



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Legislative and Policy Committee, Monday, May 1, 2023

Date Monday, May 1, 2023
Place Loudoun County Public Schools / School Board meeting (see BoardDocs / LCPS-TV)
Length 39m (video)

- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): <https://player.vimeo.com/video/823792367?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.

[00:00:06] Good afternoon. This is Atusa Rieser calling to order the Monday, May 1st, 2023 meeting of the Legislative and Policy Committee. We will begin with public comment. And today there are no speakers signed up for public comment.

[00:00:22] So we will move on to item number three, which is approval of the draft minutes for April 10th and April 17th. So we'll start with April 10th. If I could please get a motion. So moved.

[00:00:40] Second. Second. Okay, motion's been made by Mr. Beatty and seconded by Mr. Sorotkin. All those in favor, please say aye. Aye. That motion will pass unanimously with all committee members present. Moving on to item 3.02 is approval of the April 17, 2023 draft minutes.

[00:00:59] Could I please have a motion for that as well? I move to approve the minutes of the April 17, 2023 meeting. Second. Motion's been made by, do you have a question, Mr. Sorotkin?

[00:01:14] I do. Did we have a meeting on both April 10th and April 17th? we had a meeting two weeks in a row the 17th was the closed session oh okay that was the closed session only okay thank you i believe there are separate minutes for that too there are there's there are draft minutes in board docs okay i got it and so motions been made by mr beatty and seconded by mr sorotkin all those in favor please say aye aye that motion will also pass unanimously

[00:01:47] with all committee members present um we will move on to item number four which is our action items we're beginning today with item 4.01 which is the virginia school board association's addition or change request and i will turn that over to mr slevin thank you miss reaser as you all are aware we are asked annually to provide input on the 2023 legislative positions of the vsba in preparation for today's meeting a query was sent to all school board members asking for for their input on the legislative positions of the VSBA as well as cabinet

[00:02:27] members were asked to provide any input on the VSBA legislation legislative position we have one recommendation from staff that came from the Department of Student Services related to the attendance coding we are asking specifically for the General Assembly to direct the Board of Education to add Add an attendance withdrawal code that can be used for the circumstance where a school has been notified of a planned absence of more than 15 days that will result in a mandated withdrawal.

[00:02:59] So as you know, chronic absenteeism is becoming more of a topic of concern with recent action by the Virginia Board of Education with it being indicated for accreditation. In this particular case, if a family has a planned absence that they know is going to exceed over 15 days, what happens now is that student would leave the classroom, they would go on their trip or would go to their destination, and those absences would accrue impacting the chronic absenteeism indicator for that school.

[00:03:35] So what the suggestion here is that could we have the option of, knowing that they're going to be out, could we withdraw them at the first day of absence, and then those attendance numbers wouldn't accrue. So I'm happy to discuss, take any questions. No, I do appreciate staff bringing that forward. I had a family in my district who wanted to travel to Germany and their child was actually withdrawn and because a large number of families utilized special permission to attend that elementary school, and I think it happens a lot at elementary school if I remember correctly from the board presentation, they were in a situation where

[00:04:14] truancy was going to be an issue so i think we have a lot of families that do travel overseas and sometimes they they hit that mark so i appreciate the option for the board to consider pursuing that like to see if any of the other committee members have questions or concerns about this position mr sorokan thank you madam chair uh i'm curious if how how many students per year would fall under this situation like that where they're taking a trip or absence like this and get withdrawn

[00:04:46] after the 15 days? I could get the exact numbers, but if I recall, that was part of the presentation to the board last week, and if I'm super quick in board docs, maybe I could pull it up. I guess from a big picture, what do we gain by adding this extra code? Is this just being that we look better at the analytics that come out of the reporting system, or is this going to prevent

[00:05:23] a parent from being called a truant or you know like where where what's the advantage of making this change i think the advantage i think it does have to do with the um storytelling of the of the data in terms of the student is essentially as described the student is intending to be out for more than 15 days so we know that they are going to be eventually withdrawn um so just moving that

[00:05:53] action upwards um makes that with withdrawal um have less of an impact on the school um and then when they come back they would just be is there a special code in the system for that or do they come back and they're just a student as they were before except that those 15 days of missed school don't count against them and against the school they would be re-enrolled so i think some of the concerns that I did hear from families who were either traveling to Asia or Europe for extended

[00:06:33] visits was that truancy was an issue and even and I think from school to school whether it was considered excused or unexcused there was some room for discretion and I think this would benefit families and that it would flush things out I think also some families were surprised to be unenrolled and so I think it would give them notice that you know this number of days will result in in this particular action being taken so not on slide 11 of the of the chronic absenteeism update when you get a chance to look at it earlier shows the percentage of chronically absent students who were unenrolled or

[00:07:11] re-enrolled and so for again this is the base of students that have been identified of have being chronically absent so it's not of all students is 4.9 percent across the board and there is a bump up in elementary school as you know at Miss Reserve. It's 6.7 percent in elementary, 3.8 in middle, and 3.9 in high school. So it's not a major issue. This is just one, not that it's not a major issue, but it's one approach to addressing this topic. Mr. Sorokin. Thank you, Madam Chair. And so I think the percentage that

[00:07:48] would be impacted by this change would be even less than that 4 point whatever percent, because that's all students who were chronically absent for more than 15 days, but here we're specifically talking about the subset of that that where they notify in advance that there's a planned absence of 15 days or more is that do i have that right okay so is there some reason why we don't just i mean if we're notified of that situation is there some reason why now why now we don't just say like hey do you want us to just withdraw your student now since that's going to happen on them

[00:08:20] in 15 days anyway i can't speak to a particular reason but i know that's not current practice Okay. I have to imagine if we're asking for a code section to be able to do it, it must be because the right to do it doesn't already exist, being a Dillon's rule state, perhaps.

[00:08:40] Well, it could be a voluntary withdrawal on behalf of the parents if they ask in the beginning, like, you know, please withdraw my students so that they don't end up being technically truant at the end of the 15 days. And I wonder, does staff have the concern that if they didn't do so voluntarily, I mean, maybe they aren't actually doing so voluntarily if that right already exists.

[00:09:03] Does that impact the accreditation? Will it adversely impact the accreditation for those schools? Or does it have the potential to do that? This would help avoid that. The intent of this is, yes, there is potential, and we're trying to lessen that potential.

[00:09:22] As students aren't going to be in school, we know they're going to be withdrawn. Right. I think it would allow for the analysis, the accreditation analysis, to be based on actual truancy instead of families that choose to provide an opportunity for their children to have enrichment through foreign travel.

[00:09:48] Are there other VSBA legislative positions that either staff or Jackson West wanted to flag for the committee? This is the only staff recommendation. misreys are there there are not i just point out that there's an existing vsba position related to

[00:10:07] attendance that's in your packet that's um related to this so typically um vsba gives us a really tight turnaround which is why this is uh up for the committee to decide whether to recommend or not to the board it has to go for an information item as an and as an action item to the board

[00:10:40] before their window closes so i'm looking for a motion to either recommend or not recommend the VSBA legislative positions as they stand with or without the suggested amendment those are the options. Yes Mr. just one I guess point of information whether it be an existing position from VSBA you Karen and I sort of went back and forth unsure if there should be an amended position or a new one

and so if you feel had decided to add this I'm happy to talk to VSBA in the interim between now and an informational meeting and you advertise it whether they prefer it be an

[00:11:17] informational item excuse me be a new item or an amended item in their in their agenda. Thank you i appreciate that so we could decide whether we want to generally support um i i think first it would be beneficial for me to have some feedback from the committee members as to whether the staff requested change is something that the committee supports and then we could decide how to present it to the board mr matey um i'm okay with moving forward on this i would say that um it seems like there's a bigger issue in terms of parents deciding they need to take their children out for 15 days

[00:11:56] But obviously that's outside the purview of the school. And so I think in this case, giving staff more granular reporting on any data that gets out would provide a better picture about what's kind of going on in the schools.

[00:12:11] Because it's true, a parent actively taking their child on a month-long vacation somewhere is very different from a child that just doesn't show up to school. So I'm okay with having different reporting. We can talk about the other specifics, the whole framework with the drawn and re-enrollment.

[00:12:28] But I think having this extra code would be a fine change. You as well. Yeah, and I support it as well, especially because we see it so much at the elementary school level. And I think it's important to distinguish between parents choosing to provide an opportunity and children being truant.

[00:12:48] So seeing as how the committee is generally in support of this going forward to the board, we can just take a vote on recommending the positions together with a suggested change, and then we'll decide at the board level whether it's going to be an amendment to the existing VISPA position or a new one.

[00:13:10] So I'll just go ahead and make that motion. Second. All those in favor? Aye. So that will pass unanimously with all committee members present. And we will move on to item 4.02, adoption of new policy 3310, evaluation of new and established programs.

[00:13:32] And I believe, Mr. Slevin, you're going to speak to this. But we had a considerable amount of very useful feedback from the community to consider. And I believe staff would like to work on incorporating some of that and bring it back to the committee.

[00:13:48] Is that right? Yes. Before, I just wanted to take a moment to thank Mr. Jackson for being here. I don't know if you have any additional questions for our restaurant consultant. Thank you. I appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Jackson. You good? You have any? Thank you. Okay. All right. So for policy 3310, evaluation of new and established programs, we did receive some additional feedback.

[00:14:09] We also, in working with the regulation, we also have Division Council take a look at regulations. And so based on the regulation and the policy, there's some additional work we want to do. So we would like to take this off of action and bring it back in our June LNP meeting. the committee is okay with that that sounds fine thank you very much okay so we'll move on to item 4.03 revision of policy 3120 powers and duties and we'll turn that over to mr. Slevin yes as a as a thank you mr. Rieser as a reminder to

[00:14:48] the board this particular policy was brought up as a place to hold a VSBA recommended policy related administrative action in absence of policy. The powers and duties policy 3120 was determined to be a place where that may make sense, and so we simply added a section I to the existing policy. We did

receive some feedback regarding the need for this particular amendment and some feedback about additional timing. That being said, staff feels

[00:15:28] that the timing is actually pretty tight within the policy it asks that the superintendent come to the board at their next scheduled meeting after the decision was made to explain their rationale for the decision and get feedback on that and so at this time we're recommending this be forwarded to the board full board yes and I'll just point out to the committee that staff did add language that we requested regarding an attempt to convene an emergency meeting so that school board could weigh in if they wanted to and in the at lines 146 to 147 the policy spells out

[00:16:08] that the decisions are subject to review at the next regular meeting which would mean any decision that was made in the absence of an emergency meeting would only be in place for a maximum of approximately two weeks so at this at this stage at this point in time the superintendent has the ability to take such action without any time limits.

[00:16:32] So it is prescriptive. It will be more restrictive after the policy is passed than what we have now in any case. I'll just open it up to the committee for further questions or concerns. Mr. Sorokin.

[00:16:50] Thank you, Madam Chair. So it's not related to the new section, but I would just recommend changing the title of the policy just from powers and duties to powers and duties of the division superintendent, which would align it with the same language in policy 3110 and just be a little more specific about what the policy is for since it's all about the powers and duties of the superintendent.

[00:17:17] I'll second that just so we can do so formally unless staff has any concerns. We have no concerns. So all those in favor of the amended title, please raise your hand and say aye.

[00:17:32] that will pass unanimously with all committee members present and if there are no other questions on the underlying policy that I'll go ahead and make the motion that the LMP committee recommend to the full school board to adopt this policy as amended second all those in favor that will pass unanimously with all committee members present we will move on to item 4.0 for revision of policy 2520 participation by the public and I will again turn that over to mr.

[00:18:07] Slevin thank you mr. Reiser this policy was brought forward at the April 10th LMP meeting particularly with the focus on the time allotment determination and the ability to limit the time during committee meetings we did make changes requested by the LMP committee on lines 72 through 74 in terms of some of the placement of the language so you can see those changes there we did receive some public comment related to public participation in meetings generally

[00:18:46] about the importance of public comment and there was a number of concerns related to the amount of time allocated to speakers as you know with a large number of public speakers that that's at times results in one minute of speaking time as opposed to two or three possible minutes depending on the the length of the agenda so there's also I'm sorry there's also some commentary around behavior and participation of attendees being addressed during the meetings but at this time staff didn't have any recommended changes

[00:19:24] about regarding that thank you Mr. Slevin do you have any data on other boards that have a like Are there boards that have a minimum number of minutes or minimum amount of time for speaking?

[00:19:40] And if so, are there other limits or restrictions that they also incorporate? Or are they, because we have a pretty liberal policy. We don't have a limit on number of speakers per meeting or even which meetings people can speak at or the total number of time.

[00:19:58] I know like our Board of Supervisors limits one of their meetings to a really short amount of time and then the second meeting to a more medium amount of time, but they have other restrictions that we don't. So I'm wondering if we have some information about how other boards do it.

[00:20:17] So in the past, we've looked at different policies related to public comment and how Loudoun County compares. And as you stated, you're accurate in that we have a very open public comment policy. In terms of approaches that other school divisions use, many of them prioritize the amount of time that a person is able to speak to the board, but they do that by establishing a time certain and allocating a certain number of speakers.

[00:20:44] So, for example, Fairfax County limits the amount of speakers at school board meetings to 16, but those 16 speakers are guaranteed to speak for three minutes at a time. They call out separate opportunities for public hearings.

[00:21:03] So, for example, if there's a large number of people interested in speaking about a budget item, like if we have budget hearings or attendance zone hearings, those are scheduled separately. We also have some places that govern, like if someone's not able to sign up to speak at a particular time, they may need to let another group of people sign up for the next board meeting.

[00:21:30] Some places are as low as 30 minutes. Arlington and Alexandria give 30 minutes of public comment, for example. And then I think in Chesterfield, it may be 15 minutes of public comment. Wow. So in places like Chesterfield or Arlington, if the same people are signing up and someone else wants to give input, what are their opportunities?

[00:21:55] Are there so that you can hear from everyone? There are some places that do other opportunities to give input. Yes. And I think similar to LCPS, board members have their contact information on their website. There's opportunities in committee meetings. There's opportunities to email staff, like we've been trying to do in terms of the listening sessions.

[00:22:18] I think there are different strategies people use to make their leaders accessible. But not in the format that we're seeing at public comment? Or do they also have additional public hearings beyond attendance zone and budget?

[00:22:38] Yes, they have separate public hearings outside of regularly scheduled board meetings. and I also some even have public speaking sign up like a lottery so if 20 people sign up and they have 15 spots they may pull full names so there's different ways that school systems do it well I do appreciate the additional information and and the suggestions from our advisory committees and other folks about the the feedback that they shared about the length of public comment I

[00:23:11] I will open it up to the other committee members to see if I believe both of you had concerns about the language being clarified regarding committee chairs versus the board chair. And I just want to make sure that what you hope to have reflected has been reflected here and that you unless you would like to give the board chair the same discretion.

[00:23:33] I think it reflects my concerns, and I would be okay with not giving the full board chair that privilege at the moment. But I guess, you know, once it goes to the full board, that could come up for discussion.

[00:23:50] Thank you. Okay, any other comments, concerns, or suggested changes? Can I get a motion to send this to the school board? So moved.

[00:24:06] Second. Okay, all those in favor, please say aye. Aye. That will pass unanimously with all committee members present, and we will move on to Item 4.05, Revision of Policy 2610, Loudoun County School Board Staff Aids.

[00:24:22] Mr. Slevin. Thank you, Mr. Rezard. Sure. As the committee may recall, this policy was last in front of the committee in December of 2022. One of the items that we specifically were asked to get feedback on related to the provision of benefits to staff board aides.

[00:24:48] So between December of 2022 and January, we had the FY24 budget presented, which included board aides which are benefited. So it's taken a little bit of time for us to work through specific policy language that would properly address the reality of board aides having access to LCPS benefits.

[00:25:17] Specifically, if you go to lines 84 through 91, you can see the changes to the section on benefits. Prior, it read that staff aides are not eligible to receive benefits, fringe or otherwise. What we have done is taking our approach when it comes to part-time employees in terms of having a regular assignment of over 20 hours to determine eligibility for school division health insurance plans, deferred compensation, and other voluntary benefits as applicable.

[00:25:53] And this will allow our board aides to be eligible for benefits. There are a few things, other changes of note. Line 31, we have added that current LCPS employees are not eligible to serve as staff aides.

[00:26:11] Part of the rationale for that is because of the special class of employee that board aides would fall into. They're not necessarily part-time or full-time employees of LCPS. They're appointees of the school board. As such, that puts some conflicting, it could end up being conflicting scenarios when it comes to benefited positions, LCPS policies, and other things that may not specifically apply to the position of board aides.

[00:26:44] So the recommendation from staff and why we include it in policy is we want that employee lane to be specific to the board aide. We've had a lot of conversation around this. Mr. Falcone, would you add any color to this?

[00:27:05] No, Mr. Slevin, I believe you covered it. So we are happy to discuss or take any questions from board members. Thank you, Mr. Slevin. Committee members, Mr. Beatty, and then Mr. Sorokin. Thank you. So one thought I've had is this policy came back up, and I wasn't here back in December, so this will be my first crack at it.

[00:27:28] But the idea of staff aides not being provided confidential personnel information. So my understanding is that they sign an NDA or they could sign an NDA. And I just, from my experience having a staff aide, it's tough to, like, give them work to do or to have them being able to monitor email inboxes and stuff.

[00:27:47] So I would just ask what Mr. Falcone's guidance is on potentially giving staff aides more access to information in an effort to help serve the member they're working for, you know, with the understanding that the member is going to be ultimately responsible for their behavior.

[00:28:07] Thanks, Mr. Biddy. That's a great question. And so the language that was proposed only says that staff aides will not be provided confidential personnel information, information protected under FERPA, or any other confidential information by LCPS staff unless required to do so by law.

[00:28:30] So that would not preclude a board member from sharing information as needed, and that would be the reason for the NDA. But the concern would be that it would address staff having to share confidential information directly with the board aide.

[00:28:45] So it would really be something that would need to go from the board member to the staff aide. Okay, that's a good clarification. So if you then go on to, I think, the section before that with the email access, with a confidential sensitive email, In that, kind of keeping that in mind, shouldn't the staff aide be able to be on that confidential and sensitive email with the school board member's permission?

[00:29:12] Again, an idea that it's sort of an implicit approval of the staff member getting whatever information the board member receives. That's a good question. I think the concern would be that board members are governed by the board member code of ethics and policy, and the staff aides will maybe govern by an NDA, but they wouldn't necessarily have that restriction.

[00:29:47] And so they may be able to access information, but the idea would be that those communications really should be directed for the superintendent and the board members and the relevant cabinet members. But I think that's something that certainly could be revised.

[00:30:06] Okay, because my understanding is in a lot of other public positions, usually there's some kind of staff member that has access to the same kind of information the elected official does. again assuming the elected official is responsible for hiring that person and is you know ultimately responsible for the actions that their staff create so um i'd look you know we can pass this along but i'd be good to have more information about that as this comes up for an information item to the full board and what changes we could we could do to just make the staff aid um especially if they're going to be a full-time staff aid you know allow them to do more work and to um take

[00:30:43] more off of part-time board members play absolutely i think that that's we're happy to and just so i'm clear on the on the ask is it to provide clarity on what the the staff aid is permitted to have access to uh that would be the first part and then if there are limits like what what uh changes could be made in order to remove those limits or to kind of gradually you know whatever levels we could put in place you know um such that a board member may decide they don't want their staff aid to have any confidential information, or a board member may decide they want the staff

[00:31:18] member to have access to as much information, I guess not more, but as much so that they can really help the board member perform this job. Understood. That's helpful. Thank you. Yeah, I think, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, what Mr. Beatty might be suggesting is could we get rid of subsection B between lines 125 and 133 or something along those lines, and I just want to chime in that I would be supportive of that as well. And I just want to tell you, it's been an actual impediment, even trying to set up filters that would appropriately filter out messages that

[00:31:55] are not supposed to go to my staff aid. It's catching things that should be going to my staff aid. And we try to be responsive to emails like within the first day or so that they come in. So things are getting lost and trying to avoid that from happening. And I just wonder if it would be possible to cross-reference the school board member conduct policy or the contents in the NDA as a way to get around it. So, I mean, if you, and I know Mr. Sorokin still has some questions, but if you're agreeable to striking that subsection, we could do it before it goes to

[00:32:31] the board. And to clarify, was that subsection 5B? Correct. At line 125 in the red line version that has to do with confidential and sensitive email, Mr. Beatty? If I may respond. No, I don't think we should strike it.

[00:32:47] I just think that because I do find the fact that it goes to the confidential email address that you've got to be more careful about what you talk about that comes out of that. So I think that's a reasonable distribution list. I just think that the staff aid should be on there. And, again, that's more because it's a direction from the superintendent or the council that this is information that needs to be held internal for the moment.

[00:33:11] But I think that would be a better direction to your staff aide also. Right. I think I was not suggesting we get rid of the group. I think subsection B means that staff aides are not able to be part of the group. But I think we're trying to get at the same thing, however Mr. Falcone suggests we get there.

[00:33:29] I'm happy to revise that just to clarify. Do you all want to bring this back to the committee at the next meeting, maybe? Let me let Mr. Sorokin have his turn, and then we can figure that out. Because I think Mr. Slevin's been working on this since December. We'll see. Go ahead, Mr. Srockin.

[00:33:45] Thank you, Madam Chair. So I think there's some emails or some information, like particularly attorney-client privilege information that can never be shared with staff aides. Is that, do I have that right? Where even if we decided everything else, you know, every other confidential or employee information or student information or whatever, attorney-client privilege does not extend to staff.

[00:34:04] That's correct. Does not extend to staff aides. Right. Okay. So I think there need to be like three separate categories, things that can never be shared, things that could possibly share depending on individual board member approval and everything else that's always fine. So if we were going to reorganize the section, I would suggest phrasing it that way.

[00:34:23] That's a good thought. Mr. Slebin, do we have enough time before the next fiscal year? We do still have a tiny bit of time left, right? Do we know the date of the June? So if it comes back in our June meeting, then it wouldn't pass before the next fiscal year, when is our June meeting school board meetings yeah so if we passed it at the LMP meetings the first Monday in June is is a school board meeting so if we pass

[00:34:59] it on the fifth we should be get able to get it as an information item on the first board meeting in June and then okay action assuming we get through the information okay well at that point we could let the board chair know that it's time sensitive. Right. Okay. I do have a subsequent question about benefits. So our other classes of LCPS employees have to work 20 hours to receive benefits. Is that right? Yes. Okay. So this would

[00:35:36] just be consistent with all other part-time employees. Yes. I believe they have to. It's one plus one hour over 20 hours. Okay. Okay. That's all I have. Anything else from the committee members thank

you it's the only other thing i would add is that we did i appreciate divisions council help on this but hrtd's team also has been involved in their they've contributed to the changes please pass on our gratitude to miss bolan and her team as well and i know it's been a long time coming but hopefully next meeting then okay so we are going to move on to item number five

[00:36:15] new business is there any new business from the committee we'll move on to item number six which is our closed meeting. Mr. Sorokin. Thank you, Madam Chair. I move that the Legislative and Policy Committee recess this public meeting and enter into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia for the following purpose. Consultation with staff and legal counsel employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel as authorized by Section 2.2-3711A8 of the Code of Virginia, specifically legal requirements and procedures regarding collective bargaining by employees of the

[00:36:53] Latin County School Board. Second. The motion's been made by Mr. Sorotkin and seconded by Mr. Beatty. All those in favor, please say aye. Aye. That will pass unanimously with all committee members present. We will reconvene to close the meeting and we do not expect to have a vote today.

[00:37:13] Thank you. Mr. Sorotkin. Thank you, Madam Chair. I move that the closed meeting be adjourned, that the Legislative and Policy Committee reconvene as public meeting, and that the minutes of the public meeting reflect that no formal action was taken in the closed meeting. I further move that the following resolution certifying the closed meeting be adopted and reflected in the minutes of this public meeting, Resolution No. 34-2223, whereas the Legislative and Policy Committee has convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote, and in accordance

[00:37:49] with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and whereas Section 2.2-37 12 d of the code of virginia requires a certification by the legislative and policy committee of the loudon county school board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with virginia law now therefore be it resolved that the legislative and policy committee hereby certifies that to the best of each member's knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which the certification applies and only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening this closed meeting were heard discussed or considered by the

[00:38:25] Legislative and Policy Committee of the Loudoun County School Board second motions been made by mr. Sorokin and seconded by mr. Beatty all those is there any discussion all those in favor say hi that motion will pass unanimously with all committee members present we are adjourned thank you



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com