



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Finance and Operations Committee Meeting, Tuesday, June 20, 2023

Date Tuesday, June 20, 2023
Place Loudoun County Public Schools / School Board meeting (see BoardDocs / LCPS-TV)
Length 1h (video)

- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): <https://player.vimeo.com/video/838431938?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] - Good afternoon. Welcome to the Tuesday, June 20th, 2023 Finance Operations Committee meeting. We'll start with a request for remote participation. I understand Ms. Corvo is with us. And Ms. Corvo, please let us know what type of exemption you'd like, whether you are alone and where you're located.

[00:00:22] - Thank you. I'm at my daughter's, I'm alone. Under policy 2420, I'm asking for remote participation due to an ongoing medical condition and disability is confirmed by LCPS HRTD under the ADA.

[00:00:37] - I understand your daughters, you are alone and you're requesting medical exemption. Is there a motion? Okay, there is no motion. Ms. Corbo, would you like to use a personal exemption? - No, thank you. - Okay, so we'll move on with our item two, which is public comment.

[00:00:53] Are there members of the public who wish to speak? Seeing none, we'll move on to item three, which is the draft minutes. Is there a motion, Mr. Mejedevi? - So be moved. I'll second that, any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye and raise your hand, aye.

[00:01:11] That motion will carry to zero with Ms. Corvo asking for the vote. And now we'll move to approve of consent agenda, is there a motion? - Yes, Chair, I move that this committee approved the

consent agenda posted in the board docs. - I'll second that, any discussion?

[00:01:27] No. All those in favor of the motion, please say aye and raise your hand, aye. All right, so we'll move it on to item five, which is our action items. Start with business, financial services, math, intervention, resources. Let's get through our packet and find that.

[00:01:52] You're digging. I'll move that the Finance Operations Committee recommends that Loudoun County School Board award RFP R232651, LCPS Mathematics Intervention Resources to Heinemann and Curriculum Associates from the date of award through June 30th, 2024.

[00:02:18] Is that a second? Not yet. - Let's have a discussion. - Okay, so we're going to discuss it. Okay, Mr. Mejadovy. - Thank you, Chair. So I think we discussed this last time about the contract and especially the Bridges program that the staff and the program office has been evaluating, and that's what they were looking to procure.

[00:02:48] And again, in terms of whether the company, the Bridges company, did they respond to the not, you know, again, that's something we discussed last time. From what I gather, I guess, meeting with the staff, that that's the program that they're hoping and expecting to get, to implement that to elementary.

[00:03:12] The current program, that's the two awardees in this case. I don't know the split of the dollar value between the two different contractors. This is a nice to have, but this is not what they're looking to get. So again, the other part of it is that typically we'll do a sole source contract up to \$250,000? No? What's the value of a sole source contract? The value of a sole source contract varies. In this particular instance, if you look, when you look at the action item,

[00:03:51] we've decreased the value of this contract down to \$360,000 with the intent of purchasing additional materials for the program that is now existing, but not as a sole source actually looking to use a cooperative or another jurisdictions contract available to us to make that purchase.

[00:04:09] Correct. And that's what I gathered, too. I think there was adjustments to be made. So what is the value between the two different contractors that we're going to spend \$360,000? Yes, it's \$360,000 total between the two as we continue to negotiate the agreements.

[00:04:31] So we don't have... That's the maximum. And so let me ask you this, Ms. Philoby. I don't know if this is under your jurisdiction or not. But it's, and again, Mr. Morris, you can chime in too.

[00:04:47] Because I've been doing this, and I've said this about contracting process like so many times. I've been doing federal contracting and contracting for last, I don't know, 18 plus years now, I think, or maybe more. And typically, the program office, and I think there's been a struggle.

[00:05:08] If the program office wants to go with some particular procurement vendor and they have invested some time and energy into it, that's a typical, in the contracting officers, typically will work with the program office to make that happen. Normally, there are cases where contracting officers become Peter Principled and then it becomes, it doesn't result into the right, into a favorable result where the program office was trying to intend to have that.

[00:05:41] Now you, now that it becomes where, and I'll give you a very example, like I went through a contracting process where the program office wanted my company to get to it. Everything was lined up, but then the contracting officer awarded the contract to somebody else.

[00:05:59] Now, as a business, that's part of business. I mean, again, I can live with it. But it's been a year, and the program office is struggling. So they're looking to get my company back into the government through different vehicles. They're trying to borrow money from other places to do that.

[00:06:16] And that's where I'm coming from, where I've been on both sides to understand the problem. I know you have to do things by the book also, but I think at the same time, it's really bothering me that that was all along the plan thing.

[00:06:35] Now we're going to just go and procure something that it's nice enough to have, but that was not the intent of what they were looking to get. So I just want to share that, Ms. Willoughby, that this is somewhere. I'm still not able to put my thumb to this, but it seems like we're going to spend \$360,000 to some vendors that we may get some value out of it, but that was not the intent of what the program office was trying to get to it.

[00:07:02] So I appreciate you sharing your history with federal procurement, correct? So as you know, we have to follow the Virginia Public Procurement Act, and what you've also described is a scenario that we also caution against a lot with our departments, is to not have predisposed ideas of who your successful vendor is, even in terms of having conversations with vendors.

[00:07:32] because sometimes you can get very focused on what is presented to you and at the end of the day, once you go through an RFP process, they may not be the successful vendor. Not to say that that may not be the right fit, but sometimes multiple vendors can still produce what you're looking for.

[00:07:52] It may just take a different vision in terms of how things are implemented. I am going to try to speak on behalf of Ms. Richardson since she's not here. I'm sure that she would probably say that while they have an existing program with the bridges, and it's a small nominal dollar amount that didn't require additional procurement methods, that when the school board was generous to afford \$400,000 out of year-end funds for a math intervention program,

[00:08:28] And they did the RFP and they received the, you know, it was what, one or two bids that they received and that it does meet their needs. I recall from the last meeting, Ms. Richardson describing some differences in terms of what the current vendor provides and how this new vendor would provide additional math intervention services.

[00:08:54] And my understanding is that conversations that she had with you as you referenced was in terms of trying to balance the needs of what they're wanting to use the program for with these different vendors was to reduce down the value of this contract to \$360,000.

[00:09:12] Originally, we had \$400,000 listed as the maximum amount of the award because that mirrored what the school board had allotted. By reducing this down to 360, that earmarked 40, that still meets the intent of the school board because it is still for a math intervention program, and then the 360 is the balance.

[00:09:33] So my understanding with a brief conversation with Ms. Richardson was this was hopefully a solution to balance out utilizing the existing vendor and the services it provides, as well as awarding to these new vendors, recognizing that they provided a different level of service And I don't know if Ms. Filio has anything to add to that.

[00:09:58] The very similar background, very similar experiences with federal contracting, but federal contracting, we're, as from the government's side, you're viewing it from the contractor's side, but from the government's side, we're required to provide requirements and not tell the bidders how to solve the problem, but we're telling them what the problem is and what the requirement is.

[00:10:22] They can come about it in any manner that they see fit, and it's up to the proposal analysis group for Loudoun County to take a look at the inputs to determine whether they meet the requirements and whether the cost-benefit is there. So I would ask the question, who sits on the proposal analysis group team?

[00:10:39] This particular proposal analysis group was made up of Ms. Richardson, Ms. Osbury, who was here, as well as other special ed staff that would be utilizing the program and then overseen by the procurement office. So we have, it's not just the contracting officer, it's also the actual department that's interested in the procurement, sitting in on the decision and ranking the proposals for those that they see the most value.

[00:11:10] Mr. Mejedevi. Thank you. So I've been on both sides. I've been on helping the acquisition sites to have good contracts with the federal government, supporting the federal government in acquiring bigger contracts. So I've been on both sides, so I will not be just saying I'm on the contractor side.

[00:11:28] However, having said, the government does put solicitation out when they need to procure a specific software, specific program, they make it very explicit. They don't just go and say, well, we just want a something. So again, there's FARs, there's federal acquisition rules, so again, Virginia has its own, but there's also the intent.

[00:11:48] See, I think it has to be the intent behind what the acquisition strategy needs. to be. It's not just completely open and open-ended and you're not getting, the government is not getting the desired product what they're intended to get just because of, again, they put in, as you know, there's different evaluation factors in terms of best value, not just best price. So there are opportunities for government and the program office to select the vendor that meets the best needs of it. Again, that's, we're going out of the context of this one. But again, I know I talked

[00:12:23] to Ms. Richardson too, and this is kind of where, again, I'm reading the tea leaves here. Again, I'm sure this is not something Ms. Richardson has said to me, but I read, I mean, they're trying to make this thing work. I mean, this is not the intent of what that was. And again, I feel like we did obligate the \$400,000 so that it could be used by a program that was being experimented versus, you know, just because it's, you know, objective process. So again, I'll end this here, as well as be, but I do feel like this is the second or third time we've been in the same spot, and I'd like to figure this thing out. I don't want to go

[00:13:02] through this again where, and I understand that sometimes you have to be objective to the requirements, but I think if the program office has invested time and energy into a specific program, it doesn't make any sense to go and procure something that they already have not been evaluated.

[00:13:20] That's what I'll say. One of the challenges I think that we're faced with is this year-end funding, And it's required to be obligated by June 30th, correct, based on our Virginia Public Procurement Law? That is correct. And I will also just throw in real quickly that the panel did have the option that if they felt that these vendors did not meet the requirements, they could have declined all offers.

[00:13:45] So that just for... Okay. So I'll go ahead and make the motion. Oh, go ahead. I'm sorry, Mr. Mahoney. Thank you, sir. No, I feel like the same thing we feel like this right now, where you have to do it. So everybody is in this sort of gun state where you have to do it versus, like, and I think even the chair, I mean, I think we're sitting up here and we want to make a motion because we want to spend that year and money to do it.

[00:14:13] I feel conflicted. I mean, I'm always looking how that we can use a year in fund to pay for forward. I mean, we've talked about this, Ms. Willoughby. I've always supported that. But this feels like we're just trying to spend the money. And that's where I'm having a little bit of a rub in this whole process.

[00:14:31] Anyway. Okay, so I'll go ahead and move that the Finance Operations Committee recommends that the Loudoun County School Board award RFP R232651 LCPS Mathematics Intervention Resources to Heinemann and Curriculum Associates from the date of award through June 30th, 2024.

[00:14:50] I'll second it and I'll have some comments. Okay. Mr. Mattamy. Thank you. I'll support it to send it to the full board. I don't want to be the person holding it back because we only have two people quorum. I'm sure there will be other process you could send it forward to, but I'll just support it sending it forward right now and let the board make a decision.

[00:15:09] I'll be speaking to this again at the full board as well. I too will be supporting it. And what I'd like to have is could we have the department speak to the program that's being procured and speak to the difference between this program and the Bridges program or other compatible programs that were not selected.

[00:15:28] I think that'll be important for the board to make the final decision. Further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye and raise your hand. Aye. That motion will carry 2-0. Ms. Corbo absent for the vote. Thank you. On to item 5.02, which is business financial services RFP R25259, agency nursing and special education student services.

[00:15:51] Is there a motion? Mr. Bennett. I move to the finance and operations committee recommend that the Loudoun County School Board award RFP R23257 Agency Nursing and Special Education Student Services effective July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024 to the vendors identified in the awarded vendor list 2023-2024.

[00:16:12] I'm second. Further discussion? I'm just trying to remind, if you don't mind, we brought this in action item and not as a... We didn't do it as a consent agenda. I'm just trying to recall if, what was the reason, Ms. Chair, why we brought the same back?

[00:16:34] There was a question about the historical spending as it related to the budget, and my understanding is that information, I know, was shared with Ms. Richardson, and I'm under the impression that that was shared with yourselves as well, but I can't confirm that. If not, I can make sure that that gets forwarded to you. Yeah, thank you. I think I did not have a conversation. I mean, I think maybe in the ballpark I did, like the need for, that we need the services and we need these vendors to support in many areas.

[00:17:11] Forgive me if my memory is kind of going weak on this particular item, but I'll support this for tonight. Okay. And I think that part of the discussion was the distribution of the funding and how we would distribute it across the varying vendors.

[00:17:27] That may have been the question that we were posing. - And then tonight, so they presented the awarded vendors and the different services offered in our notes. Further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye and raise your hand.

[00:17:43] - Aye. - That motion will carry 2-0 with Ms. Corbo. Addison for the vote. Onto item 5.03, which is a pharmacy benefit manager. I'll make the motion. I move that the Finance Operations Committee recommends the Loudoun County School Board Award RFP R23258, pharmacy benefit manager to express scripts incorporated from January 1st, 2024, through December 31st, 2024.

[00:18:05] - Seconded that. - Okay, seconded by Mr. Medovee. Okay, so I guess this is the first of several that are being brought directly to action, correct? I think there are either four or five action items tonight that came directly. So that's concerning.

[00:18:24] Obviously, our process is that this is supposed to come to us as an information item so that we can get feedback provide and receive that feedback from the community before we go into an action item and provides us time to do that without that now we kind of have to fall back on the fact that the full board will have the opportunity is the intention to put this on information for the board

[00:18:50] or is the intention to take this to action we can bring it originally the plan was to have it as consent at the next school board meeting what's driving this is open enrollment that occurs and the rollback of preparing for open enrollment. There's materials and stuff that has to be prepared. I believe, though, that we could have this go as info and then action in August, just to

[00:19:28] allow that additional feedback time and, correct, so it would be info at the next school board meeting and then action in August. Okay. I prefer that because I don't think it's appropriate to go straight from action to consent without any opportunity for anyone to provide feedback.

[00:19:48] I mean, we can always reject it off the consent agenda, but I think that it makes more sense. So with that, I will support pushing it out of committee to the full board for discussion because I understand how important it is to have the materials available so that at the beginning of the year, we can outline the services that we're providing to our employees.

[00:20:09] I did have one concern here. You mentioned that there will be some member formulary disruption in moving to Express Scripts. Can you explain that and tell us what medications we anticipate that occurring with? Thank you.

[00:20:24] So the member disruption will be on the negative side. There will be 360 members, 1,272 prescriptions that will move to a higher tier. And this is for the retiree pharmacy only.

[00:20:43] The positive side is there's 1,271 prescriptions that will go to a lower tier. So for, I don't think I brought the exact drugs with me.

[00:20:59] Yes, we did. On page 12 of the presentation, I'm sorry, you don't have this. I will prepare this for the board meeting, but there are two, three prescriptions that have a significant number, 80, 57, and 44 prescriptions that would be affected.

[00:21:19] And then there's some for, there's another five or six after that. And if I can maybe, I think maybe what you might, what might be helpful is in terms of the scope. So again, just reiterating what Ms. Evans was saying that there's a little over 300 people that will experience an increase in their prescription based on the different tiers and the different types of prescription.

[00:21:44] Looking at the information that I have that we've received from, I believe the, our consultant, the max increase would be a \$90 change. Some could be as little as \$10, but the maximum change that I'm seeing on this chart is a \$90 change. Is that \$90 change for a 30-day or \$90 for the annual? It ranges from, the 90 is actually for a 60 to 90-day supply. So a two to

[00:22:15] three-month prescription has the highest increase of \$90. So if we were to say 90 and it's two, so 90 times six is \$540 a year. I did that right quickly. And then there were a little over 400 who would experience a price decrease. But of course, this is why we actually pulled this additional information, recognizing the sensitivity, because no one wants to experience

[00:22:47] and increase, um, that this is what we're faced with. As we're looking at other providers, there were, there were two respondents here. If we were to look at the other respondent, can you tell us what that looked like, uh, from the proposal for the second respondent, as far as what was the number of, uh, of drugs that were declassified and what number were increased and, uh, the impacts?

[00:23:14] Do we have that information? Yes. So if we were to, so the two providers were ESI and Cigna. Cigna currently holds the contract, so there would not be a disruption if we stayed with Cigna. We would have a higher cost and potentially less in rebates.

[00:23:38] And to add to that, specifically, they did have a significantly lower number of members that would be negatively impacted. However, I believe that in terms of the review of this proposal was, you know, there's multi-facets to it.

[00:23:54] So while another vendor may have been more favorable in this one area, the rest of the proposal was overwhelming towards the successful vendor. Okay. Mr. Mahedevi. Thank you, Chair. I think that's a good question.

[00:24:12] So I think, I mean, obviously you look at the savings, it says three-year cost savings, approximately \$7.5 million. when compared to \$38 million, I mean, that's a pretty significant savings. So I guess in that context, the other company that Mr. Morse asked, I mean, what was the saving or increase in that?

[00:24:35] Like, just to kind of have some comparative number to say, well, if you were to go with the vendor, they could have been a saving or they may not have been saving. So what would that have been? One of the things I just want to make you aware of, we have not yet awarded this contract, So we need to be very cautious in what we discussed during these sessions because we still need to do some more additional negotiating with these vendors.

[00:25:06] So how can you, I mean, again, that's fine, but for us to make a decision, how can we just make a decision based on this data? I mean, do we need to go into a closed meeting to get that information from you? We have additional information we can present to you in executive only.

[00:25:27] This analysis that was done by the consultant, as well as some other information that we can put together for you for the executive portion of the packet. I think that would be helpful, yeah. So we'll anticipate that being placed into the board's executive information.

[00:25:45] Question concerning pricing discounts and rebate guarantees. Those go specifically to the employees, not to LCPS, is that correct? Or do we share that? It actually comes directly to LCPS because we are paying for those drugs directly, right?

[00:26:06] So the employees realize those discounts because we're selling them or charging the employees less because we're receiving the discount, correct? Okay. Further discussion? Seeing none, I'll place the motion to vote.

[00:26:22] All those in favor of the motion, please say aye and raise your hand. Aye. That motion will carry 2-0 with Ms. Corbo absent for the vote. Next one is the Vision Benefit Administration. RFP R23262, I move that the Finance Operations Committee recommends the Loudoun County School Board award RFP R23262 to VSP from January 1st, 2024, through December 31st, 2024.

[00:26:47] Okay, the motion has been seconded. Further discussion? So is this a current vendor that we're just making the award to, or this is something we also competed to?

[00:27:04] So it would not be our current vendor. It would not be. And were there any cost savings or anything? I mean, just like how you shared with the other ones? There were cost savings. There were two vendors that were very close, and one of the reasons that we are making the recommendation and want to go with the one vendor is they had more providers

[00:27:38] in some of our outlying areas than the other vendor. They also had a higher implementation funds that they would give us as part of our communications and part of the implementation process.

[00:27:59] Their service fees were significantly less. Their annual fee was significantly less. For the cost of the program itself, they were pretty much the same. So it was on those items. Thank you.

[00:28:15] I would just like to add that we would like to go ahead and do with this item what we did with the pharmacy, bring it forward to the school board as information followed by action in August, and provide you the financial analysis and additional information we received from the consultant as part of the executive package. Thank you. I think that that will be helpful as well. So thank you, Chair. So I think I'm just reading the line here under the background. The second paragraph says, VSP offered the best value, not the lowest price. So I just want to bring that

[00:28:49] back i think so you do award based on value versus the price as well yes please keep in mind with an rfp price is not the primary determining factor there's another other another there's various other factors that go into account when awarding from an rfp price is just a smaller part of a much larger package additional discussion seeing none all those in favor of the motion please say i raise your hand aye that motion will carry to zero with ms corvo absent for the vote on to item 5.05 business financial services FY23 year-end budget transfer requests. Mr. Mahedovey.

[00:29:29] I move to the Finance and Operations Committee recommend the Loudoun County School Board approve the budget transfer request and the total amount of \$1,129,618 for AP test fees, athletic events, athletic events, revenue sharing, and the division-wide administrative cost.

[00:29:47] Second. Further discussion? Can you speak to Ms. Willoughby? Sure. So per policy, 4120, anytime we have a budget transfer that is in excess of \$100,000 that occurs between departments or budget transfer that's in excess of \$250,000 within a department, it requires school board approval.

[00:30:13] And so now that we are at the end of the fiscal year, these are what we would call our technical housekeeping items to be in compliance with that policy. I'll always say that, you know, budget is an estimate. Sometimes we go over, sometimes we'll go under.

[00:30:30] And so we need additional funds because the AP test fees, what we had budgeted in terms of the participation of the AP test fees, we had a much greater participation. So we need additional funds to cover those expenses. Similarly, with the athletic events, I believe we had budgeted \$1.5 million.

[00:30:49] I think we're in excess of the two. And then there were some additional costs for \$200,000. We've identified our instructional allotments to the tune of \$939,000. Unfortunately, every year we typically have a surplus in our allotments.

[00:31:06] And so we are going to transfer the surplus from there as well as \$200,000 in support services of savings from printing and binding and some other contractual services. So there's no bottom line change. you know what we're transferring from equals what we're transferring to just to make sure we have the appropriate amount of budget so so then the line says that the we budgeted for 18 000 tests 18 120 tests whereas the the registration was almost 21 900 tests is that a good number so that

[00:31:42] again again the policy again or at least the making the tests available more students took opportunity to take the AP test. I mean, that's fair? That is exactly what happened. Well, I can assume that is exactly what happened. Well, thank you. That's good to know that at least the intention was that, that more students will take the opportunity, take advantage of this opportunity. I think that's great news. Obviously, coming off of a COVID year, we don't know exactly whether it's going to continue, but my question is concerning the FY, or the operating budget for

[00:32:17] FY24 or SY24. Where do we stand and what did we budget for next year? Is this going to be, I mean, clearly if we expected it here, we probably flatlined it. I would venture to guess it was either flatlined or maybe a modest increase. This would probably be another area, everything that's listed on here is probably already on our list of concerns for FY24.

[00:32:49] we do have an ongoing list that's a little unprecedented that we haven't even started the new year and we already have a list of concerns. So these items would go on that list and you will be hearing more from me as we enter FY24 regarding the challenges that we'll likely be facing.

[00:33:09] Swell. Mr. Mahedavy. To Ms. Villaby, one question. So the request of fund, since we didn't plan for it, is this coming from the year-end fund or where is this dollars coming from? The operating funds, operating budget funds, but something that we didn't plan or was in something we had, because it was not planned, right?

[00:33:32] I mean, obviously. No, so again, as I mentioned, that's why I always kind of mentioned the budget being an estimate. And so sometimes we have an overrun. So we have more expenses related to AP test fees and then sometimes we have underruns. And so there's \$200,000 of savings from printing and binding and other contractual services.

[00:33:53] So the budget for that area and support services was \$200,000 more, but as they look at their actual spending and projecting through the end of the fiscal year, they identified \$200,000 of savings. So that's why we're able to just move that budget authority from that area into these other areas that need it as an example.

[00:34:15] Okay. Further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye and raise your hand. Aye. That motion will carry 2-0. Ms. Corbett absent for the vote. On to item 5.06, which is business financial services FY23 year-end supplemental increase for self-insurance funds.

[00:34:37] Mr. Madhavi. I move to the Finance and Operations Committee recommend that the Loudoun County School Board approve a budget supplemental increase of \$100,000 for the workers' compensation self-insurance fund, \$20,000 for the short-term disability fund, and \$600,000 for the Virginia local disability program self-insurance to be funded from the school operating fund.

[00:34:59] Further that, the Finance and Operations Committee recommend that the Slaughter County School Board approve a supplemental increase of \$6.5 million to the health insurance funds to be funded from existing fund balance. I'll second that. So, looking at the \$6.5 million from the self-insurance fund, what was the, can you remind us what the excess was, the balance that was in that account at the end of the year?

[00:35:25] I think we were pretty healthy at that point. So, while the team looks that up, I know it was double digits, I just can't remember how big of a double digit.

[00:35:41] I will also share, this is another example of concerns as we go into FY24. This differs from the prior action request where that was all within the school operating fund and we're transferring between accounts. This is actually to increase the budget for these areas because we continue to see substantial increases.

[00:36:05] We had already, back in March, I believe, brought to the school board a supplemental increase for these areas. And unfortunately, during this last quarter, we saw a steeper increase in claims expense.

[00:36:23] So this is also giving us a little bit of a buffer. This is just budget authority. So while we are asking to increase the budget by the Health Self-Insurance Fund by \$6.5 million, that doesn't mean that we will absolutely spend 6.5. So we have a little bit of a buffer in there just in case.

[00:36:44] And the beginning fund balance for the beginning of this year looks like it was approximately \$39 million. \$39 million. And what is the state requirement for its six-month duration? Can someone remind me what is the minimum?

[00:37:01] Fund balance. Fund balance that we're required to keep in the self-insured health. Per LCPS policy, we target 20% of claims expenditures as the target fund balance. The county, however, has a difference of opinion, and in their appropriations resolution, they always target 10%.

[00:37:24] And where will this leave us for our fund balance at the end of the year if we were to use all the 6.5? 14.8%. The two-month reserve would be 17%. So, this actually brings us slightly below our target, which, again, thinking about the budget for, as we, this fall, think about the budget for FY25, you know, we have included in the last couple budgets a series of premium increases.

[00:37:57] I think it's safe to say we will continue to experience that, and if not, a continued increase to the premium rates themselves. So, the premium rates are associated with a calendar year, correct? So those adjustments would take place in January. Have we already set those rates for next January?

[00:38:16] Yes. So when the school board adopted the budget that begins July 1 for FY24, that included the rate increases that will be effective for January 1. Okay. And that was a 4% increase.

[00:38:35] Okay. Very good. Thank you. Further discussions? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye and raise your hand. Aye. That motion will carry 2-0. Ms. Corvo, absent for the vote. All right, item 5.07, Revision of Policy 6220, Student Safety and Discipline on Buses.

[00:38:56] And was there feedback we wanted before we were moving forward with this? Do we have a trainer? Yes, sir. So this one got tabled mainly because we weren't able to find the package.

[00:39:22] Okay, so break out my red line copy. So if it was tabled, wouldn't this have been put on the information items?

[00:39:39] Yeah, I'm sorry. Not tabled. It was just basically deferred to this meeting. Deferred to action for this meeting. Deferred to action. Okay, thank you. Okay. All right. So we do have all the comments in here from the Equity Committee, the LEAF, and several LCPS comments.

[00:39:56] Are there specific items that you wanted to highlight that were changed based on the comments to the committee? The primary change in the comment was the one request to move, I'm looking for it, where we referenced the student rights and responsibilities.

[00:40:32] That was moved to section B3, where it was originally, I believe, up in section A2. And that was the primary item that changed.

[00:40:48] There was clarification. Several of the comments regarded questioning what timely meant and a timely response and asking for that to be better defined. But staff went back and had looked. And in other policies, we have used the word timely in there to reflect basically an appropriate time of action, but that action should be taken.

[00:41:16] And the timely word is in Section B-4, and it's basically the very last sentence of the policy. But there were, so a number of the comments address wanting to more define that, but staff felt that leaving it just as the word timely at the end actually did address those concerns.

[00:41:42] Okay, so I see appropriate action, appropriate disciplinary action, but not timely. Yes, sir. It's the last, if you go to section, sorry, it's section C. Oh, in section C. I'm sorry. Okay, I see it there.

[00:42:05] So that's consistent with other policies? It was specifically referenced in policy 3070 was the one they used as an example where timely was used in that policy and was more recently deemed appropriate, per se, as far as defining the action timeline.

[00:42:30] Okay, I'm okay with the updates. again, I think they're making it a little more clear where the actions have to take and the timeliness associated with those and the principal's actions and requirements in here.

[00:42:49] Mr. Mejedevi. So thank you for sharing. I think that was the feedback. I think multiple people talked about the timely nature of the thing. So what would be timely, I guess? The transportation staff envisions timely basically it being two school days, two school work days, is what their internal timeline is.

[00:43:16] And so if we were asked to actually put something in the policy, that would be the recommendation, would be two school business days. But their feeling is that timely is two business days. Are there circumstances in which timely doesn't mean two business days, that that would be unreasonable?

[00:43:38] Because if there's not a situation in which that's unreasonable, I would default back to the two business days. Can you think of a situation in which two business days is not reasonable? There could be times where it was a more urgent requirement where something, I mean, an emergency, where a notification is immediate.

[00:43:59] And so in those situations, the transportation between the bus driver, the dispatch, the principal, I mean, when it's an emergency situation, communications happen right then. We're not waiting two days. The two days is really more referring to the timeline where there was an incident on the bus that the bus driver didn't feel was an emergency but needed to get reported.

[00:44:25] They would be reporting it to their lead, and the two business days is getting it in the system, getting the written notification through into the system so it's starting the routing process. Yeah, that's interesting. I had not considered the timeliness to be more urgent than time, you know, given the two days, But using the word timely also means that it could be more urgent, and therefore timely would not be two days in that circumstance.

[00:44:54] So that definition doesn't work. Mr. Madhavi. Thank you. So what would be beyond two days, I guess? I mean, so the part of the, I mean, again, this definition where, so let me kind of go back, if you don't mind. It's, the section is management of student injuries and accidents.

[00:45:13] So LCPS will follow an effective process for handling and investigating accidents so that all injured students and staff are cared for promptly. And then it says further injuries prevented and correct and timely information is disseminated to all necessary parties.

[00:45:34] So is this about the accident and the student injuries? That is the information that the section is here about sharing information. So the last section, I mean, it is referring to accident, student injuries, but it really is any type of a concern with student safety discipline on the bus and in the school.

[00:45:58] And so I'll go back up in just a second with Mr. Morris with your comment, too. Timely, can't appropriate to reach out to the school principal and others immediately. The intent there is to make sure that, and oftentimes, if there's an accident on the bus, if a student's injured on the bus, notifications happen immediately for emergency response as needed.

[00:46:26] This would be the timely side when I was talking about the two business days. It's the follow-up. It's getting the report filed. It's getting the information that needs to be documented into the system. It's hard to envision a timeline where it would need to be, it would never, I can't envision a timeline where it would need to be over two days.

[00:46:47] The two days is the routine stuff, would be timely. Urgent issues, emergency issues would be much quicker. That's why I'd be afraid to put in two days, because there are situations in which immediate notification is appropriate. Mr. Manavie. Thank you, Chair. I mean, you could have it, you know, maximum to two days.

[00:47:03] I mean, timely means, but you could actually put some time frame that it, there is some clarity around that. So, I mean, it could be right away. And I think the staff and the principals send emails right away to the parents saying, hey, there's been a bus accident or injuries could have happened, et cetera.

[00:47:21] So, I think every parent appreciates that. And so, I think that's already been happening, the case today. But then you kind of expanded. I'm kind of going back to saying even discipline. So, I think this is sort of kind of confusing a little bit because we're talking about accidents and injuries, and not necessarily discipline, because now, because the discipline data is on section B4, the driver shall report any student misconduct on school buses to the principal, so that's already been addressed, so this is specifically for accidents and injuries.

[00:47:58] Can we cap it up to two business days versus being timely? I mean, obviously, I think as Mr. Morse mentioned, I think that if there's something urgent, I think we're already doing it already. It's already being done.

[00:48:15] And the other sort of question is, are there any Virginia code that we're going to follow in terms of how and when we share the information, how soon the investigation report has to be sent out, et cetera? So the Virginia code that is referenced, and I apologize, I'm not the expert on the transportation code, but the Virginia codes are referenced at the bottom of it, And my understanding is that this policy does reflect what's in code.

[00:48:50] But we would be, I mean, not but, and the staff would be very happy to go back and add into the student safety and discipline section to add a comment about adding a timeline. So that it's, instead of timely, a maximum of two business days to communicate that to the school.

[00:49:11] And we can do the same thing in item C. Yeah. Yeah, I think this paragraph, I don't know if I'm in my, the way I'm reading it, I think it can be simplified a little bit for the staff and for us and everybody reading it as well. The Section C paragraph as well.

[00:49:28] I mean, that's, because I think it's got a lot of things going on in these three lines here. So that's one. But the last question is, this line 16, 17, and 23, 24, can you remind us again why we removed those lines again? Bus rider safety rules should be included.

[00:49:48] Yes, sir. So, line 16 and 17 was the reference to the student rights and responsibilities, and one of the comments that we received from the parents had suggested that that would be better placed in another section of the document, and it's...

[00:50:05] Line 52. Line, yep. And so, it was moved there. We agreed with that comment and relocated it. Have we made the motion on this yet?

[00:50:23] I don't think we made the motion. No, we have not made it. So what do you think about the Section C, Mr. Morse, about, and if you read it, I mean, it just, it's a lot of things going on versus simplifying, you know, again, accidents reporting, injuries reporting.

[00:50:44] I think it's a very complex sentence, and so that's. I think it's, they're holding it to a high level because, you know, you capture this within the student discipline. There's obviously content that's associated with the student rights and responsibilities.

[00:51:04] I think that we may muddle it up if we try to put a two-day, because then people are going to say, well, what if someone got injured? Two days is insufficient, and we know that. But if we were to put a no longer than two business days, then people would interpret that as saying that that's an acceptable duration for other incidents that we don't want to take two days.

[00:51:30] So if there is an injury, timely does not mean two days. Timely means right now. So I would be a fan of not adding the two-day stipulation into Section C and just leaving that language as it is. I agree, I mean, in terms of reading that, I think it's just, I mean, to keep it that way.

[00:51:53] The last sort of thing around this is the bus incidents. Is there a report that is shared with the school board yearly or a quarterly basis, all the bus incident reports? Because it says the principal is notified, but does the school board get any information on how many incidents happened in the bus and so on and so forth?

[00:52:16] I'll have to get back to you on that one, sir, I don't know the answer. so chair again this is something we've been trying to add just to getting an update on if there's incident reports collectively I'm not asking you know exactly but how many incidents are happening across buses and so on and so forth I think it will be really helpful for the board member to help that and track that I like that I think that some kind of like a semi-annual or an annual report would be appropriate do you want to amend this and put that language in section D

[00:52:50] Yes, it would be Section D as in Delta. Would that be okay to add a Section D about providing a report to the school board? Yes, sir. What timeline are you looking for?

[00:53:08] Semi-annual. Yes, sir. Excellent. So I'll go ahead and make the motion. Move that the Finance Operations Committee recommend the Loudoun County School Board approve the staff and SBAC recommended revisions to Policy 6220, Student Safety and Discipline on Buses, as amended at the committee.

[00:53:28] Second, further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, please say aye and raise your hand. Aye. That motion will carry 2-0 as well. Thank you. On to our information item, which is the naming of the basketball court.

[00:53:50] Joe Tarango, is that pronounced properly? Yes, sir, and Mr. Stocks will be taking this item tonight. Okay, Mr. Stocks, please. Thank you. Mr. Brian Blueball, principal at Algonquian Elementary School, has submitted a request and it's supported by school board member Atuza Rezer to name the Algonquian Elementary School gymnasium basketball court after a longtime teacher and coach, Mr. Joe Tarango.

[00:54:17] Principal Blueball was planning to be here tonight and he had a statement he was going to provide you guys and read and he sent it ahead and if I can read it, it pretty much covers what's in the board item and the general information, but if I'll read his statement for him. Joe Tarango served as the Potomac Falls High School Panthers head baseball coach from the time the school opened in 1997 until the conclusion of the 2022 season. During those 25 years, Coach Tarango guided Potomac Falls to eight district titles, two regional championships, four appearances in state playoffs, and more than 300 wins. Coach Tarango was selected as district or regional coach

[00:54:56] of the year eight times. He has taught PE for 27 years at Algonquian Elementary School and will start his 28th year at Algonquian Elementary School next year as a lead PE teacher. During that time, he has made a huge impact on the Algonquian community. He is an exemplary teacher who strives to ensure all students enjoy and have equal opportunities in PE. He has a broad and growing command of PE and the structures of discipline and creates learning experience that make PE meaningful for all students. He demonstrates and has an understanding of the intellectual,

[00:55:34] social, emotional, and physical development of all age groups to diversify the learning environment. He builds positive and professional relationships with parents and guardians through frequent and effective communication. He also has run the Algonquian Basketball League for 27 years at Algonquian Elementary School. This is a three-month after-school basketball program for fourth and fifth graders that is a pillar in our community. Skills and teamwork are the focus of the league where all are welcome to participate. This year I met with my fifth grade student leaders to discuss

[00:56:10] their legacy project for our school from the fifth grade class. They wanted to do something nice for Mr. Tarango. Ideas were thrown around and the group decided that it would be a great idea to name the court at Algonquin Elementary School after Mr. Tarango. So the fifth grade students have asked that I pursue this court naming on their behalf. Excellent. Is he retiring? He is not. He's a current teacher coming back again next year for his 28th year. Okay. Maybe in the near

[00:56:45] future, but not official. I'm not forcing him out. 27 years as a baseball coach and 25 years as the basketball coach. Mr. Mejelevy. Thank you. I think that was a question I was going to ask. I mean, so it looks like he's there. So do we have precedence in setting up name for current teachers like that?

[00:57:03] Not for naming areas or programs of the schools. There's a different criteria for naming a school building or a school facility. So this is different, and no, this still falls under the policy. It's within policy and regulation.

[00:57:20] No, I think because we never considered a current staff member because, I mean, again, that's because I think they never thought that there would be an occurrence where you would be naming a current facility for a current staff, so I don't know.

[00:57:38] I mean, as much as I'd like to support, I mean, Ms. Reeser also supporting to it, but I'm just kind of finding it interesting that we would name after, typically you'd name it after somebody's retired versus somebody who's a current, so yeah, I guess if Ms.

[00:57:56] Blueball was around, that would be my question to ask, is like, what's the impetus driving that? I mean, again, nothing taking away from the record of Mr. Tarango, but what's driving that? In conversations leading up to this, and we've only been doing this a few years with policy and regulation, set forth the procedures for naming areas of school buildings prior to formalizing that process.

[00:58:24] It was kind of done at a school level and less the resolution and school board action. And I did ask. I said, this is the first one that I've been involved with that has a current active... teacher still in the system that's not retired and he said this is really what the fifth graders wanted to do this is their legacy project so what the the the um the driving the driving desire is by the fifth grade class to do this if you ask why it was brought forward i mean this is coming as information items some more homework for propios to do before um i don't know how this i guess

[00:59:03] It says here to be brought up as an action item on August 1st. So your plan is to bring it as a, I mean, in the line summary it says here? Or it's for the finance and operations committee? Yeah, we'll be back here in August.

[00:59:20] Okay, sounds good. All right, thank you very much. Is there any new business? Seeing as there is no new business, we are adjourned. Thank you all very much.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com