



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Legislative & Policy Committee, Monday, September 11, 2023

Date Monday, September 11, 2023
Place Loudoun County Public Schools / School Board meeting (see BoardDocs / LCPS-TV)
Length 1h 14m (video)

- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): <https://player.vimeo.com/video/864085517?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 2026-10-21. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:01] Good afternoon. This is Atusa Reeser calling to order the Legislative and Policy Committee meeting for September 11, 2023. We will begin with public comment. Sign up to make in-person public comment prior to the start of the meeting.

[00:00:18] The public comment period for this committee lasts no longer than 10 minutes, and speakers are limited to comments during the time allowed by the committee chair and announced prior to the public comment period the meeting will be audio recorded and posted in board docs um today we have one speaker andrea weiskopf signed up for public comment we will allot three minutes three minutes that's time to tell a joke okay hi i am commenting on policy 3120

[00:00:54] the duties of the superintendent i was looking at section c4 line 47 and before the word school laws and enforcing i would like to recommend you insert the word just enforcing just school laws which would prevent unjust policies from being implemented and another section that could be added is that it is the superintendent's duty to protest unjust policies that demean students

[00:01:34] i would also as you're looking at this like you to think about policy 70 30 and as you made this the contract with the superintendent i still want to go back to the word occasionally in policy 7030 the fact that you already know this will be abused is a reason not to have it in there it puts the onus on the

employee to speak against someone evaluating them and it is only deemed acceptable because we live in a right to work state and you have been gaslighted into believing

[00:02:13] that is acceptable additionally if you supported collective bargaining it is hypocritical to keep the word occasionally in there. Even if you don't support collective bargaining, I hope you believe that work should be paid. I do have time for a joke. The past, present, and future walked into a bar.

[00:02:34] It was tense. Okay, thank you very much. You can find me online every day. Black Lives Matter. Thank you. So with that, we're going to move to item number three, approval of the June 26, 2023 draft minutes. Could I please have a motion? I move to approve the draft minutes from the June 26, 2023 meeting. Second. Okay, the motion's been made by Mr. Beatty and seconded by Mr.

[00:03:12] Sorotkin. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Passes unanimously with all committee members present. And we will move on to item number four, which is our information items. We'll begin with revision of policy 2010, legal status, authority, powers, and duties. And I I will ask Dr. Smith to please present on that.

[00:03:34] - All right, thank you, Ms. Reeser. So tonight we're bringing forth information on policy 2010 for revision. There's several items in this policy that we are recommending to update per Virginia code, specifically Virginia code section 22.1-79.

[00:03:52] Items here include updates for House Bill 1630 and Senate Bill 1479 on specialized support positions, Also, House Bill 2021 on back-to-school nights, House Bill 2025 on sending SNAP information and free and reduced meals applications home, and then House Bill 2161 and Senate Bill 1151 on changing the amount of notice required before public hearings.

[00:04:17] And so I'll talk through some of those changes. Throughout the policy, we're recommending changes. We're just capitalizing school divisions, so you'll see that in a number of places, beginning there on line 14 and really throughout the policy. On line 64, the recommendation is to be with Virginia Code and reduce the public comment from a minimum of 10 days to a minimum of 7 days.

[00:04:40] You'll see on line 87, we are adding specialized student support positions and school bus drivers. On line 93, we're defining specialized student support positions to include school social workers, school psychologists, school nurses, licensed behavior analysts, licensed assistant behavior analysts, and other licensed health and behavior positions, which may either be employed by the school board or provided through contracted services.

[00:05:08] On line 106, we have added to ensure that the information sheet on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits program developed and provided by the Department of Social Services, and that's in subsection D of Virginia Code 63.2-801, and that's sent home with each student enrolled in lcps elementary or secondary school at the beginning of each school year or in the case of a student that enrolls after the beginning of the school year as soon as practical after enrollment on line 115 we ensure that a fillable free and reduced priced meals application is sent

[00:05:46] home with each student enrolled in an lcps elementary or secondary school at the beginning each year there so we put that that there on i'm sorry i'm line 115. line 121 we have added pieces around to ensure that any lcps back to school night which parents enrolled are invited and any parent in attendance receive prominent notification of and access in paper or electronic form or both information about

eligibility and application for free and reduced meals for students and a fillable free or reduced price meals application that may be completed and

[00:06:21] submitted on site and those are the proposed revisions to policy 2010 thank you dr. Smith any questions or comments from committee members mr. Beatty thank you chair one about the formatting these there's a wa and a number after that is that a artifact of the editing or is that a footnote let me take give a specific line number like like 64 has one seven has one that's an artifact of

[00:06:53] editing okay all right um thank you and then one question going back to item m on 121 can we put something in there about sort of the notification of back to school nights themselves because um just as an effort to get that on more people's calendars at a sooner time such that when they come to a back to school night then they we can give them whatever information we want to give them especially about the free and reduced meals like because i think that hurt um question about constituents about trying to find those nights and so i think that would be helpful is just to to make sure that more people are aware of when those days are.

[00:07:29] Female Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Rady. Mr. -- Dr. Smith, did you need to reply to that, or -- Male Speaker: No, we're happy to draft some language for you on that. Female Speaker: Mr. Sorokin. Male Speaker: Thank you, Madam Chair. So, with regards to sections L and M, I -- like the rest of the changes, are those new requirements based on changes to code?

[00:07:52] Male Speaker: Yes, all the changes are based on changes to code. Male Speaker: Okay. two specifically i was thinking about that and i i i don't think those are things we currently do or at least to to not to an extent where i would consider it compliant with whatever the changes in law were but i don't think i've ever gotten a like a free or reduced uh meals application sent home with one of my students or uh i don't think that i've seen uh information about it prominently at back to school nights although in fairness I don't think I've gotten

[00:08:27] looking for it so can you can you tell me what the plan is for rolling this out and making sure that all of our back to school nights or other activities are compliant with this yes I know our school nutrition services and in a coordination with Department of Digital Innovation have been working on a form to have that ready to roll out so we can share with schools and we would post it on our website and continue to push it out with with schools and with families okay thank you and I myself wanted to also follow up on the topic of the free and reduced meals just wanted to see if there was an update on the we had

[00:09:05] discussed this potential of being able to have a student ID that had embedded in any information on it the fact that a student qualifies so for example if there are other benefits that come with it they don't have to be applied for or spoken about for example at a gate entrance their card could just be swiped and I know we were looking at working with the supervisors on students being able to use public transportation for free and supervisor Sainz actually did follow up with me on that to get an update so it seems like a good time to just let other committee members know that you and I've talked about the potential of presenting to either this committee or the appropriate committee

[00:09:45] of a school board some of these options so I can speak specifically to the the pass for athletic events that we're looking into, so we've been working with business and finance as well as our school athletics office in terms of how to make some of that happen. We have some options that we're looking into one honestly one of the issues that we're running into is around sharing of information and privacy

around who has that information. We want to make sure that if we're able to do that their passes and their cards look identical really to others and it would only be when they scan when they have that information and we're also having to work through the folks that are scanning that so our ticket takers are they able to have that information and know this

[00:10:24] is someone on free and reduced meals so it's some of the student privacy issues that we're working through right now so we're not there yet we know that's something we'd like to continue to work on and to make happen in terms of the athletic events and did you want me to speak to the bus passes as well or did you have a I don't know if that was part of your question I just had the impression that we might be able to use student IDs for all of these things and some if there's a barcode and it gets swiped in any of these various situations it would just allow person entrance so that's why I mentioned the the buses if you have an update you want to share sure so I'll say around the IDs themselves what we were looking at is we send electronic ticket like we do with

[00:11:03] our season passes around athletics that one of the issues around student student IDs is schools do them differently based on your picture vendor so it's usually whoever comes takes your school pictures will also print your ID cards if you want them and so there's a lot of schools that don't have them so we don't have a universal student ID card for that reason and others around how they're used whether the school level whether it's elementary middle and high and so forth so that's one piece and while we were looking at the what if we can send them a pass through it's a ticket spigot is who we use for all for athletic events so that's that one the piece around the and so in terms of the

[00:11:41] buses that was an item that came up a joint committee looking at the bus passes And our latest conversation with the county administrator was around, they were looking to see if they could make local routes free for everyone, so that would not, so then we would not need the specific student ID cards for our students.

[00:11:59] It would be, the local rates would be, the local fares would be free for everyone. Okay, I appreciate that. And in the interest of time, since this is not the committee to take up the fact that we have a different vendor for every picture, that was news to me, but we can table that for now.

[00:12:15] Are there any other questions or comments on this policy? So I think we need to send this out for community feedback, and then you can come back for action next time. Thank you.

[00:12:31] Okay, so we'll move on to item number 4.02, which is Revision of Policy 2160, Conflict of Interests and Disclosure of Economic Interests. And will you be taking that, or Mr. Allen? Okay. Thank you, Dr. Smith. I'm happy to take it initially if there's other questions. I know Mr. Allen's here to help answer.

[00:12:48] So policy 2160, Conflict of Interest and Disclosure of Economic Interest, is being recommended to update tonight to incorporate amendments of two sections of the Virginia Code, 2.2-3132 and 2.2-3103.1, and so specifically around the conflict of interest training that's required and around gifts from certain foreign dignitaries.

[00:13:14] So I'll walk you through that one. So we have a revision or suggested revision on line 69 that says foreign country of concern means any country designated by the Secretary of State to have repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2019 or the 73 Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

[00:13:41] Line 325 is revised to say so long as the foreign dignitary is not a representative of foreign country of concern on line 604 and line 606 we remove the word elected and those are the recommended changes for policy 2160 and these are all by code yes ma'am thank you dr. Smith are there any questions or comments from committee members mr. Sorokin thank you madam chair my only comment is that I would I would love for the state to change the statement of economic interest form so that it's less Byzantine but I think that's out of the scope of what we

[00:14:20] can accomplish in the committee well you could bring that up during the legislative program um okay so i guess we will also send this one out for community feedback and move on to item 4.03 revision of policy 3120 powers and duties of the division superintendent dr smith all right 3120 powers and duties of superintendent two um changes here to incorporate amendments of virginia code 22.1-79.3 and 22.1-279.8, really to focus on updates around specialized supports positions

[00:14:59] and critical shortage areas and division safety officials. So to walk you through this one, on line four, we replaced the word division with superintendent. You'll see on line 29, we replaced board with school board.

[00:15:16] On line 67, we've made some edits here to include specialized student support positions, We've also included a sentence that says specialized student support positions include school social workers, school psychologists, school nurses, licensed behavior analysts, licensed assistant behavior analysts, and other licensed health and behavior positions, which may either be employed by the school board or provided through contracted services.

[00:15:43] Line 81 says annually designating a school division employee as the school division safety official whose duty it is to receive reports pursuant to subsection A of the Virginia Code 19.2-83.1, 19.2-29.1, and 19.2-299.3, and including such designation in the collated packet of school safety audits submitted to the Virginia Center for School and Campus Safety.

[00:16:09] The designation includes an updated contact information for the school division safety official Including current mailing address current working daytime phone number a current functional email address and current functional fax number The superintendent should update this contact information within 48 hours of any change such information Those are all the recommended changes. Thank you. Dr. Smith. Are there any questions? Mr. Sorokin. Thank you, Madam Chair For the school division safety official who who do we have identified as that individual? I believe that would be Mr. John Clark, our Director of Safety and Security.

[00:16:44] Okay, thank you. And then the requirement to have a current functional fax number, is that required by code, or is that something we could remove? Mr. Allen, can you help us with that? I'm just double-checking, but I believe that's required by the code section 279.8.

[00:17:02] Give me a moment. I guess while... It is, that's correct. Fantastic. Fax machines live on for another day. Could also bring that up during the Slater program. Any other questions or concerns?

[00:17:20] Okay, I think we're ready to send that one out also to -- for community feedback and from our advisory committees. And just before we transition to our discussion of the legislative program, I just wanted to take a moment and officially welcome Ms. Casserly to our committee.

[00:17:40] Thank you for getting all of our documents ready. I understand you're taking over for Ms. Dawson, so just an official welcome even though we all already know you. also thank you Mr. Allen for

taking lead position on legal counsel for our committee today I'd like to just take a moment and reintroduce Charlie Jackson from Jackson West consulting who is our legislative consultant and his colleague who is joining us for the first time today miss Tanya James welcome to our committee and for board members who have not had a chance to meet them they will be here in person first when we're doing the program but you know you can

[00:18:18] always take a few moments and introduce yourself after the committee if you like. So with that, we will move to our discussion and adoption of the 2024 legislative program. Typically we start by just reevaluating what we had in our program in previous years, removing items that were either responded to and adopted by and implemented by the General Assembly's session or or budgets and then decide which of the remaining items are appropriate to keep and any new items that we want to add so should I turn it

[00:18:55] over to you dr. Smith or right over to mr. Jackson at this point I'm happy to lead us through and then mr. jacks can add in as we go through thank you all right so we'll start mr. did you want to go item by item for discussion or how did you want to proceed well so I think I think we could do that and we could decide at that juncture if an item was addressed in the last session and we're just ready to remove it or if staff and our consultants recommend keeping or

[00:19:29] revising it and then at the end of our review if there is unanimous consent on everything that's been discussed we could just vote on it as a block if we need to pull anything out to vote on separately we could do that and then vote on the remaining items as a block. Any objection? Yes, Mr. Soraka. Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a question. So are we, as the committee members, are we voting on individual items today or are we just discussing and bringing it back next time? No, we are planning on sending this to the board unless there

[00:20:06] are any items to be flushed out or further, if there's a need for something to come back. But we did intend to vote if either as a block or item by item just depending on whether any of the items need to be pulled out. Similar to what we did with the VSBA positions.

[00:20:23] - Okay, thank you. - Sure. Mr. Beatty, any questions? Okay, Dr. Smith. - Okay, so we will start, the first one. All right, so we'll start with school mental health supports.

[00:20:38] Both Jackson West and staff are recommending to keep this item and we would recommend, but we would recommend some revisions. I'd like to share those revisions if that's okay. - Yes, please. - Okay, so we are revising this item. The top part remains the same for the first several statements there and sentences.

[00:20:57] We did include that LCPS desires a legislative response, including funding and support structures. So that would be new there. That supports the following, accessibility of mental health resources, early intervention and prevention, and holistic and inclusive approaches.

[00:21:12] We've also wanted to be more clear about this. We've added an additional statement that says, specifically greater access to child and adolescent psychiatrist services, individual and group counseling, partial hospitalization programs, substance use intensive outpatient programs, therapeutic day treatment programs, and crisis response services are needed.

[00:21:32] This approach of community and school partnerships and mobile mental health services are viable options for increased accessibility for students and families. Thank you. Are there any questions or discussion on this item from committee members? Mr. Beatty.

[00:21:50] - Yes, what are the holistic and inclusive approaches? Is there a definition staff could provide for that? - I don't know that I have the exact definition with me. I think the intent with this is, let's see where we at, so that item there, that was included in last year's item, so that's not a recommended change for us.

[00:22:14] We include the holistic and inclusive approaches last year. The change is really the two sentences below that. I think the intent there was to make sure that we are um providing kind of those wraparound supports and services that are needed and so it gives us kind of a broad swath to be able to access resources and supports there uh for each and every one of our kids but the but that is not a recommended change that we have for for this year thank you i think we are ready to move on to the next item continuation of free school meals um

[00:22:53] staff and jackson west don't have any we don't have any recommendations to remove this we'd actually recommend that we keep this and we would um wanted to continue to include this as part of our federal priorities uh for the upcoming program and um correct me if i'm wrong mr jackson but i believe this can also be on the um can be lobbied for at the state level there are state level organizations such as um no kid hungry and others that are also working with the to lobby the state delegation for potential funding. Is that right? Ms. Reeser, that's right. And I'll turn to Ms. James,

[00:23:31] who's going to lead on that issue for us. Okay. Thank you. Yes, we can both lobby at the state level and the federal level as well on making sure that we can continue to provide mills and not be on the locality alone. But yes, we can. Thank you. And Ms. Reeser, I believe that delegate, but would be Senator, potential Senator Rome is planning to continue to push that in the state level.

[00:24:02] Okay, thank you very much. Committee members, any other questions or comments on that item? Mr. Beatty. Thank you. On line 57, it talks about waiving meal pattern requirements. What is that? Like, I know we've had issues with particular menus.

[00:24:30] Is that just another way to say what we serve in the menus, or? I'm not 100% sure, so I don't want to speak to that, but I'm happy to find out and follow up. Okay, thank you. Okay, moving on to the item regarding the proper reporting of student or school employee arrests.

[00:24:54] Yeah, so we are recommending that we revise this item just to take out the or employee. There was legislation last session that does require the reporting of employee arrests, but it did not go as far to notify around student arrests.

[00:25:16] And so we are recommending that we continue to keep this item for students, but remove employee based on the most recent legislative changes. Thank you, Dr. Smith. Committee members, any questions or comments?

[00:25:31] Mr. Sorokin. Thank you, Madam Chair. Only that the title on line 66 should have the same or school employee taken out. Point noted. We have that.

[00:25:47] Thanks. Anyone else? Okay. We will move on to the budget priorities, which begin with the support removal of -- supporting the removal of this support cap, which may be at least partially moot at this point, but I will let Dr. Smith speak to that. Yes, I'll share a little bit and then turn it over to Mr. Jackson for additional items.

[00:26:07] So we do recommend that we continue to keep this. We did have some that is currently proposed in the FY24 budget as it is now that's waiting for signature by the governor, but we do recommend that we continue to keep this because it didn't go far enough and so yeah. Mr. Jackson. No, Dr. Smith, that's right. Ms. Reeser, the state budget that was finally at the governor's desk now to be signed into law takes another step forward on the support cap does not get it all the way done. I'd say we're two-thirds of the way there. My math might be off a little bit, but the last two sessions we've taken

[00:26:46] steps forward and hopefully the next session we can take the final step. Thank you. That's very helpful. Are there any questions or comments from committee members? Mr. Beatty, then Mr. Sorokin. Thank you. Could you explain what the support cap is capping? I mean, you mentioned mental health specialists, instructional assistants. This is like a salary or a number of people we can hire. Specifically, what are we eliminating? I defer to your staff on how it impacts Long Island County Public Schools, but it sets a number of, it sets a cap on the number of positions that are funded with state funding, and I deferred

[00:27:21] So we are typically above the standards of quality in terms of the staffing that we provide, and so it does provide the additional state support for positions that we go above and beyond the standards of quality, and that's a number of different positions, so I don't know that I can identify them specifically, but we have continued to go above and beyond the SOQ.

[00:27:42] Thank you. Yeah, if you could provide those positions, I'd appreciate that. So as I'm understanding this, we've got our standards at Loudoun County. we fulfill those, but the state standards are going to be lower than that, or there might be. And so that gap is sort of what's been gapped.

[00:27:58] And if I understand correctly, that did not used to be the case, that there was state funding if a school division had needs that were different than the very minimum threshold. Yeah, that's right. And so for something as simple as counseling ratios, right?

[00:28:17] So in some cases, we give 250 students to one, where that's not the case. The ratio is higher at the state level. Same way with assistant principals. There's a number of positions where we have those positions, but our staffing standards are lower. And so that's where now with the additional, the removal of some of the support cap, we would get additional funding for positions we already have, not creating new positions.

[00:28:41] And Mr. Jackson, please correct me if I'm wrong, but it's my understanding what's put in this year's budget is it's not necessarily guaranteed to reoccur year after year. It could be one-time funding as it is now. we would not be recommending create new positions because we're not sure about how long that funding is going to last.

[00:29:00] That's right. The governor will introduce a new budget here in January or a little bit before, and that could wipe away or it could add funding, and the legislature could certainly make changes. So Dr. Smith is certainly right about that. And the cap has become known.

[00:29:16] I may be getting confused with COCA, but it was either during the recession during Governor McDonald or Governor Kaine when the cap was put in place. So this is really getting back to where we had been. I may be getting one of those confused for which governor did which, but the cap was put in place then.

[00:29:35] And I'll just add, I think it's important to note that what happens is that funding winds up coming from local appropriations. So local taxes wind up paying for it instead of the state funding. And we can touch on that a little bit more when we get to JLARC, which I think is coming up, but I think that Mr. Sorokin also had a question.

[00:29:58] Okay, so yes, and you'll bring back the information that Mr. Beatty asked for, or follow up. - Yeah, I'm happy to provide kind of what the SAQs are and where's some of the gaps there. - Thank you, I appreciate that.

[00:30:14] - Okay, so moving on to the next item, which is commitments to the teaching profession. Dr. Smith. - So this was an item that we enhanced last year. There's only one change here at the beginning. The LCPS was proud despite nationwide teaching shortages to open, and that actually should be 23-24 when we started working on this originally.

[00:30:35] It was last spring, but with its teaching ranks near at full capacity. If you'll recall, we were about 97-98% when we opened this past year, and so that's what we're referencing here. but we still want to continue to advocate that we have strong recruitment and retention efforts so we can make sure that we have a diverse and high-performing team of professionals.

[00:30:59] Thank you. Any questions or comments? Okay, we will move on to our section on state policy positions to begin with supporting the enactment of the JLARC recommendations to improve the state public funding model for education.

[00:31:21] Oh, I did. I skipped the cost of compete funding. sorry about that thank you there are no changes recommended on that one but we can discuss it if anyone has questions no no I did miss it thank you yes no questions okay now we can move on to the JLARC report yep so thank you all I'll start and again then turn it over to mr. Jackson for any additions so as you know we we had the JLARC report that came out last year and so we are adding this item to act on to recommend to act on several of those items from the JLARC

[00:31:56] So it says, per the General Assembly direction, the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission, JLARC, studied education funding in Virginia and reported its finding and recommendation in the Virginia's K-12 Funding Formula 2023 report. JLARC determined that the standards of quality, or SOQ, used to calculate the state's share of public education costs are inadequate.

[00:32:18] This is evidenced by the fact that every school division in the Commonwealth exceeds most of the standards and has done so for many years. Other necessary costs associated with providing a quality public education are not even addressed in the SOQ and therefore not state-funded at all. As a result, the current state of public education funding model does not reflect the true cost of the state's obligation to provide a public education.

[00:32:40] The Commonwealth has not fully funded its share of the true cost of public education in decades. As a result, local governments increasingly bear an ever-growing proportion of public education costs. The General Assembly should enact JLARC's near-term and long-term recommendations. Thanks, Dr. Smith, and just to put a fine point on the JLARC report, it was really a historic report from JLARC, and I think, you know, with, I think the item here is written, encapsulates it well with, you know, approximately, Tanya, correct me if I'm wrong, a quarter of the General Assembly is turning over seats, and that's not common.

[00:33:19] And so, both the report and the political season that we're in with the entire legislature up. This item's been on your agenda, at least as long as Jackson West has been here. And I think every year we've said, you know, hey, look, we're funding -- overhauling the state funding formula is not something that's probably in the cards this session. If the committee is open to it, we'd love to see you all move this item up to the top of your agenda. I think it's a topic that folks in the education community are talking about statewide. And if there's a time, that time is here in the near -- in the relatively near future. Whether is this this general assemblies incoming general assembly or or ones closely thereafter we think

[00:33:59] it's time to push for that and so if the committee is open to it we'd recommend you bumping it up and reordering some of these and moving it towards the top of your agenda thank you I do have a point of clarification just confirming my understanding so whether it's with the support cap or SOQs, there's always a local portion that each school division's locality carries.

[00:34:27] So, I just wanted to make sure I clarified that so that based on the comments I was making earlier about the support cap and those positions, I mean, there's always local appropriations going towards these items. It's just a matter of, like, especially with the SOQs, these are requirements that the state has of the local school divisions, but they are underfunding what they are requiring.

[00:34:50] Whereas with the support cap, a school division may be delivering more than a minimum set because it's determined that its community needs it or its locality needs it, but there's still buy-in at, it's just a give and take of who's putting in what amount and who's requiring it.

[00:35:07] And if I've got any of that wrong, would you just correct me for the edification of the other committee members? I think you certainly have that right, that as the support cap goes, I think Loudoun County is in a different position than certain localities and able to fund to and beyond the cap.

[00:35:26] And the state funding formula is probably more complicated than anyone here can articulate in this meeting. And from your sales tax to everything else plays into a formula, right? And so I think what JLARC opened the door for is sort of comprehensive re-looking at how we fund schools statewide and local localities ability to fund up to the cap or over that consideration of all of it I think is what Jay Lark wanted to put on the table.

[00:35:56] And presumably those local appropriations could either remain with the taxpayer or be used for other services the county needs. So I think I individually as one of the committee members would support making this a priority because they think it would be in line with um with the state should be supporting what the state is requiring um we we can decide after we've gone through the whole program and we know what we're keeping and not keeping which to make our top priorities but i do appreciate your suggesting that for us to consider as we finish up and then

[00:36:31] let me open it up to the other committee members to see if mr sorotkin has a question or comment thank you madam chair uh are there specific proposals that are floating around in the general assembly yet as far as how to respond to the jlark study or or what to do are they talking about totally overhauling the soq model or are they thinking things more you know a more modest approach than that what have they started talking specifics yet about what what they what they're going to propose or what they're what bills might be coming as far as lead appropriators go, and some of them are retiring, Senator Howell, Senator Sasselon, some others,

[00:37:09] their focus was on this past weekend, that budget done. We'd have to check in with some appropriations staff to give that answer to you better, Chair Sorokin and Dr. Smith. I don't know if Voss or others have weighed in there. I'm not aware of specifics and how folks have weighed, and I think it is accepted by most that we have to do something, and the J-ELEC report clearly pointed that out but i haven't heard of specific proposals any other questions are coming mr baity thank you chair um i'm just skimming through one of the documents and i could second

[00:37:47] forward it on jlark.virginia.gov but there's an interesting point at the bottom of it about a simpler student-based k-12 funding formula that many other states do and i guess it says virginia is only one of nine these is a staffing based formula so do you know of any work that's it's been done to go more towards a student-based funding program, and I imagine that's something you could get more of a bipartisan consensus, because there's a lot of thought of trying to have the dollars for all the students.

[00:38:17] Is there any motion on either side of the aisle about that, or either house? Not that I'm aware of. Thank you. Okay, so we can move on to the next item, which is broadband access.

[00:38:37] Yes, thanks, Ms. Reeser. So, in terms of broadband access, we're not recommending any changes. Loudoun County has received a VATI grant to provide internet connectivity to about 9,000 underserved addresses in Western Loudoun.

[00:38:53] We're probably a few years away from being fully connected, but there's still a lot of work to be done, so we recommend that this item remains. Any questions or comments on that? And we'll move on to supporting dual enrollment.

[00:39:10] Again, no changes recommended here. Dual enrollment continues to be a focus for us as we provide our students with different opportunities. As you know, we partner with George Mason, James Madison, Richard Bland, Nova Community College, and so partner with them on a number of dual enrollment courses.

[00:39:28] And so we recommend that we continue to keep this as a priority for us and that we keep it as an opportunity for our students. Any questions? Mr. Sorokin. Thank you, Madam Chair. So if the committee will recall, I actually brought this item up last year just questioning the need to have it in our legislative agenda just because everyone supports dual enrollment.

[00:39:54] So I don't know what we're saying with this particular item. It would be like supporting advanced placement or supporting kindergarten. I don't know what we're gaining by having this in there unless there are specific policy proposals that we're pushing for. And if there are, then I think that should be added to the item.

[00:40:13] Otherwise, I would support removing it as a legacy of a time where the dual enrollment model was not as fleshed out or there were thoughts in Richmond about moving away from it? So I can just provide a little bit of history, having been on the committee since 2020.

[00:40:29] And initially, there were whispers of charging tuition for dual enrollment, which was the reason it was first put into the legislative program. And if you look at line 166, it still talks about, it addresses the possibility of an implementation of a statewide uniform tuition rate and makes clear that the school division would oppose that.

[00:40:57] I don't know that there is an active effort, but I think that there remains concern, and that's why we continue to keep it, but I'll allow staff a moment to chime in if they feel that's changed. Yeah, so two things I would add to what Ms. Reaser shared was first around tuition.

[00:41:17] So the JLARC report did identify that higher ed institutions do have funds they really should not be charging us charging school divisions tuition and so i think um so that was one piece that came out of that that we need to continue to to reinforce and find ways to to reduce some of those costs for for our school division with any dual enrollment the other thing that that this talks about was anything that would basically provide a barrier to students taking it and one of the things that we continue to have a challenge with is getting getting teachers certified in order to teach it so you have to currently

[00:41:53] there's there's policies around the credentials that you have to teach us you have to have a master's in the content area or 18 plus credit hours so sometimes we struggle in certain schools to be able to offer dual enrollment classes because we just don't have a certified teacher and so in my mind this also allows us to think to think about how we can remove any barriers to offering dual enrollment i don't know mr jackson anything you'd add - No, I'd agree with that.

[00:42:20] - Would you like to see some language added with regard to that? - Yeah, if there are specific barriers related to a dual enrollment that we're looking to remove or that we're asking to be removed, then I would certainly support continuing on if we're gonna add that to this item or any other specifics that we can put in there.

[00:42:36] But just as it stands now, I would not support keeping it as it stands now. - So we could maybe have some language drafted to address some of the points that you were making, Dr. Smith, about the additional training requirements for teachers that present the material, teach the material?

[00:43:01] - Yep, we can put that together and bring it back. - Okay, thank you. We can, oh, Mr. Beatty. - Thank you, just based on the discussion, I do think there's some merit, and you mentioned that a lot of people are in favor of this, but I think there's some merit of also just kind of continuing to bring it up because if it doesn't show up in a legislative policy agenda that someone receives, someone might say, well, maybe we can start charging tuition something like that. So there may not be any like physical barriers now, but it is something good to keep on the top of mind of legislatures that they shouldn't renege on anything or go back. So

[00:43:37] I think I'm in favor of keeping it as it is. Yeah, now I'll just add in support of what Mr. Beatty said that especially because there's going to be such a large turnover and many of the folks that may be coming to the legislature either are not familiar with issues in education or have never been in elected office before, so perhaps it is a good time to continue having items that allow for the education of new members of the General Assembly, so I would also support keeping it, and making it more robust.

[00:44:09] And to that point, is there anything, Dr. Smith mentioned it briefly, I'm not sure if it's this jailer report, but a previous one, certainly laid out additional recommendations to bolster dual enrollment, and so we can certainly look at those and see which ones have been enacted by the General Assembly, and which ones are still hanging out there to bolster it.

[00:44:28] Female Speaker: Yeah, I think that would be very helpful. And if it's something that's available for Dr. Smith to share with committee members before, obviously it's clear the program's going to come back at our next meeting. We won't be passing this as a block, but if there's an opportunity to share that

with the individual board members so that they can have time ahead of the committee meeting to study it, that would be very helpful.

[00:44:48] Thank you. So we will move on to the item regarding recognizing and supporting a balanced assessment model. Dr. Smith. So we would recommend to keep this but to revise it. And so we have taken really all of the language from last year.

[00:45:07] We have updated and revised it to read as follows. Loudoun County Public Schools seeks to implement a balanced assessment model that will support the LCPS mission to prepare students to be knowledgeable, critical thinkers, communicators, collaborators, creators, and contributors. LCPS supports the use of, one, summative assessments to determine when students are proficient in their content knowledge.

[00:45:27] Two, growth assessments, such as MAP and the Virginia Growth Assessment, to determine when students are achieving sufficient progress. And three, performance assessments to determine when students are developing as critical thinkers, communicators, collaborators, creators, and contributors. LCPS supports the ongoing development of SOLs and Virginia Growth Assessments to provide standards-level data on proficiency and growth for teachers to use, provide feedback for students and families and for personalizing instruction thank you questions or comments from committee members mr sorotkin thank you madam chair so i thought part just from

[00:46:05] discussions over the years i think part of this item was trying to get flexibility around which growth assessments we offer and uh to basically to not have to give both the the like the sol growth assessments and the map assessments at the same time so if is that intended to still be part of this item because if so i feel like it's not uh laid out as as clearly as it needs to be if that's the intent the intent of this item is to really think about how um in terms of a balance assessment model to look at a number of different types of assessment and we're not just saying

[00:46:41] that we're all about uh summative sol assessments really and um currently and mr jackson will correct me if i'm wrong there is a in the last session there was the establishment of a work group to take a look at the MAP assessments and the Virginia growth assessment to see what data reports are coming out of that and how we can improve the Virginia growth assessment so we haven't seen much from that work group yet to see what what we might want to advocate for so it can be a piece of that and we could include some more of that language there but it's really about having that balanced assessment model and not just relying on one assessment

[00:47:12] type okay thank you any other questions or comments okay we will move on to the next item school resource officers and and actually I think that title is slightly misleading this is really more about emotion detective body cameras but I think the recommendation is to remove it so that will be moved dr. Smith you know look at this one you're right in terms of the title this how it was titled last year and looking at this and talking with our safety and security and

[00:47:48] local law enforcement around this it doesn't appear there's much much movement on motion detected body cameras also with our cameras that we have in our schools and are in our school property we just feel like in terms of the length of our legislative program this is not something that that we're really getting movement on and we feel like we have the right security measures in place as we are now so we would recommend removing it and I think at the time that this was added many years ago there there may have been no discussion around the fact that there is quite a bit of monitoring in schools anyway.

[00:48:24] And I think there was more conversation at that time about other requirements for law enforcement to have motion detected body cameras. So I think it was a different time and place. And I understand what changes have taken place and that this may not be a necessary item for us to carry.

[00:48:43] And I'm fine with removing it, but would like to allow other board members to chime in. Any comments? So, I believe this is one of the few items that were recommended for removal. I think at the end of the program, I will make a motion to remove -- we'll go ahead and take a vote on what we want to remove, so at least when it comes back at that point, it's just what we're keeping or adding.

[00:49:11] And move on to item number 12, which is the diploma requirements for students with disabilities. So, I know we've had significant discussion on this item for the past couple of years. We are not recommending any changes to this item and to keep it as it read from last year. Any questions or comments by the committee?

[00:49:28] We will move on to the item regarding the retention of unspent appropriations. Yeah, so I'll start and then turn it to Mr. Jackson. Our recommendation is to continue to keep this as written.

[00:49:44] We understand it's unlikely to move forward, but we do think it's important that we continue to include this in our legislative program. I would just add to that that while I think everybody agrees there's not a bill going to pass about this. We met with Delegate Reed and the new superintendent recently.

[00:50:01] The Delegate Reed is aware this is on your agenda, is aware of your desire there, and I think it has an impact just being on there. Any questions or comments? We will move right along to pre-K for all.

[00:50:19] So we would recommend continuing to advocate and keep pre-K for all on our program. We know we need to identify a long-term champion for this item. It continues to be on our radar, as I know it is yours. It's a board priority to expand pre-K options, and so we recommend keeping it.

[00:50:38] Any questions or comments from the committee? Okay, we will move along to unfunded state mandates. Here again, another item that we feel like we need to continue to be clear about. Explicit on our program, we're not recommending any changes, but to continue to keep it as part of it.

[00:50:55] And you think they should be separate from the JLARC item, or should they be closer together physically in the program? I mean, of course, unless we put JLARC as a priority item. I mean, Ms. Reeser, I mean, if the committee is open to it once you've sort of taken a couple off and added a couple, maybe go back and sort of look at it with fresh eyes about where they're located.

[00:51:19] We'd love to do that. But, yeah, I certainly think this needs to be on there in addition to the JLARC. Thank you for the feedback. any questions or comments from the committee mr baby thank you how going back to the jlark and i even the i'm thinking of the state cap how is this different than those other two funding requests is this just kind of a catch-all for anything that doesn't fit those but those seem like they would encompass everything in terms of staffing and taking the standards um we probably need to bring your finance staff here to talk about the the totality of how k-12 is funded in

[00:51:55] in the state uh but certainly you know the support cap um has been a big item that superintendents across the state have been trying to tackle well we've talked about loudons in a little different position than some other localities um we've supported that effort obviously obviously that additional funding helps you all across the board and loud uh coca um is something that that um affects um i think planning district eight localities um more or i think only planning district eight localities um

and prince william and loudon more than others there and so when we When we were able to take a little bit of a chunk out of that a couple years ago, I was really partnering with Prince William County.

[00:52:31] I think COCA, the cost of convenience, negatively impacts Loudon more than others. The JLARC funding formula writ large, if we were to get in a room and decide to rewrite how to fund the state, there would be winners and losers in that, and certain elements of average daily membership in your student population and sales tax creates winners and losers in that.

[00:52:53] And there's, again, there's a lot of elements that goes into that. And so JLARC is really recommending sort of a holistic review of everything. But the items that we have here, certainly COCA, is certainly something that has a significant impact on Loudoun.

[00:53:12] If we go back to the pre-recession numbers on COCA and the support cap, too, really just a statewide effort from superintendents to so there's just two we're calling out but certainly there's a lot of elements that goes into the funding formula and dr. Smithy I don't know if you want to add to that I think there can be mandates from the state that are not SOQs is that correct that's right and you know I think I don't have it in front of me but I've seen a list somewhere of the number of things that continue to grow that the legislature legislature has mandated that we do that we teach about that that it just

[00:53:52] continues to expand over time without increased funds and so so that continues to grow I think what we're saying here is you know happy to work with you on items so we need funding to build it we can't just continue to do more and more and more so I think I'm just gonna pause from the items for a second to say I think it would be easier to digest if the topics were maybe so we've got like hazing curriculum and pre-k for all those are more curricular whereas unspent appropriations and unfunded state mandates are more budget so maybe if we did reorder the items that don't make it into the top three on the front page

[00:54:30] to have to be somewhat thematic I also think it would be helpful since our these are not enumerated beyond like we have a section the sections are enumerated like budget priorities state policy positions I think if there was some lettering designation to the items it could be easier to follow in discussions for example at the breakfast or even just in committee again thank you and speaking of things we're asking for that may not be funded we can move on to hazing education curriculum so we are not recommending any change to this

[00:55:10] item this was a item I believe that we added last year and we continue to work with folks in our community on this locally but we believe that it should have a place statewide and so we're recommending keeping it. Mr. Sorokin.

[00:55:28] Thank you Madam Chair. So we're with this we're requesting funding for a state pilot right not this isn't requesting our ability to do something locally so if that's the case I would just recommend adding that word onto line 245 Loudoun County Public Schools seeks funding for a state pilot just to be a little clearer about what we're at what we're asking for. So I think we were We're asking for the pilot to be at LCPS when we first developed this.

[00:55:55] But I think since then, it's actually been piloted at some of the schools in our division. So where are we on that? Are we asking to expand the pilot? I mean, I think this is our decision. So I'm looking to Dr. Smith to see if you have feedback or if this is something you want to take back to Cabinet.

[00:56:13] I don't know how many schools it's been taught at, but I know it initially started with a smaller number of schools and I believe it's been wildly successful at many schools I the feedback I have heard is it was well-received by parents especially but even by students so are we at a place where we want the state to pilot this at other school divisions or have we have we even had it at every one of our secondary schools I don't believe we've had it at all of our secondary schools but I can I can follow up and let you know I when we were looking at this we did feel like it needed to be more of a statewide at this point we I felt like we were ready to move to that.

[00:56:49] We have tried it a couple places, but here's kind of an example of what we talked about just with the previous item. We also believe funding needs to come with it. It's not just something else that we can just add on and say, hey, oh, we're going to do this in addition to it, but we need support in order to make some of this happen. And so, yeah, so happy to find out where we are in terms of our local pilot, but staff would recommend that we support a statewide pilot.

[00:57:13] Okay, so that would be our goal, and if that leads to a smaller program, we'll take it. Maybe it'll be regional. Any other questions or comments from the committee? Okay, thank you. We will move on to the next item, which is the Regional Governing Board for Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology.

[00:57:35] So looking at this one, there was some recent developments where the Fairfax County Superintendent did announce the Formation Advisory Committee for Thomas Jefferson, and so that would include regional participation. It didn't quite get us there in terms of what we were looking at and what we were asking for last time and just looking at the totality of our program.

[00:57:57] We thought this one that could possibly be removed, but we're not bound to that. Committee members, any questions or comments? Mr. Sorotkin. Thank you, Madam Chair. So the most recent thing I saw on this, I saw the superintendent's recommendation to the board, basically to not have a regional governing board and to do a advisory committee instead. But has an advisory committee actually been formed? Has there been more recent movement on that than the recommendation from six months ago or whatever it was? Because I haven't seen

[00:58:35] any actual movement or formation since then. We have received a few emails from the superintendent in Fairfax, but we have not had our first official meeting yet. Okay. I would not support removal of this item a because i think that the regional governing board is the right way to go in the long term like every other governor school in virginia has but also without seeing what the advisory board looks like or that confirmation it's actually been formed and occurring i think it would be premature to remove this until until those things happen and we can evaluate the current

[00:59:11] state any other questions or comments do you want to weigh in on that well i i think i support mrs Okay, so we will move on to the item regarding the teacher and substitute shortage.

[00:59:35] All right, I'll start this and then turn it over to Mr. Jackson. So we did get some movement on this item last session and that we were able to decrease the amount of time needed for retirees to come and return to the school division down to six months from a year.

[00:59:52] but we are also we are pushing that this needs to be even shorter to 30 days and so mr jackson i've had several conversations about it and so we're continuing we actually we we update it to continue to focus on the 30 days uh yeah just building that briefly dr smith the the study that the bill included i think

had 30 days uh in it to study and to come back by november 1st to see that it's feasible uh it was a bill by senator lucas and delegate coiner we're both coming back to the assembly delegate supermodium who wants to be a senator supermodium also carried a version of this bills just get merged into each

[01:00:28] other so don't get your mind was certainly helpful with this and we should know more in November if we can pursue 30 days or not any questions or comments from the committee okay thank you for that we will move on to the item on electric buses and infrastructure for them we don't recommend any changes this continues to be an item that we feel like we need to continue to advocate for any questions from the committee mr. Beatty sorry thank you do we have any updates on it maybe it's not the correct committee this but about sort of our

[01:01:04] current pilot and how that's used the range of the buses any positives negatives especially around the charging infrastructure because that could be you know that just requires extra planning it takes a lot more to put electricity in the bus especially if it's a big battery than to just fill it full of diesel so I'm curious if we can get some kind of update on that as to maybe that's more appropriate for the full school board but how um how they're actually doing in the wild so i can give you a little bit of an update that uh we are using two different types of plugs which we are we are checking out um and we're using um we also i know last year we installed chargers at two

[01:01:42] two additional schools um but i don't have a update on how those are going at this point but happy to give you an update and get that to you thank you yeah i'm really curious on the range And I'm just, as a fellow electric car driver, like, I'm curious, like, how these buses actually work, especially in the cold, things like that.

[01:01:58] So, you know, it's, and that's a good thing that they can go back to the manufacturers as they continue to design these. Mr. Sorokin. Thank you, Madam Chair. I would, I would agree with that. I'd love to, I know one of the things that has, at least when they were, these were first rolled out, the range was preventing, preventing them from being used in our neck of the woods in Western Loudoun.

[01:02:22] So if there's been any innovations or enhancements to the range of the buses or what we're procuring that would allow them to be used countywide, that would be good to know, to be able to roll them out more broadly. Thank you. And we will move on to the item regarding attendance requirements for accreditation.

[01:02:41] Dr. Smith. So you'll recall this was an item that we recommended for consideration statewide by VSBA that we support a review and overhaul of the attendance requirements for accreditation by adding 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.

[01:03:03] Yes, and we did have a full board discussion on this, and the request for that was previously fully supported or supported by the full board, I should say. I don't remember exactly the vote count. So I will support adding this to our program so we can continue lobbying for that.

[01:03:21] Any thoughts or questions from committee members? Okay, we will move on to the audit of higher education teacher prep programs. Did you want to speak to that? Yeah, no, that's fine. You go ahead. This is a new item that we are recommending, especially in light of the Virginia Literacy Act.

[01:03:41] And so we prepared the following item. The Loudoun County School Board has emphasized and supported the transformational nature of the Virginia Literacy Act and will be in compliance by the

23-24 school year. As we work to recruit reading specialists and reading teachers, important that pre-service teachers demonstrate instruction in the classroom. The LCPS school board supports legislation and regulations that would require universities to offer programs in alignment with the requirements of the Virginia Literacy Act and expedite scheduling audits of the program to limit the need for initial training and evidence-based literacy instruction by local school divisions. Currently the audit cycle is on a seven-year cycle and

[01:04:20] so the purpose of this is so that we are not waiting seven years to find out if higher ed is in alignment with with LCPS around the work on the Virginia Literacy Act as we as we update around the science of reading and so that we would know that sooner than later and it also prevents LCPS from having to go back and retrain teachers provide additional professional development they should be receiving in their in their higher education programs. And just to add on to that this this was an item that I brought to Dr. Smith and asked him to take back to cabinet and prepare for consideration to be added for all the reasons that he stated. One thing that I've learned since we had that conversation was initially,

[01:05:00] I believe the legislation required this to happen every five years. And there were some amendments made to change it to seven years because that is the typical reaccreditation cycle. But the reason, a reason to include it in our program, in any case, it may not be that legislation is carried to change the entire cycle to five years or everyone to five years, but there would be certain secondary higher ed institutions that will be audited this

[01:05:35] year and then would not be audited for another full seven years after that type of training is required. So, it might require crafting something that only addresses the particular institutions that are maybe at the six or seven year out from the implementation of the Literacy Act, if that makes sense the way that I'm explaining it.

[01:05:57] If not, it's something I'm happy to talk with you about offline to further explain if you want to pass it on to legislators who are elected and might consider this. It also may be something that nobody actually wants to carry since the discussion did take place and there were amendments made.

[01:06:14] It may be difficult to institute a partial schedule just for some schools, but I think it's worthy of having a discussion because it would affect the school division in terms of what kind of training new teachers are coming in with if there isn't fidelity at the higher ed institutions.

[01:06:35] Any other questions or comments on that? Yes, Mr. Beatty. And would this just affect schools in Virginia? I guess we don't have control. Correct. and I guess primarily public schools then, right, not private institutions? Or is there some leeway in that?

[01:06:54] I would say our recommendation would be all higher ed institutions in the state of Virginia that are training teachers. Sure, but does the legislature have the ability to force them or cajole them, encourage them to do that? I'm going to ask Mr. Jackson to weigh in, but the legislature can pass laws related to all institutions.

[01:07:19] I just don't know that there's the same level of regulation with private schools that there is with public education. I would agree with that, Ms. Vice President. So with that, we will move on to our federal policy positions.

[01:07:37] There are three, so I'm hopeful that we can get through all three of them before the next committee meets. Dr. Smith, we'll start with Title IX regulations. So the recommendation is to keep this

here, where there was a few changes based on the federal Title IX regulation that removed the word sexual violence.

[01:07:56] And so we did recommend removing that here just based on the federal Title IX regulation there, but everything else remains the same. Any questions or concerns? Mr. Strotkin.

[01:08:12] Thank you, Madam Chair. So I think I remember having a discussion about this and about leaving that term in, even if it didn't align with Title IX, just because Title IX calls everything sexual harassment, and that's really dumb, and that we wanted to be a little more clear about that like we know that there's a huge umbrella of things that are being put under that term and that I think I would still support keeping it there just so that it's no one

[01:08:45] just reads that without having a working knowledge of Title IX and things that we're just talking about sexual harassment and not sexual assault, violence, rape or anything else that comes under that any other thoughts okay so um i think the only item that is being recommended and supported for removal at this point i think we've got two other real quick ones if you want oh am i missing a page i got e-rate funds and jrtc no i'm not missing a page i'm just doing what i did

[01:09:21] earlier which is um sometimes the bolded text is next to each other and in my mind it blends in so let's move on to the lifting of restrictions of e-rate funds please so we have uh we want to we We recommend that we keep this, that we need to continue to advocate for flexibility with E-rate funds.

[01:09:38] Any questions or concerns on that one? We've discussed that for a couple of years, so I think everyone's really familiar with it. And then the expansion of JROTC offerings. So this, again, has been an item that's been on our agenda for a number of years. We want to continue to advocate for this.

[01:09:55] We really -- I think it's part of our special programs that we are planning for another ROTC program if we can get authorization, and so we should continue to keep it. Was there any movement on whether more resources had become available? Or did it matter which branch of the military we were looking to offer a program in?

[01:10:14] No, we've tried to ask about this several times, asked about funding for it, and reached out to several of our federal legislators around it, and we have not made any headway. Any questions or concerns on that one? Sorry, I keep trying to wrap up quickly for curriculum and instruction.

[01:10:36] So just going back to the removal of school resource officers needing body cameras, could I get a motion, please? So moved. I will second that. All those in favor of removing that item from our legislative program, please raise your hand and say aye.

[01:10:56] Aye. That will pass unanimously with all committee members present. So we'll go ahead and officially remove that item. And I think we can then bring back the rest of the program, maybe slightly reordered with the amendments and the expansions that the committee requested to consider next time.

[01:11:16] And what we'll do is maybe we'll just have some discussion on it and then see if we can just vote on it as a block. Okay. Any other questions or comments on the program before? Thank you very much for your help and for all of the work that you and Cabinet did on this, Dr. Smith, and for our legislative consultants and the staff that supported the program.

[01:11:41] Looking forward to presenting this to our new slate of legislators and continuing to work to make education better for students here. and the Commonwealth, because a lot of this impacts more than

just Loudoun County. And with that item, we will move on to new business. Is there any new business?

[01:11:58] Mr. Beatty. I just have one question about where we are with the collective bargaining resolution. I know we were hoping to have something out by now, right? I think because of the weather emergency canceling our last meeting, we are just slightly behind.

[01:12:18] my anticipation is that we will have a closed session can um scheduled for the october meeting to continue our discussion thank you you're welcome any other new business okay we are adjourned thank



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com