was objective (case rate data). We like that. Now, for this stage of our school year, the more emphasized guidance is nuanced and subjective. So, it is logical that our updated LMTP be robust enough to reflect the emphasized guidance.

The following is the specific guidance re: transitioning between learning models (see SLP p.12-14):

- Wait a minimum of 2-3 weeks.
- Consult with MDE/MDE/local public health official (Wash Co. Epidemiologist) for guidance
- Hybrid model can be used as a bridge to safely move back toward in-person learning (for example- stay in hybrid for 28 days and monitor for any add'l clusters b4 transitioning to in-person)

Tools to Capture Nuanced Guidance: See 'Covid Temperature Check' & 'Safety Measures Rubric'

- Work group believes these tools capture the factors that which the SLP/RST guide schools to consider- including:
 - The impact on the school community, staffing, the ability to trace and isolate close contacts, testing capacity, extracurricular activities, and staffing levels.

Structure to Execute on this Guidance:

We recommend that our work group combine to form an expanded Covid Response Team. Per the guidance in the SLP (p.8). This team would then make recommendations to the board re: learning model transitions. The board would then approve, reject, or amend the recommendation. The Learning Model selection authority resides with the board. This is a recommending committee.

COVID-19 Response Team role:

- Meet weekly with agenda items that include:
 - 'COVID-19 Temperature Check' report
 - 'Safety Measures Rubric' report
 - Division Principals report
 - Discuss and determine necessary action items:
 - Safety protocols adjustments
 - Recommended change in learning model
 - Short term closure of classroom/grade level or division,
 - Preparation for consultation w/ RST or Public Health Official
 - Prepare status update messaging to families and staff
- Report to School Board: updates and recommended changes to learning model and corresponding timelines (determine frequency: weekly or monthly and as needed?)

This process would replace the current Learning Model Transition Plan

15

•

St. Croix Preparatory Academy Learning Model Transition Plan- Factors to Weigh per MN Safe Learning Plan, Regional Support Team and Wash Co Epidemiologist

students in inpatient mental health facility

<u>Category</u>	<u>Factor</u> <u>Red</u>		Yellow	<u>Green</u>	Reference from MN Safe Learning Plan
					_
Covid	County Case Rate	30+	11-29	10 or less	р.6
In Washington	County Case Rate-Trends	increasing 3 consecutive weeks	both increasing and decreasing over 3 week period	decreasing 3 consecutive weeks	p. 12
County.	Is there significant COVID transmission in community	yes	somewhat	no	p. 12, 13, 14

	Ability to Staff	>25% division absences, and/or key operational staff absences prohibit delivery of essential services (food service, health room, custodial, special services)	15-25% staff absences and/or key operational staff absences approaching level which would prohibit delivery of essential services (food service, health room, custodial, special services)	<15% staff absences and staffing of essential services is solid	p. 12
	School absences due to Covid (ill, quarantined or isolated) over past 5 school days	>5%	3-5%	<3%	p. 13
	Ability to Trace & Isolate cases within 24 hours	multiple cases not traced w/l 24 hours	occassional case not traced w/l 24 hrs	all cases traced w/l 24 hours	p. 12
Impact of	New cases- common theme?	no		yes	p. 12
Impact of Covid In	New cases- traceable to school community?	yes		no	p. 9,
Dur School	New cases- spread over several weeks or close together?	close together		spread over several weeks	p. 13
	New cases- are parents & staff forthcoming about close contacts?	no		yes	p. 13
	# of new cases - SCPA Community				p. 13
	# of new cases -SCPA community member who were in the building				p. 12
	# of close contacts				p. 12
	Extra-Curricular Activities	extra-curricular activites not permitted	limited extra-curriculars maybe held	most extra-curricular activites may be held	

	Required On-site Testing Progam -for staff	not conducted	successfully conducted with <90% staff participation	successfully conducted with >90% staff participation	
Mitigation	Community Testing Capacity-for families	limited availablity of free community testing	>2 day leadtime to receive free community testing	2 day or less lead time to receive free community testing	
	Implementation of Mitigation Strategies	required strategies not implemented	100% of required and most recommended strategies implemented	100% of required and nealy all recommended strategies implemented	
Strategies in Our School	Weekly Safety Protocol Assessment Score	<80%	80-89%	90% or higher	
	% of Staff either vaccinated or opting to not be vaccinated	<25%	25-75%	>75%	
	% of Staff either vaccinated or opting to not be vaccinated 6+ weeks ago	<25%	25-75%	>75%	
	Grades compared to prior year at this point				
	School Counselor Referals				
Impact on kids	Increase/Decrease Failing Classes				
	Daily Average Absences/Check Ins				
	Families Desiring IP/504 evals				

St. Croix Prep Parent Feedback on Learning Model Transition Plan 1/30/2021

Full Comment

I feel that our school admin/teachers, etc. must confidently state that the goal is to get kids back in school as soon as they can with safety guidelines in place. This is not being communicated clearly or confidently which creates concern with parents.

After watching the board meeting, this is an example of why parents are upset/checked out and do not know what to do or how to help. Teachers are not on board with getting kids back. No one seems to care about the kids – no strong push on how the kids feel.

The main objective should be how are we going to get the kids back in school as soon as we can. This should be where the energy is focused and seen with everyone on the board. This will help parents see that the school truly cares. Teachers should be essential workers and be required to teach in person with children in their classrooms.

So disappointed that we are not moving our kids back sooner – we are behind other districts that are larger. We are a school that promotes leadership, and we are not taking the opportunity to lead the charge. Teachers should not have the biggest say in the decisions. We will lose very good families because of our lack of standing up for our children and listening to parents.

It will soon be a year and COVID-19 are not going anywhere. We need to accept that and find a way. These kids have been isolated for nearly a year and no real in person learning. My kid (who was an A student) is barely hanging on with Bs. There is no joy, no motivation.

I am a nurse; I have daily contact with patients, I touch them, have close contact with them and I am not vaccinated. Why can't the teachers be willing to teach our kids?

Full Comment

Administration seems to be managing to a small group of vocal teachers (employees) versus managing to the needs and desires of their customers (kids and parents). They should not even be talking about "safety" or "risk" anymore as there is overwhelming and consistent consensus from multiple studies and sources that schools are safe and kids do not spread the virus. They may have a waiting list but the quality of the current enrollment (good families that are leaving) and the waiting list (the quality of those applying) will suffer because of this. We are witnessing self-inflicted brand damage and loss of brand trust by the leadership and board of SCPA.

What is most disappointing in the most recent board meeting is the lack of conversation about what is best for kids!

Our personal priorities and values do not seem to currently align with the school. We had hoped they would be able to be on the cutting edge of getting the students back in person and be more in alignment with the success the private schools are having with in person, but the board is so unbalanced that we do not see how the parents voice will influence any decisions.80% of lower school parents opted to send their kids back when provided the option in Jan. We feel unheard.



Covid-19 Safety Measures Rubric

An unscheduled walkthrough will occur weekly to provide assurance of compliance with the safety measures set in place to mitigate the spread of the COVID 19 virus. The walkthrough will be conducted by St. Croix Prep Facility Director who will work in cooperation with Division Principals and St. Croix Prep COVID-19 Coordinators.

The Facility Director will work with the staff in the point of observation to determine a plan for compliance and assure the implementation of the safety measure in question.

Date/Time: _____ Conducted by _____

Masking: All staff, student and visitors to the building will wear a face always covering over their mouth and nose except for eating and drinking

Point of Observation	Lower School	Middle School	Upper School	Area of improvement
Classrooms	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Hallways	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Offices	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Workrooms	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Atrium	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Cafeteria	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Gym	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
PAC	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Auxiliary Gym	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	

Physical distancing: Staff will always maintain a physical distance of six feet, students will always maintain a physical distance of three feet if in In-Person Learning Model and six feet if in Hybrid Learning Model.

Point of Observation	Lower School	Middle School	Upper School	Area of improvement
Classrooms	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Hallways	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Offices	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Workrooms	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Atrium	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Cafeteria	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Gym	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
PAC	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Auxiliary Gym	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	

Sanitization: Commonly touched surfaces will be sanitized at two-hour intervals or between the changing of cohorts in any given area.

Point of Observation	Lower School	Middle School	Upper School	Area of improvement
Classrooms	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Hallways	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Offices	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Workrooms	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Atrium	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Cafeteria	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Gym	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
PAC	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Auxiliary Gym	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	

Hand Hygiene: Adequate supplies will be available, and staff and students will appropriately utilize the opportunities to do hand hygiene, including washing hands after lunch, bathroom use, and when able and use of sanitizer at all other times.

Point of Observation	Lower School	Middle School	Upper School	Area of improvement
Classrooms	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Lunchroom	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Bathroom	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	

Capacity: Rooms will not exceed a capacity that does not allow for the recommended physical distancing

Point of Observation	Lower School	Middle School	Upper School	Area of improvement
Classrooms	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Offices	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Workrooms	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Atrium	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Cafeteria	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Gym	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
PAC	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	
Auxiliary Gym	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	>90% Partially Not at all	