



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Human Resources and Talent Development (HRTD) Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 28, 2023

Date Thursday, September 28, 2023
Place Loudoun County Public Schools / School Board meeting (see BoardDocs / LCPS-TV)
Length 1h 18m (video)

- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): <https://player.vimeo.com/video/869743911?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.

[00:05:15] Good evening. I am calling to order this week's Human Resources and Talent Development Committee meeting for Thursday, September 28th. My name is Erica Ogadegbe. I'm chairing this committee and I'm joined by Mr. Jeff Morse. We will move on to item two, public comment. We have one public speaker today. If you can use two minutes. Thank you.

[00:05:46] Good evening. Your educators are glad to hear that policy 70-30 staff time schedules is being sent back to this committee. We look forward to you ensuring that policy is reasonable, educator-friendly, and clear.

[00:06:05] On another note, we received questions about counselor salaries and reached out to HRT staff earlier this afternoon with questions. I did see that when I had received a response just when I got to this meeting, so I haven't been able to digest it yet. So I just want to say all school counselors are contracted to work an additional 30 minutes as well as additional days before and after the school year and Since counselors are on the teacher scale the calculation of the additional time each day as well the additional Contract days isn't clear Counselors are concerned. They are not receiving compensation for the additional 30 minutes each day So we look forward to understanding the salary comp calculation and ensuring our counselors are being compensated for their contracted time

[00:06:44] Thank you The next item on our agenda are the adoption of the minutes from August.

[00:07:00] Do I have a motion? So moved. Second. Thank you. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the August meeting, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. That motion passes with all committee members present.

[00:07:17] We'll now move on to the action items. I do want to just state before we get started on the scheduled action items, We have four policies that were scheduled for review this evening. Given that, and I know I personally have a number of questions about them, we actually won't be getting to 70-30 today.

[00:07:38] I know that there are a number of outstanding questions about the policy, so we're going to take that up in the October meeting. So just for awareness in case there are questions about that. So starting with item 4.01, policy 7040 school calendar.

[00:08:00] Thank you so much. We reviewed policy 7040 at last month's HRTD committee meeting as an information item. It has since gone out for feedback. And Ms. Katie Kutch, HRTD supervisor, is standing in to walk through that feedback and or changes in place of HRTD Director Nicole Davis, who could not be here this evening.

[00:08:27] And I will turn it over for further discussion. Good evening, everyone. I'm here to discuss feedback on policy 7040 school calendar. This policy went to directors and supervisors for comment as part of the normal regulation review process as well as public feedback.

[00:08:50] Just a reminder, the intent of this policy has not changed. Overall, the language was simplified and reorganized to clearly distinguish the development of both the student school calendar and staff calendars and Tamir language outlined in code, as well as to align with current practices and clarify the responsibilities of the school board and the superintendent.

[00:09:14] In your packet, you'll see the community feedback on the calendar, including information regarding number of days and holidays.

[00:09:38] So the feedback included questions on the number of days of the staff calendar, a lot of questions regarding the 197 versus the 200 days.

[00:09:51] You'll see that in quite a few of the questions.

[00:10:22] This is a note that we have not increased the days of the calendar. The language is per the code. The Virginia code is 200 days. We want to ensure that the contract days remain at 197 contract days for 194 working days as in previous years.

[00:10:41] Other questions are regarding staff and school holidays, including the newer holidays that were added two years ago. We wanted to emphasize that the policy does not speak to the designated holidays. That is in regulation 70-40, and that it is difficult to plan for floating holidays, for schools, subs, transportation needs, and other designated holidays to make those floating holidays.

[00:11:14] Other questions were regarding the length of the school calendar going into the school year, further into the summer. And a lot of feedback we get is from secondary principals and secondary teachers regarding testing and other items that occur in the spring.

[00:11:33] We want to note that the calendar is for secondary and elementary. It allows students to make up work time and get additional assistance needed at the end of the year. And I believe most of the other

questions were regarding the 197 and 200 contract days.

[00:11:54] Any further questions? Won't turn off at all.

[00:12:20] Can you hear me? Okay. Hopefully this one, this is what happened on Tuesday. The mics kept going off. Minor thing, but in terms of the name, is there a reason we don't just call it student and staff calendars instead of student school calendar and staff calendars?

[00:12:48] So we, the policy has always been called school calendar, which kind of over encompasses the general calendar for the school. We had a lot of confusion last year that I'm sure Ms. Bolin could speak to in further detail regarding items that were in the policy that were regarding more of the staff calendars opposed as in instead of the school calendar for students um and so the policy has always been school calendar in this policy the updates kind of emphasize that further if that answers your

[00:13:25] question yeah and it's it's really minor i just think it it would work to just say student and staff calendars and just remove the word school so i guess what i'm proposing is if we change the name of the policy to student and staff calendars and then section A would say student calendars and section B is staff calendars it's really nitpicky and

[00:13:54] minor I don't think that's an issue so we can absolutely move forward with that I would however like to just double-check that there's not a reason why we have to have school calendar in the title or mentioned, if it has something to do with code or because it essentially is our published school calendar, so we can say yes to move forward, and then

[00:14:31] in the event, I check with Division Council, and I can bring that forth if we move this policy forth, if that's acceptable. Yes, I think that's fine.

[00:14:48] I think the other question I had, so there was one piece of feedback, and I don't think that this is necessarily to be addressed in policy, but there was feedback around teachers who are starting work before they have a contract login and access to technology.

[00:15:06] So I just wanted to raise that as a question to see if there's feedback from staff on that particular comment. So I think some of the struggle is budget. And making sure that, especially new employees, that we have an approved and confirmed budget to put their salary on their contract if they are a new employee.

[00:15:28] Outside of that, we do regularly work with DDI to figure out how to provide those accesses more quickly. But there is something, and Ms. Kutch may be able to speak to this, there is something based upon when we can actually put them in the system to be effective so that they don't get paid too early, and when they then get their lead ID to gain access to all of those items.

[00:15:59] And so I know as we look at Oracle and as we look at our systems, that is something they are working through. Any other questions? Yes, Mr. Morse. Thank you. Along those lines, it sounds like there's a process problem because there's no reason why an employee, as soon as they get their badge, their ID should be activated.

[00:16:21] They should be able, you know, everything should occur rapidly. So if it's not happening now, are we in the process of changing that is the question. So the badge piece is relatively quick because we have control over that.

[00:16:38] Really, it comes down to the lead ID and access to email and anything that the system rolls over that provides you access because you're not technically an employee until that first day of work.

[00:16:55] Is that right? Is that correct? I think the other thing is, and I didn't see the feedback specifically on this, But I would imagine that it would not be certainly in every case that there would be some sort of access issue on the first day.

[00:17:11] I think the majority of our new teachers and individuals starting their contracts in August would have access as their first day. I know the DDI does go to Beginning Teachers Institute now to assist teachers in setting up their laptops, making sure their technology is set.

[00:17:31] So I would say that as well. I would just ask that we map out the process so we know, you know, they're unique cases. People get hired every day. But there has to be a process that says as soon as they, you know, they get their badge, everything, you know, everything should be happening on the schedule that we want it to.

[00:17:52] Not, you know, if there's a delay for whatever reason, we should probably figure out why and why is it that we cannot, you know. In other words, tell us how we can, what we need to do to execute to make sure that the employees are getting what they need on the first day.

[00:18:08] Because we don't want them to go in a classroom without electronics. You know, if that means that they get hired and they come in and pick up their computer and everything and it gets activated at midnight, you know, however it needs to occur, our employees should be, you know, armed with all of the devices and technology that they need on day one.

[00:18:29] If they're stepping into a classroom, they should have it. I agree. So one other question, so back to the 200 days versus the 197, this really, this obviously stirred up a lot of questions and I know that wasn't one of the changes.

[00:18:54] This is an existing policy but it went out for feedback and so there are questions about that. Is it possible to reference that that comes from code and doesn't necessarily reflect the scheduled contract days?

[00:19:15] It looks like we scratched out the reference. Well actually it says pursuant to Code of Virginia. It does. If you look at B3 and you just flip the page a little bit to line 47 on the red line version, it does reference that it's pursuant to the Code of Virginia.

[00:19:40] Hello?

[00:19:47] Is it worth having something that specifically says, um, we could move it to, um, the beginning to where it says pursuant to the code of Virginia, the contract for teachers shall include 200 days.

[00:20:28] But I think what I'm trying to get at is can we have something that specifies which is not necessarily the same number of days in the contract, right? Because then we will still get, oh, are you changing us to 200 days?

[00:20:47] I'm not sure I understand. So our policy says that the contract for teachers shall include 200 days.

[00:21:04] So the previous language had will require up to 200 days. Now we're saying the contract for teachers shall include 200 days, but our contracts are 197 days with 94 working days, right?

[00:21:22] That's correct. So we're saying in policy that the contract will include 200 days. Our contracts are fewer than that. so what why did we change from require up to versus shall include because we're saying we're saying our contracts will be 200 days but they're not so that's seems to be in conflict the code

[00:21:55] language says con the contract shall include 200 days so it is it it's code language that's placed there that's why it was changed it was changed to match code so are we out of compliance having contracts for 197 days?

[00:22:14] No, because it says, it also goes on to say the 200 days, or it says, it has subsets that says a minimum of 180 teaching days up to 20 days for activities such as teaching, participating in professional development.

[00:22:32] It has some of the same language as the 180 days and or 990 instructional hours. It has some of the same language as for students. We just don't include all of that additional language.

[00:22:50] And so our 990 instructional hours are obviously included in the 197 days. That's correct. So I would add or 990 hours to that sentence.

[00:23:06] because then that covers the then the 990 hours is is inclusive of the 180 days not the 200 or the 197 right that's student hours correct so for for the 200 it is 180 teaching days or 990 instructional hours and up to 20 days for activities such as teaching participating in

[00:23:40] professional development and other activities. So that's where the 200 comes from. It's 180 days of instructional time or those hours and up to 20 days additional for these other activities that are listed. But you can see that we're saying that the contract for teachers shall include 200 days and our contract is 197 so by there's some adjustment needs to happen here to reflect that

[00:24:13] we our contracts are 197 so if we're putting in policy that our contracts are 200 we're introducing some inconsistent information we can look at changing it um i think we do try to stick with code language to be able to refer back to code. And I hesitate to put 197 in policy because there's not necessarily a guarantee that we will remain at 197. And that's why I was suggesting

[00:24:52] that we should add a sentence that indicates that this isn't necessarily reflective of the contract hours are reflected on the contract, or we put in all of the other language that explains it. It's just that we're saying the contracts are 200 hours, and they're not.

[00:25:23] Yes, Mr. Beatty. No, I completely agree. For us to say that a contract shall include 200 days when the contracts don't, I think that's an inconsistency that has to be remedied somehow. Either we make all the contracts 200 days as it says in policy or we have some flexibility in the policy such that 197 days is not going to be at odds with the code so if it's again adding the 990 hours which it sounds like we're basing something off of or yeah i mean figuring that out so that it's consistent and there's no confusion or we include the language about 180 day teaching days

[00:26:00] plus up to 20 days and then i just i don't know mr morse do you have thoughts on this i think that we have to match the language to the state but the way i would phrase it is that uh you can put the the 200 is as a total you obviously teachers are not teaching 200 total days they're they're working 197 they're teaching 180 so i would just keep the flexibility in the activities and other

[00:26:33] days such that you know you talk about including up to 200 days well those last three days 197 to get to 200 we have three additional days for which you know we don't have any specific work assigned

right i mean but sorry but i but but our contracts are 197 so we don't have contracts with 200 days well i mean the contracts i don't know what the precise language is on the contracts that would be interesting to know but you could put the 200 out the 200 days and that you know three days of

[00:27:09] non-work days are captured within that contract language so because there there is flexibility built in up to a maximum of 200 days understood I mean right now we are we've executed at 194 at 190 and 197 so that flexibility is built in as long as you know I think what we're talking about is capturing 200 days available for teacher work, which includes the instructional thing.

[00:27:41] You know, you just, those three extra days, instead of saying we're at 197, it's we're at 200, and three of those days are not considered non-work days, but they're part of the contract. I think my question there is, though, right now, our contracts say 197.

[00:28:01] So we, you know, if we wanted to execute contracts in future years for 200, what I'm hearing from staff is we don't have to do that. But my concern right now is that it's inconsistent.

[00:28:19] This says, it doesn't say up to 200 days, it says includes 200 days. But our contracts are 197, so it's just introducing a question for staff who have a contract in hand that says 197. So what if we just add it back in up to?

[00:28:38] The contract for teachers shall include up to 200 days. That captures R-197. It also captures the ability to mirror code and go to a 200-day teacher contract.

[00:28:53] And, you know, you kind of have it in there where you say including up to 20 days for activities. So built within the 200 are up to 20. That doesn't mean if you only use 19 that they have another day of instruction. It means that, you know, you have that, you have 20 days available for activities such as teaching, participating, et cetera.

[00:29:12] But if you wanted to add that, that would probably be clearer, I think, up to 200. I think I'm comfortable with that, but I also just want to hear, you know, I'm not asking that we update the contracts next year to be 200 days either.

[00:29:32] No, I understand. We like to match code as much as possible and so I think that still gives us an opportunity to mirror code language without undermining it, so to speak.

[00:29:58] So at the end of the day here we have, it looks like there's two additional changes. You're going to bring back the question about removing the word school from the title and the title of section a and we are going to revert the changes on line 43 to to reintroduce the words up to for the 200 days and with that all those in favor of moving this ahead to the school board as an information item yes oh I'm sorry I'm

[00:30:36] let me make a motion I'd like to make a motion that we move this forward with the changes discussed to the full board as an information item. Second. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. That motion passes with all board members present.

[00:31:14] Our next item, 4.02, is revisions to policy 7562, professional learning. So this evening Mr. Phillips was not able to attend, so I'm going to do my best to take his part.

[00:31:32] As a refresher, the changes, the intent of this policy also has not changed. These changes, the changes made were specifically to add language from code regarding the annual review of the division's professional learning plan and to add clarifying language to additionally clarify this position or this policy this policy has been reviewed by Division

[00:32:08] Council and there was one outstanding question in regards to well actually there was several feedback in regards to virtual versus in-person professional learning. We have referred this feedback or shared this feedback with the Office of Professional Learning and had discussions with Mr. Slevin as well as Dr. Ellis in regards to moving forward.

[00:32:46] But what I would say is that the goal is to continue to offer a variety of platforms for both in-person as well as virtual professional learning, recognizing that not all professional learning can be done virtually, but not all virtual learning needs to be done in person either.

[00:33:07] We are trying to offer more flexibility for individuals to not only take professional learning when they have the time or the capacity, but we also heard very loud and clear that our teachers would like the opportunity if possible to do the professional learning from the comfort of their home on PD days.

[00:33:32] And so where that's possible and where that works, we are trying to be flexible for that too. So I do see a continuation of sort of this merger of options in both.

[00:33:57] - Okay, I had a couple small things. On line 12, where we have, this is related to the school board shall annually review its professional learning program for quality, effectiveness, participation by instructional personnel, and relevancy to the instructional needs of teachers and the academic achievement needs of LCPS students.

[00:34:24] I wanted to propose adding the word safety, so saying, and the academic achievement and safety needs of students, because I'm assuming in professional development, there are topics related to the safety of students that we would want to make sure we're effectively covering.

[00:34:45] Does that make sense? It does make sense. this language that was added is code language. And in code language, safety is not currently included. So this language around the school board review is from code? Yes, ma'am. Okay. So I know we try to stay with code language, but is there a reason we couldn't refer to the safety of

[00:35:18] students? I feel like that's an important thing for us to be reviewing. I don't think it's a problem but this language was pulled straight from code I don't think it's a problem to add I only think it's a problem if we remove the language that's included in code but that's on the inclusion of the word safety okay so I'd like to add the word safety online and safety needs so after the word

[00:35:55] achievement and safety and then the other thing just to note is this was a question I'd asked of staff ahead of the meeting that I'd asked about time frame for when this review would be taking place and understand that this is part of the program evaluation list for the year that the Department of Teaching and Learning Plans will be sharing with the board soon so just for awareness that was new for me any additional items okay so I would like to

[00:36:29] to make a motion to move policy 7562 professional learning with the addition of the words and safety on line 12 forward to the full board for as an information item second thank you with all those in favor of the motion please raise your hand and say aye that motion passes with all committee members present I lost my progressives so I'm having a hard time I have to keep okay item 4.03

[00:37:07] revisions to policy 7712 sick leave so the next two policies I am going to hand over to Miss Jeanette Evans HRTD director for employee benefits but before I do that I would like to take a minute to, I

don't know, remind committee that last month, as an information item, we also brought forth 7716 retirement benefits. That policy was supposed to come before committee as an action

[00:37:46] item this evening. However, after feedback and after discussion of a number of things, we found language that was critical that be added, and it was a pretty significant add, so we are restarting that through the policy process.

[00:38:03] So it will go back through cabinet, back through legal review, come back as an information item and feedback before going as an action item. So I did want to mention that because it's not on this evening's agenda. And with that, I will hand over policy 7712, sick leave, and 7714, personal leave, to Ms.

[00:38:27] Evans. Thank you. We got quite a bit of feedback on 7712. A couple of things were changing language from he/she to they/are, so we made those updates.

[00:38:45] A suggestion was made to take stepmother, stepfather, and combine that to step-parents, which we did on lines 84 and 85, and on lines 94 and 95, take mother-in-law and father-in-law and change to parents-in-law, which we also made.

[00:39:04] There was also a suggestion to include step-siblings and foster-siblings. We have not added that at this time. There needs to be some discussion. Generally, excuse me, I'm sorry.

[00:39:22] Step-siblings and foster siblings are hard to document. What is a step-sibling? So if my dad divorced his second wife, then they're no longer my step-siblings. Are they? So those kinds of questions, that's why we did not add that language there.

[00:39:41] Another question that came up quite a few times, and we've talked about it a little bit before, employees are asking why there is sick leave and personal leave and annual leave, why it's not just all one bucket called PTO. Under the Virginia Retirement System rules, if a retiring employee wants to purchase service as part of their retirement, they can purchase additional months based on their sick leave payout.

[00:40:08] If we go to a PTO model, VRS will not honor that. They will not recognize that as sick leave because it's in code as sick leave. So that's why we maintain sick leave annually, personal leave. Another question that was raised is sick leave being credited in advance.

[00:40:35] We give it to employees up front, but they actually earn it throughout the year, right? So if they leave, and they've used all their sick leave, then they have to pay those days back. I'm sorry, this person is very stubborn.

[00:40:57] Questions were raised about the requirement, or not the requirement, the ability of supervisors to request notes if an employee is out. Generally, those would be requested as a performance management issue.

[00:41:14] If an employee feels like they are being targeted or they're being asked for notes in an unreasonable fashion, then that would go to workplace relations. We have had cases where employees have reached out to us and we send them to workplace relations to resolve those issues.

[00:41:34] So that was our answer to that question. And I think that was a lot of questions, a lot of statements about please add leave, please add sick leave, please add personal leave.

[00:41:50] Those are budgetary items. You will be seeing them in the budget. Mr. Morse. Thank you, Madam Chair. I wonder if staff would be interested to see if the school board could take the VRS sick leave

definition issue to the General Assembly and see if there'd be the potential for a change because I know a lot of businesses combine their days all together and there could

[00:42:22] be a formula associated with the PTO like instead of having 20% of your sick days be refunded it could be you know 10% of your PTO and then we lump it all together so there might be other easier ways to do that that are more aligned with the way industry does it on the outside. Because there is no longer, in the companies I've worked for, it's no longer split out. It's combined. So there are other discussion items there, but I would be interested in feedback on that idea. I think related to that, if a person has accrued vacation time, they get 100% payout on their vacation time.

[00:43:03] So the difference is that you only get 20% of sick, but you get 100% of annual. So if we move to PTO, it would be 100%, right? It could be. That's correct.

[00:43:18] And so there would be a budget concern for that as well, because for annual leave, just like you say, and for sick leave, I don't think they get any payout. I think it's turned over into VRS at a credit of 25%.

[00:43:35] So the payout is only for retirees and it is 25%. So that's what I was referring to, was the retirement payout.

[00:43:51] When you combine them, it makes the formula different because they don't get the same payout for vacation days, PTO, or vacation as they do for sick leave. So sick leave is a percentage of that. So it would actually be higher than the 25%, not lower, because you're combining with 125, mathematically.

[00:44:14] Yes, Mr. Beatty. Thank you, Chair. What number of, what percentage of retiring employees take advantage of that sick leave payout? Most of them? Or, like, talking about the budget hit, like, would it really affect this in a meaningful way? Or is it just such a real small number?

[00:44:35] I would have to go, I would have to go look for that information. I don't know off the top of my head. Okay, thank you. So just to clarify, too, when I was referencing the budget item, it's almost like a future budget item, and it's less about the retirement payout and more about if an employee were to leave, that 100% payout, if we combined their, say, 24 days of annual leave and their 14 days of sick leave accumulated over whatever the max is, it's now significantly different.

[00:45:13] And that's the concern. That's why, you know, depending on how VRS states it in their policy, then, you know, that would give us flexibility to adjust our policies accordingly. I'm not saying that we have to double the amount of pay that we're giving employees at their retirement because we've adjusted that calculation wrong.

[00:45:35] I think that we should maintain at least maintain the level of refund that they're getting, you know, somehow try to come up with a formula that if we were to move to a PTO only, there would be some other percentage that would be an equitable distribution compared to the way they're receiving it today.

[00:45:54] And this is, obviously, we're not going to get anywhere with this. There is a budget impact, I'm certain, and the adjustments would have to be made. So it's not something in the short term, but something, you know, it would start with VRS and then work its way back down to the divisions.

[00:46:14] Any additional comments? We could talk about that at the LNP because we've got the legislative agenda coming up. So it would be something we could add to that. So if there were some speaking points that we could present to the legislators about potentially a plan.

[00:46:40] So I just have a couple of, on that, a couple of thoughts. One is if they're combined, they're combined. So it would be hard to, you know, if there's then a formula that assumes that a certain percentage of that is sick for the purposes of payout, then you would have employees questioning well I'm not tracking why I was out but I was out sick a lot but now you're assuming that I'm not do my full payout for PTO because you're assuming a percentage of that was sick so it seems like either it's all together and it's treated the same

[00:47:20] or it's separate and the other I think the other thing in Ms. Boland was saying this that it's not just retirees, but anybody who leaves the school division gets a payout. And so how is that handled? Agreed. And so, yeah, I mean, there would have to be an adjustment. So you would treat it all the same because it would only be one pool at that point, but it would be an equivalent payout is what we're trying to aim for. So we're not trying to screw over the employees and give them a smaller payout by calling it all PTO and only giving them 10%. We're trying to combine it all

[00:47:56] and give them some kind of running an average of what our employees would have seen, kind of trying to make it equitable to where they would be. Or, you know, it starts on a certain day, and then from that day forward, just like we did with the health care changes that we made eight years ago, it would be grandfathered from here.

[00:48:15] Everybody moving forward gets PTO, and PTO is treated this way. So, I mean, those are possibilities. You know, obviously I haven't looked into that, but I just know that on the outside that PTO is treated differently. I'm sure that if we ask specific companies, they could probably share with us how they reimburse.

[00:48:34] Because I know my company, when I left my last company, they reimbursed me all of my leave time at 100%. So there are means to do that. We just want to be fair with it. Any other comments or concerns?

[00:48:52] Okay. So I think to the point about sick leave being accrued monthly makes sense.

[00:49:07] but the policy only reflects an annual accrual. And so I think that it would be helpful to include language in Section D1 that clarifies that it is actually accrued monthly but credited in advance.

[00:49:36] And the word here is anticipated, and in the next policy, the word, I think, is advanced. So that should be consistent. I think advanced is clearer, the next policy, yeah, in personal leave it's called advanced.

[00:49:57] So I think advanced is clearer. So I think we need to specify that the accruals are monthly and then it makes sense why you would have to pay it back if it's accrued on a monthly basis.

[00:50:15] So perhaps on line 25 it could say sick leave for the contract or a signed year is accrued monthly but credited, i.e. advanced, at the beginning of the contract year. I'm sorry, can you repeat what you just said?

[00:50:37] Mm-hmm. So, line 25, sick leave for the contract or assignment year is accrued monthly, comma, but credited, i.e. advanced, at the beginning of the contract year.

[00:51:02] And then we would change advanced also in 1A, correct? On line 29, where it says unearned anticipated sick leave. Yes.

[00:51:17] Any unearned advanced sick leave, thank you.

[00:51:36] So I think in reference to the conversation around family members, I actually, in response to one of the comments that came in I feel like family is different and comes in all kinds of ways and one of the feedback things that we had received was what about long-term partners who

[00:52:14] aren't married and that doesn't seem to be covered however there is language that in the other deaths And I'm trying to understand, too, so if in Section 4 for family illness death, there's no limitation on the amount of sick leave to be taken, is that accurate?

[00:52:38] And then for other deaths, we're saying five days. Correct. Okay. And family includes, so if you have power of attorney. Right. Then that doesn't necessarily mean a family relationship, but if you have power of attorney, that's considered family.

[00:52:55] Just like any relative living in your home who you are caring for as a dependent is also considered family. So any other relative not listed above living in the household of the employee.

[00:53:10] So when we say relative, we're leaving that open. So if, for example, someone had a long-term partner with whom they were living with, but they weren't married to, so it wasn't their spouse, that would be covered by the second to last bullet.

[00:53:26] So if somebody said to me, I'm taking care of my partner, I would not ask questions about whether they were married or not. Okay. Okay, great. So that answers that question. And then back to this question about step-siblings and foster siblings.

[00:53:45] I mean, I understand the need to be specific and so forth, but to the question of like, is your step-sibling your sibling after a divorce? i would say in many cases absolutely yes these are potentially people that you've grown up with your whole life and so forth i would i would err on the side of being more inclusive there and including step siblings and step and foster siblings so i don't know you know what the

[00:54:21] thoughts are there but i just i feel like we're being a little too stringent there so i guess the concern becomes, we are rather inclusive when it comes to the number of individuals or number of relationships we provide within this policy that you can use leave for. So the concern I think

[00:55:00] we have is where does that stop? And when you say some of these individuals, you know, if you talk about a step-sibling that you could have grown up with, then where do we get into, well, we also have best friends that we've grown up with that we are now caring for and neighbors. And so where does, where do we draw the line of who is listed under those acceptable relationships? I think

[00:55:34] that's the concern at what point um do we do we do we not provide the ability to use your leave for for this so i mean i would say a neighbor or a best friend isn't isn't typically family and siblings are family i mean and i think the example that was brought up is like what if there's a case of divorce and you know if somebody says my stepsister passed away I'm not going to ask them

[00:56:09] well did your did your parents divorce or are they still married or you know it's your sibling so I think there is a line there I understand what you're saying I do have some concerns about that but we can certainly add it I don't think a foster sibling is something that needs to be added I

[00:56:45] think we're talking about employees and you're talking about a foster sibling they're no longer in a foster home together we get on the on the slippery slope right when we start talking about okay they were they were foster children together 30 years ago and you get into the argument of how close that

relationship is so it's just very difficult to define based on the family relation a familial relationship, how close people are, because you're a lot closer to other people that

[00:57:25] aren't on here, perhaps, than you are to your great-grandparents. So I don't see the harm in adding step-siblings, because I think that that is something that is, if someone was to come in and say, for instance, if my sister passed away, I would request leave. My half-sister, but there's no reason it could have been my stepsister. So that question wouldn't even be asked. So for me,

[00:58:00] I don't think step sibling would be that far down the path, that far from here. So I don't really have a problem with step sibling if you have siblings in here. Because again, who's going to ask that question? And how would we regulate that? That's just not something we want to be in the business of regulating. What is the idea of having a distinction between the unlimited pay with

[00:58:35] family unlimited sort of basic unlimited leave that you have or leave without pay versus other deaths is that just because we don't want people to abuse the system or are there legal reasons for having to have a segregation in that respect so we have a pretty comprehensive list of family and so for other deaths would be things like friends somebody that no i understand that but is there a reason to have a difference in term because really what we're trying to say is if it's a family you can take as much sick leave as long as you have it or it's leave without pay

[00:59:10] but if it's anyone else you're limited by five days right that's how i read this so is there a particular reason for having that distinction or is this something that uh yeah that's my first question is there a reason for that distinction as far as i know the reason for the distinction was to limit the amount of time um for non-family relationships so if so if i could just add a additional clarification as well I think we're we're adding an assumption as well we're adding

[00:59:45] the assumption that for any of these members that are specifically listed out they the the death of the death of these family members could include additional tasks or activities or involvement on your behalf that would take more than five days or could take more than five days to address yes

[01:00:10] So I'm glad you said that, because I think if you were to sort of square this where we've got, is it a step-parent, step-sibling, maybe it makes sense to sort of rewrite this section where it's, if you can show, if you need the extra time for additional duties, if you, you know, it seems like we're giving a lot of latitude here.

[01:00:28] So maybe it's just saying, if you need this latitude, and maybe there's the opportunity for the supervisor to verify that in some sense, maybe that makes more sense than trying to list out every single potential relationship where we're going to include some people, exclude some people. That might make more sense if I look at this, because, you know, there's a distinction about where stepped siblings come in, where foster siblings come in.

[01:00:52] And Mr. Morse is right, if you haven't seen this person in 30 years, you probably only need the five days. So I think maybe that's a way we could square this and sort of make it whole where there are needs for extended time. Like I can imagine, you know, I remember my grandfather passed away.

[01:01:09] Everyone went out there. It was a lot of work to basically clear out the whole house so they could sell it. So that's where it makes sense. But if it is your neighbor, you know, obviously you don't need the five days because you're not in that same situation. So that might be where we can fix this, but sort of

make it whole where we can accommodate very explicit situations where you need that time and sort of also allow this to, you know, us to run a school system and provide for education.

[01:01:38] So I'm not clear what you're suggesting the change be then? The change would be, you would just say an employee will be allowed five days for attendance at funerals. And then you say, if you need additional time, please work with your supervisor in order to get that based.

[01:01:55] I think that's a simple thing. And with preference towards, I don't know, preference towards family relationships. But I think, like, because that's the intent is to allow someone enough time to take care of whatever needs to be taken where they're not going to be penalized. And they obviously are taking sick leave, leave without pay.

[01:02:12] But also not having to list out every single potential thing where we're excluding someone. That's what I'm trying to square it there. So, I think, and I'll just bring us back to the conversation we had during the last meeting, and you may not have been here.

[01:02:28] So, one of the questions that I had raised was, why don't we have bereavement leave as a policy that's not included in sick leave?

[01:02:36] We should have, and most organizations actually have a whole entire separate category of leave for bereavement leave that typically does have, I mean, in some places it's honestly just not sufficient, sorry, not a sufficient number of days to even attend a funeral, much less attend to the needs of, as you were talking about, closing out a house and so forth.

[01:03:10] i am not in favor of adding in a first limit of five days and making people come back and ask for more having lost a parent and having going back to work and having my manager ask me if i was all good now we need to give people space to grieve and i i appreciate what we have now in terms of latitude for you know people to take the time that they need in order to grieve and handle the

[01:03:44] logistics and everything that you can barely keep up with I would not be in favor of removing that can I just add some concerns I would have with that as well would be the burden it would then place, one, the supervisor and or principal to, one, track, and two, if we're asking them to verify, we would then need to provide guidance on what they're verifying, who they're verifying with.

[01:04:18] The other piece is, you know, when we don't provide specificity, we are often asked to for guidance purposes. an employee wants to know what they have the ability to ask for.

[01:04:36] They also feel there could be inconsistency in the approach if we don't provide it spelled out. So I do have some concerns with them giving it back to the supervisor. Yes, Mr. Baby. No, and I could appreciate that.

[01:04:52] So I thought of the idea just as a thing. And so at that point, I would say it doesn't make sense to add stepless siblings, I think, based on what we've discussed here. I think this is a very comprehensive list. It fits pretty much every situation, and I don't think we need to make that change. Okay, so I would say, just to go on record, I would be in favor of adding step-siblings and foster siblings.

[01:05:19] I think that we make assumptions about how people who've been in foster care, I know, you know, sometimes people are in multiple homes. They might lose contact, but there are people who've been in foster care who that was the only positive family environment that they experienced in their entire life, and they have absolutely maintained contact with a foster parent and or foster sibling.

[01:05:48] So I'll just put that out there for one final round of thought, and then I think we can move on from that. Okay, so going back then, the other thing is the version in BoardDocs is not the version that you have because some of the changes that you referenced aren't in the version that we got a copy of.

[01:06:23] So when you said that you changed references and added there, for example, that's not reflected in the version I have. Can you confirm on like lines 62 and 63, did you change he/she to they are unable and then they have a medical?

[01:06:51] Yes. Yes, we did. And I apologize. I sent the wrong file to the assistant. But yes, they were changed. Okay. So at this point, I think the only two things that we then have in addition to the changes that you described are on line 25 as discussed with the adding the information about monthly accruals and changing the word anticipated to advanced and then on line 29 changing anticipated

[01:07:22] to advanced does that sound right okay yes with that said I'd like to make a motion to move policy 7712 six sick leave with the discussed changes to line 25 and line 29 forward to the full board as an information item.

[01:07:44] Second. Thank you. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. That motion will pass with all committee members in favor. Thank you.

[01:08:03] And our last action item for this evening is policy 7714, personal leave. And I have personal leave as well. Again, most of the comments were related to either going to a PTO model and/or adding additional days to personal leave.

[01:08:29] We did change to advance, as you had said earlier. Mr. Morse? Can you remind us on line nine of the red-lined copy why we changed the maximum days from five to three?

[01:08:46] Because I originally did the policy with the hope that it was going to be approved in the budget. And when I made the changes, I missed that one.

[01:09:22] So I have two different pages. So there's a front page, policy 7714, page 1. And then there's a page 2. It looks like the line numbers didn't carry over to page 2.

[01:09:38] Okay, that's why I'm confused. Okay. Any other comments? So I think for this one, my question is related to the payout.

[01:09:55] So again, so when we talk about the general provisions for personal leave, we indicate that personal leave is credited and advanced. Is this also accruing monthly? Because if it's not accruing monthly, I wanted to question why we're prorating payouts.

[01:10:17] So that, currently it is not our practice to accrue it. It's simply given up front. The payroll department came and sat down with us and we had a conversation. When we have employees who are starting in February and March, they're getting the same number of personal leave days as somebody who's starting in September.

[01:10:41] And so the suggestion was made that we prorate it so that when that person starts in February, they're not getting three full days. They're getting whatever the appropriate accrual is. And is there a, so if someone were to leave LCPS, is there a payout on the personal leave?

[01:11:12] I'm trying to think the best way to answer this. It is used as part of the calculation to determine whether they are overpaid or underpaid. Yes. Can you say that again?

[01:11:31] So when a 10 or 11 month employee leaves prior to the end of the contract period, Payroll does a reconciliation of the leave they've taken, the amount they've been paid, the amount they've worked, and they either owe us or we owe them.

[01:11:47] And so it's part of that calculation. And we credit them the full three days, or in this case with this change, whatever the total was that was allotted to them based on their start date being later in the year. Yes, and I will confirm that with payroll, but that's my understanding.

[01:12:04] So I think given the fact that we address payouts on the other leave types, we should be addressing that in policy as well to indicate that the employee is eligible to receive a payout of their leave.

[01:12:25] And I guess here's another question just language-wise back on line 12. If personal leave is applied at the beginning and it's not accrued monthly, how is that advanced? just is it really advanced if it's not accruing monthly it is advanced okay even though it's not technically accrued but we're advancing it okay got it so i think i'd like to see language in here

[01:12:54] that consistent with other policy addresses how payouts would work okay i'll work with payroll um based on that would you want to bring it back again in october or do you feel like that's a straightforward enough change to add that language i i think we can bring it forward in october so

[01:13:29] back to us for action again i think so because i think we have to work with payroll um on what that looks like because i'm i'm cautious about using the word payout um because personal leave doesn't roll over um and so i'm not sure a payout is the same type of terminology as what annual leave or sick leave i'm not sure we define it the same way and i think it's a little more complicated and i'm not sure we can pull that language together so yeah i think we ought to

[01:14:04] bring it back that makes sense any that concludes our action items is there any new business uh just one bit of new business in an effort to help clarify occasionally i have done some research and what I found is it varies obviously not more than once per week was a definition 2 to 33% which is I think where where our our favorite Latin

[01:14:42] teacher found her numbers or less than 20% were three of the three of the amounts that I ran across however there was a significant study the meaning of response categories how often is occasionally and this is some research It was done by Pace and Friedlander, and it provides that 32% of the survey thought it was one to two times per year.

[01:15:08] 41% was three to six times per year, and 20% was one to two times per month. So that equates to, let's see, 93% of the population believed it fell somewhere between once or twice a month to once or twice per year.

[01:15:27] So I hope that helps you scope occasionally, and I'll just leave it at that. Thank you. So I appreciate that. I think we need specificity that's not up to interpretation as much as possible.

[01:15:46] I think just hearing that, there's a wide range of ways to interpret. So I know that's coming back for October, and I would encourage Mr. Morse, If you have thoughts more specifically to share them with staff, I know you and I won't be discussing this outside of this room, but I have shared some thoughts with staff in advance regarding 70-30, but I think we've got some additional work to do, so thank you.

[01:16:16] With that, we are adjourned. Thank you.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com