



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Human Resources and Talent Development (HRTD) Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 23, 2023

Date Thursday, February 23, 2023
Place Loudoun County Public Schools / School Board meeting (see BoardDocs / LCPS-TV)
Length 28m (video)

- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): <https://player.vimeo.com/video/802210776?rel=0>
- BoardDocs (School Board): <https://go.boarddocs.com/vsba/loudoun/Board.nsf/Public>

Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-22. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:00] go ahead and call we'll go ahead and call this okay great thank you so much we'll go ahead and call this meeting to order this is the hrted committee meeting for thursday february 23 2023 i've been informed that we do not have any public comment for this evening so we will move to item number three the minutes from january 26 um do i have a motion to approve the minutes so moved a second

[00:00:34] oh i'll second um all those in favor of approving the minutes from january 26 raise your hand and say aye aye all those opposed any abstentions that motion will pass uh with two yeses and uh two zero

[00:00:57] one with um mr baity myself um supporting and mr more sustaining from the vote okay action item four so um we do not have any new information items this week because we still have six policies up for review and action by the committee so we will try to get through these policies that are up for

[00:01:30] discussion today the first one is policy 7550 drug and alcohol free workplace the discussion on these items um predates me what's that yes okay is there a motion to move the drug and alcohol free

[00:02:02] workplace policy number 7550 forward for full school school board review as an information item so moved is there a second second okay any discussion on this policy yes mr morse thank you

madam chair uh just i i wasn't here for the preliminary discussion i just want to touch base on a couple things drug paraphernalia is that a recognized term do we have a defined set of things

[00:02:38] that that are captured under the the expression drug paraphernalia that would be on line 26 of the clean copy so um on line 16 it says the term drug paraphernalia has the meaning given in virginia code so i think we just referenced virginia code okay and virginia code has a listing of all the okay the second issue was uh a cannabis oil is that that's a recognized uh altering substance

[00:03:16] As far as, is that the same question? Okay. So, yes. There is a difference between that and CBD. The team did do some research based on Ms. Okadeke's question previously.

[00:03:33] And the last question was, we talked about termination, but we don't talk about loss of license. This is true throughout the policies we're looking at tonight. So, for a sweeping statement, is that something that we just leave out of the policy, or is that something we should capture? To be honest, I think I would have to go back and do more research because ultimately a recommendation for a revocation comes from the superintendent to the school board.

[00:04:02] And I'm not sure other than referring it to code based on those parameters, the criteria for by which we would revoke license, which does include information about drug paraphernalia.

[00:04:19] We don't reference it in policy. So, I mean, that won't stop me from voting to move it forward, but when it gets to the full board, if we could have the discussion on whether, because if we don't have it in there and we want to revoke a license, I wouldn't want to face the possibility that we cannot move forward because it wasn't captured in the policy.

[00:04:40] So we could probably just reach out to legal counsel on that, but that won't hold me up from voting. Thank you. So as a follow-up to what I think was previously listed as CBD oil, that was my same question.

[00:05:00] Is that an altering state to use an oil? My understanding is as like a muscle rub, for example, people use for medicinal purposes, not necessarily mood-altering purposes.

[00:05:18] So CBD oil is technically different than cannabis oil. It doesn't have THC in it. Does that help? Okay, and then my other question was on line 90.

[00:05:39] We went ahead and made that. Okay, so you changed that to termination rather than dismissal from employment. Okay, any further discussion? All those in favor of moving this forward to the school board as an information item? Aye.

[00:05:55] That will pass unanimously. move that forward as an information item I'm assuming not next week because that agenda is set but at a future school board meeting or is it actually we have it tentatively on whatever goes forward tonight we will put okay great okay item 4.02 is policy 7552 tobacco and smoke-free environment do I have a

[00:06:31] motion to move this policy forward as amended to the full school board as an information item i move that the hrted committee accept the revisions to policy 7552 tobacco and smoke-free environment and move to the full school board on february 28 2023 all those in favor say

[00:06:54] aye that motion will pass unanimously as well thank you and item 4. 03 policy 7554 employee responsibility concerning student alcohol and drug usage is there a motion i moved that the hrted committee accept the revisions to policy 75 54 employee responsibility concerning student alcohol

[00:07:30] and drug usage and moved to the full school board on february 28 2023 second mr morse uh so let's Let's see.

[00:07:45] I've got to go to my red line copy.

[00:08:08] So this was -- I think what I was looking for was in no place do we talk about -- let's see if I can find this just a minute, please.

[00:08:42] Oh, okay. So here it is. So in lines -- well, let's go to the clean copy so everyone will be on the same line. It says the lines 19, the principal administrator there shall notify the parents or guardians of a student who has been confirmed to be illegally under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

[00:09:01] If we're going to test the student, shouldn't we notify the parents even if they're not confirmed? They should be notified when the suspicion occurs so that in either case, whether it's confirmed or not, they're aware of the fact that the school was investigating their child.

[00:09:28] Does staff have any thoughts on this? It starts on line 19.

[00:09:44] The principal, administrator, or their respective designee shall notify the parents or guardians of a student who has been confirmed to be illegally under the influence of drugs or alcohol. but it doesn't talk about notifying the parents if they're suspected. Is there a reason behind that?

[00:10:00] I don't know of the reason. I would have to check with legal counsel to maybe see if that was added. This policy was brought forth so long ago that I can't even think of. I mean, to me, that doesn't really make sense either, so I don't know.

[00:10:21] I also don't know who confirms if we're going to test them, what type of permission or we would require for that either, but I can find out.

[00:10:41] I just agree with the comments that you made. I think as a parent, if my student came home and let me know that they were tested for drugs at school and nobody told me about that, I would be very concerned. So, I mean, I would be inclined to say if there isn't any concern with adding in parental notification here or if that's covered in another policy with regard to student behavior, if we can get some clarification on that.

[00:11:18] Mr. Beatty, did you have a comment as well? Yes, thank you, Chair. One concern that comes up is basically parents emailing and saying that the bathrooms in particular are notorious for these incidents.

[00:11:34] What are the repercussions of someone not reporting? Is that in here? If they have reason to believe it, perhaps not the student per se, but they can smell something coming out of the bathroom, is there a reporting requirement for them to report that to the appropriate administrator in order to determine what's going on?

[00:11:53] For the employee? Yes. So essentially this policy is the reporting requirement policy for employees to report students that they're concerned to be under the influence.

[00:12:12] Is that what you're asking? I guess so, but for me, this is like if you see a student that is visibly intoxicated or something, but what if there's sort of reason to believe that it's going on in a room outside of direct observation and maybe like someone told you or something?

[00:12:27] Does that fall under this kind of policy? I don't know if it would fall under this policy. I mean, that may fall under the mandatory duty to report in regards to potential child abuse and neglect.

[00:12:49] I think that might fall under neglect if you're aware of an incident of students using drugs and or alcohol, especially on site, and you fail to report it, but I don't know.

[00:13:06] To clarify, it's sort of the question is, are we looking at having like a consequence outlined in the policy for failure to report such an observation? Yeah, I think so. I mean, like, it's one of those things like if you're, like you said, there's neglect, obviously.

[00:13:22] Yeah. But if you, it's sometimes easy to just walk past it. Sure. So I think having something specified that if you're not going to report it, these are the consequences, I think that would be appropriate. So we could potentially add language that is in a similar policy in regards to progressive discipline up to and including termination.

[00:13:46] I can't remember what policy we recently added that progressive discipline to, but we can pull that language. If we have that in policies, we use pretty much the standard language, the same language in all those policies. We can wordsmith it. We also have a recommendation for this who has been confirmed to be legally under the influence.

[00:14:06] We could change that language to who is believed to be under the influence instead of confirmed. Or who is suspected. Yeah, I think that that meets my request. I was just going to add to what you were saying that I believe it's in the suspected child neglect and abuse policy.

[00:14:29] There's also a statement about the principal having a role in making sure that the policy is complied with. So, for example, if a teacher is not reporting it, then the principal is holding the staff member accountable.

[00:14:48] And then there's that other language about progressive discipline. So I think that it could be consistent and then also address your concerns. that could be like another subsection that takes similar language. Yeah, I think so.

[00:15:04] Even if it is, you know, if it's already in policy, if it's a cross-referenced here, there's more visibility into that so that an understanding of what happened. Thank you, Madam Chair. Also, along the lines of Mr. Beatty's comment on line six, it says, no LCPS employee shall encourage or condone illegal alcohol or drug use.

[00:15:25] I think what it should say is LCPS employees shall discourage, not no employee shall encourage. That's kind of a really passive statement there. I think we're trying to make more of an impact here.

[00:15:43] All LCPS employees shall discourage and perhaps will not condone illegal alcohol or drug use. I would agree with the both, the discourage and not encourage.

[00:16:00] I mean, I think, or what was the wording? Discourage and not condone. Yes. They have encouraged, not encouraged or condone. Right. So it would be all LCPS employees shall discourage and, I mean, it's kind of redundant, but and not condone.

[00:16:19] I think the discourage is strong enough. I think that really. I do think both are, I think they're separate. One is action-oriented, like to discourage is something that you are required to do, right, and not condoning is slightly separate.

[00:16:43] Yeah, I would agree. Thank you. Just for clarification, is it your intention to move it forward with that language amended, or are we going to ask staff to provide?

[00:17:02] How do you want to approach that, Madam Chair? So I think we do have clarity on having the language adjustments. I think the one piece that's pending is feedback. I think you said from legal that you wanted to relate it to the parental notification, or are we comfortable saying that we want parents to be notified if and when their children are tested?

[00:17:29] I mean, I agree with that. I'm comfortable with the language adjustment that staff just recommended. So as amended, I would consider that amended language, but I'm comfortable with that, and I'm comfortable with the discourage and not condone.

[00:17:47] Can I just make sure to clarify so that we're all on the same page if we're going to bring it forward? So I have three potential amendments. I have in line one, in line six, sorry, changing that sentence to all LCPS employees shall discourage and will not condone illegal alcohol or drug use by any students and the rest of the line is the same.

[00:18:14] And then further down, instead of who has been confirmed to be illegally under the influence, I have changed to who is suspected to be illegally under the influence. And then the third amendment is to add a Section C for consequences that is similar to other language in other policies that addresses the responsibility of employees to report as well as the school administrator principals responsibility to address the

[00:18:50] employee should they fail to do so so I think we've made the motion so so all those in favor of moving the policy forward as amended for the school board review at the next school board meeting on february 28th hi that motion will pass unanimously thank

[00:19:19] you i'll just use my notes document just timed out so give me a moment okay item 4. 04 is policy

[00:20:16] 7652 evaluation related to step increase and one-time payments related to 10 years is there a motion i move that the hrted committee accepts the revision of policy 7652 evaluation related to step increase and one-time payments related to tenure and move to the full school board on February 28th 2023. Second. Are there any discussion items for this one Mr. Morse? Just the grammar in that last sentence could we just take a look at that and that's administrative change but the way it reads

[00:20:55] right now it says a one-time payment when they are on the top of their respective salary scale dash comma the following year if employment continues maybe just get rid of the dash and comment put for the following year i think that probably makes it a little bit easier

[00:21:14] but that's that's an administrative change so i have no other comments i move with the hrted

[00:22:01] committee accept the revisions of policy 7624 supplemental retirement plans and move forward to the full school board on february 28th 2023 just a point of clarification so it says all employees with the exception of school board members are school board members employees i mean i know like we've got employee numbers and stuff but technically don't technically school board members are not employees does it have to I guess because they're elected

[00:22:34] officials does it have to be in there so we can change it to say school board members may not participate in the 403b they can participate in the 457 and we can do that in the next section as a separate sentence to clarify that they're not employees we can keep it then I just I think that might be I I

[00:23:12] would support them so just administratively to separate that out so all employees and then school board members are not eligible and then for the 457b it's all

[00:23:24] employees school board members are eligible thank you i move that the hrted committee accept the

[00:24:01] revisions to policy 7016 employment complaints and move to the full school board on february 28

[00:24:07] 2023 second so in while you're looking at that i had a question for staff because this is one that

[00:24:59] we had some extensive conversations about last time were there revisions since the last time we reviewed this so there were extensive revisions and I should have had them put to the original in my apologies but column or section a there were multiple things added to section a to provide clarity in regards to the the review process additionally section B regarding confidentiality was added as

[00:25:36] as well as C, to explicitly remind employees that retaliation was prohibited. So all of those were asks at the last committee meeting, and were added. Sorry, Mr. Morse.

[00:26:06] I did find it. On the first sentence under Section A, if the employee's immediate supervisor is unable to address the employee's complaint, they will attempt to obtain assistance. Attempt is kind of a weak word there. I would think that they will obtain assistance.

[00:26:23] from the next level supervisor. I think that would be stronger. I think we want to make sure that the employee's complaints are, because an attempt could just be, well, I dropped him an email, and then nothing was heard. So try to make the voice more active.

[00:26:40] So I think the intention there, and I agree we could probably use a different word, was if the employee does not take that next step, the onus is on the employee to go if they do not feel as if they're, their concerns have been addressed.

[00:27:00] Okay, so I guess I misread this. This is the attempt by the employee, not the employer. That's correct. So we want to maintain the flexibility. Okay, I'm fine with that. Thank you. Any further discussion? All those in favor of moving this forward as amended, raise your hand and say aye.

[00:27:21] Aye. That passes unanimously. We are, is there any new business? Okay, we are now adjourned. Thank you.

