



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Legislative, Audit and Policy Committee Meeting, Thursday, May 30, 2024

Date Thursday, May 30, 2024
Place Loudoun County Public Schools / School Board meeting (see BoardDocs / LCPS-TV)
Length 2h 6m (video)

- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): <https://player.vimeo.com/video/952183244?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.

[00:00:00] Good afternoon. This is April Chandler calling to order the Legislative Audit and Policy Committee meeting for May 30th, 2024. We will begin with public comment. Sign up to make in-person public comments occurred prior to the start of the committee meeting.

[00:00:18] The meeting will be audio recorded and posted in board docs. Today we have six speakers signed up for public comment. We will allow two minutes. The first speaker is Patricia Caldwell-Wilson, followed by David Milam.

[00:00:49] Okay. All righty. Members of the committee, there has been a lot of discussion about collective bargaining.

[00:01:06] As a retired Loudoun educator, I know today needs to be about decision-making. We've been in this process to gain collective bargaining for nearly three years. Tactics such as denying membership access to LEA in schools has been detrimental.

[00:01:23] having a seat at the table is important to educators. The teachers' work environment is their students' learning environment. The decisions you adopt and send forward today will speak volumes to your educators. Are you willing to make the revisions to the LEA prior to prioritized resolution?

[00:01:42] Are you willing to vote each concern up or down? Are we here to support teachers, or are we here to make decisions that will continue the loss of educators, like myself, who left Loudoun after only 14 years because of poor policies and too many years of no pay raises. After teaching in another unionized state before relocating to Virginia 40 years ago, I did not teach my first 19 years in Virginia because there was no union. I'm here today because these meetings are held when teachers are working. They'd love to speak but aren't given the

[00:02:19] opportunity. The resolution is in your hands. What is adopted and moved forward today will either show your support for educators or continue the climate of union busting we are experiencing in Loudoun County Public Schools. Thank you. The next speaker is David Milam followed by Corey Brunet.

[00:02:53] I'm sorry I'm not wearing red today. All my kids went to the University of Michigan so I wear blue and in Michigan, when my wife Bonnie was a teacher there, they did have a union, the Detroit Public Schools, and she was able to participate in collective bargaining for salary and benefits with others.

[00:03:17] I'm a pastor. I preached last Sunday on Leviticus 19, which is famous for love your neighbor as yourself, but it starts with reprove your neighbor when you have a difference, and the reproof is so that you don't have a grudge or become a vengeful.

[00:03:35] So we're supposed to talk, in other words, to one another, not kind of talk past each other, have barriers and buffers between us. Collective bargaining allows for people to talk to one another.

[00:03:51] It allows for teachers to talk to one another. The passage ends with love your neighbor as yourself. I heard Dr. Spence speak to the equity students a couple of Saturdays ago. He said, we are about loving each other, seeing each other, hearing each other, knowing each other.

[00:04:12] I think that very kind of principle that Dr. Spence articulated is the principle that this body of school board members ought to have and embody that sense of letting teachers and staff bargain collectively have their ability to talk to the school board about things that make them great employees and part of this wonderful school system. Thank you very much. Thank you. The next speaker is Corey Brunet followed by Patty

[00:04:48] Nelson. I had my eyes dilated not long ago so I don't have anything to read but I did want to take the time to tell you we've already talked about this that this is an agreement between the employees and the school board the employees and the school board the employees and the school

[00:05:20] board today is a prime example how many staff members are here versus how many educators are here right now. They couldn't come. I got professional leave. I assume the other, the few that are here also did. They can talk to you whenever they want. We cannot. We need collective bargaining. Thank you. Thank you. The next speaker is Patty Nelson, followed by Andrea Weiskopf.

[00:05:55] Hi, I'm Patty Nelson, a longtime resident of Loudoun County. I've been here 32 years. My kids grew up going to Loudoun County schools, and I want to thank you for that. I also want to bring up that regarding collective bargaining for public employees, we are way behind. 47 states had collective bargaining for public employees before Virginia. This is just, it took, I wore out three joints overturning that ban on collective bargaining. And these teachers have waited for

[00:06:34] 33 months to get a resolution through. The waiting, it's too much waiting. We have waited a long time. I'm the Secretary-Treasurer of SEIU Virginia 512, which is Loudoun County, Fairfax County,

Prince William, the City of Richmond, and home care workers around the state. We have been struggling with this in every part of the state. Nobody knows how to do this because it's all brand new for us and the only way to get a fair ordinance for these teachers is to make sure you have teacher voices at the table, that you have LEA voices at the table. When we did the ordinance

[00:07:13] in Loudoun County for general services employees, which we won our vote on March 6th, we had union at the table with the board members and we struggled it out and it's the only way to get a fair playing field. So, enough with the union busting in Loudoun County. Thank you. Thank you. The next

[00:07:38] speaker is Andrea Weiskopf, followed by Sandy Sullivan.

[00:07:55] I took personal leave to be here. For Eisler Dare, LCPS is a job. For Spence, LCPS is a job. He'll probably stick around until his youngest graduates. For Smith, LCPS is a job. He's looking elsewhere. But for most educators, LCPS is more than a job. It is our community. It is our life. For me, LCPS is the children who

[00:08:29] trick-or-treat at my door. For me, LCPS is seeing my neighbor's child run on Claiborne with the Stonebridge cross-country team. For me, LCPS is a colleague turned friend.

[00:08:46] For me, LCPS is telling the cashier at Giant that he's going to rock his AP exams. For me, LCPS is holding a child who disclosed abuse. For me, LCPS is teaching with a former student.

[00:09:05] That is my why. What is Eisler Dare's why? We are LCPS. We belong on that side of the stanchion. Thank you. Black Lives Matter. Thank you.

[00:09:21] Our last speaker is Sandy Sullivan. Two years, eight and a half months. 33 months, 1,008 days ago.

[00:09:38] Let's really move forward with collective bargaining today. This process for Loudoun educators began two years, eight and a half months ago. 33 months ago, 1,008 days ago. The way to honor the work of your educators today is to make the revisions to the resolution that LEA prioritized.

[00:09:57] Today is about decision-making and not just discussion. What we expect to come out of this meeting is revisions to the document, and that moves forward to the full school board. The eight items on our letter to the previous school board, that was a compromise. There were more than 30 egregious items in the resolution that was drafted by Eisler-Dayer, an anti-worker law firm.

[00:10:19] With that said, we cannot move forward without addressing an additional item. Our council told us that we must address this item, non-member representation. We're about to do major work on this document, and this is a union and employee issue and not a leadership and staff issue that we need to address.

[00:10:37] You do not get to say how the union spends our dues dollars. The Janus decision in 2018 made it so that workers did not have to join the union and made it so workers would not be compelled to pay dues.

[00:10:54] The union cannot, the union should not be compelled to represent non-members in grievances. Thank you. All right, we're going to move on to item 3.1, approval of the March 21st, 2024 draft minutes.

[00:11:17] Could I please have a motion to approve the meeting minutes? So moved. Thank you, Ms. Donahue, and may I please have a second? Second. Motion was made by Ms. Donahue and seconded by Ms. Chernoff.

[00:11:36] All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. The motion passes unanimously with all committee members present for the vote. We will now move on to item 4.1, VSBA positions. Dr. Smith will present.

[00:11:53] Dr. Smith, the floor is yours. Thank you, Chair Chandler, board members. At the March meeting of the LAMP committee meeting, four proposals were presented by board members for consideration as statewide legislative positions for the Virginia School Boards Association. One proposal on literacy audits was presented by Ms. Mansfield.

[00:12:13] One proposal on firearm safe storage was presented by Ms. Donahue. One proposal on teacher training was presented by Ms. Chernoff. And one proposal on alternate assessment was presented also by Ms. Chernoff. Each of these proposals are presented in board docs today.

[00:12:29] Since our March meeting, House Bill 1076 was passed by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor. This bill requires the Board of Education to permit school boards to administer during the 2024 to 2026 school years, assessments as alternatives to our through year growth assessments, also known as the Virginia growth assessments, established by the board.

[00:12:50] And this provided that any such alternative assessment is aligned with the standards of learning. And this bill achieves the intent of Ms. Chernoff's alternate assessment proposal. So staff would recommend that you consider these proposals for action today and send them to the full school board.

[00:13:06] They are due to the Virginia School Boards Association for their consideration by June 17th, 2024. And so due to the timing, we ask that you maybe consider that in terms of your actions today, but we're happy to answer any questions regarding these proposals or the process you may have.

[00:13:24] - Thank you, Dr. Smith. Are there any questions or comments from the committee? - Yes, Mr. Smith. - Thank you, Dr. Smith, for the overview. I had put that proposal in place about the bill in terms of the MAP assessment versus the growth assessment as a way to kind of look at evaluating the true value of doing both.

[00:13:43] And I wanted to keep that in there at first because I wasn't sure if the bill was going to be signed. We have more information now, and with that guidance from VDOE, we will be able to move forward with those decisions. So I will be, I would like to, I will be making a motion to get rid of that, as well as I agree with Dr. Smith that we should put this on consent so that we meet the deadline and that our positions can be considered.

[00:14:07] So there's no other discussion. I can thank the motion. Is there any other discussion? No, thank you. All right. Seeing no further discussion, would you please make your motion? I move to amend the VSBA LCPS proposals by removing the proposal submitted on state testing and then also moving that this goes to consent.

[00:14:31] Second. Thank you. The motion was made by Ms. Chernoff and seconded by Ms. Donahue. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Aye. The motion passes unanimously with all committee members present. Thank you.

[00:14:51] Next up, we will move to our information items. We will start with item 5.1, Office of the Auditor General, Fiscal Year 25 Audit Plan. Mr. Ahmad Woods, Auditor General, will be presenting. Mr. Woods, the floor is yours. Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Chandler, members of the committee. Today, I'm sharing with you OAG's Fiscal Year 2025 Audit Universe.

[00:15:17] The audit universe consists of potential audit activities the OAG will perform during the fiscal year 2025. In the universe are carryover audits. These are audits approved for the FY24 audit plan carried over to the FY25 audit plan.

[00:15:35] These items will also need to be approved or re-approved to be included into the FY25 audit plan. Below are the fiscal year 2025 audit universe.

[00:15:51] In total, there are seven audits to choose from. This pool of audits represents new audit topics for the committee. The committee will have the opportunity to approve of at our next L.A. and P. Committee meeting. Of these seven items, I am recommending that you select three to four audit topics for approval at our next meeting.

[00:16:13] The universe was developed with input from stakeholders of different areas within the LCPS environment, which included, but not limited to, board members, members of the cabinet, senior staff, and principals. Thank you, members of the committee, and I welcome any questions you may have.

[00:16:31] Thank you, Mr. Woods. Are there any questions or comments from the committee? Ms. Chernoff? Thank you, Mr. Woods. It was great meeting with you and kind of unpacking some of this in more detail. I know next time we're going to vote, and since there's many listed here and we're being asked to consider up to possibly three, maybe four, it seems like three might be more reasonable given the timelines from this year, I just want to put in a personal plug since I have my colleagues here and I can speak to you at this time.

[00:17:05] I really would like to look at the school board and staff communication. I think we're also going to be talking about staff aides. I think as a new board, we are establishing a lot of those routines and learning a lot. And I do think that maybe having an audit to look at how that flow of communication, how the data is transferred and how we can receive all of that, I know I would personally find beneficial.

[00:17:28] So I'm going to put a plug for that one. And also I'm going to put a plug for transportation. I don't think this will come as any surprise to anyone in terms of how I've been talking a lot about start times and buses and things like that. So I think this will fit in nicely with that work that we're also doing to help give more clarity and fine-tune solutions for our transportation department.

[00:17:49] So I'm pretty open to a dialogue about it, but I just wanted to make sure that I went on record with what I would prioritize myself. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. Any further discussion? No? Oh, well, thank you. On that note, I'll just say I also feel very drawn to the transportation audit.

[00:18:11] I'm also very curious about the Jefferson contracts and would like to learn more, but it seems to me that that would be a great way to make sure that we're using our policies efficiently. So with that, thank you so much. And we will move on to item 5.2, policy 2610, Loudoun County School Board aides.

[00:18:34] Dr. Smith will present. Dr. Smith, the floor is yours. All right. Thank you, Chair Chandler. Policy 2610, Loudoun County School Board aides. As a part of the FY24 Loudoun County School Board approved budget, an allocation for board aides was provided to each board member.

[00:18:51] As board aides have been hired, there's been a need to update and revise policy 2610 to align with LCPS current practices and responsibilities. The red line policy and board docs include several additions and clarifications. You'll notice that we've referenced several other school board policies throughout the document and policies such as policy 1030, policy 1035, and policy 7566. The most substantial update to this policy is in section B, job duties. As we've expanded on the job duties of the board aid, specifically regarding representation in official capacity and communication in meetings.

[00:19:28] Additional updates have been made to this section regarding confidentiality to ensure that there is clarity about what can and cannot be shared. This policy revision is presented as an information item today and we're happy to answer any questions you may have. - Thank you, Dr. Smith. I have to say I'm certainly not the only person at this point who has served as a board aide and a school board member, but this policy is near and dear to my heart.

[00:19:54] I think it's important. I know having had that experience myself, I felt a great sense of responsibility to set aside my own activism in terms of what happened at the school board level and to represent the person that I was serving in that capacity at the time.

[00:20:13] And I think it solidified my own desire to run for school board, but while I was a staff aide, it was very important to me to put my school board members' needs first. So I'm very excited to have this conversation with my colleagues on this committee and with the full school board.

[00:20:33] Are there any other comments or questions? Yes. Ms. Donahue, please. Thank you, Chair Chandler. Thank you, Dr. Smith, for your presentation, for presenting this policy revision.

[00:20:50] I did have a few questions. So my first question is with regard to under what circumstances or what the process would be if circumstances arise that would make it appropriate for an aide to be dismissed.

[00:21:10] In the current draft, it appears that that is left to the discretion of the member to whom the aide is serving. And I wanted to confirm if my read of that is correct.

[00:21:28] That is correct, and that's how it reads, that it's at the discretion of the board member they are serving. There is language in here as well that the board aid also represents the board member in terms of that. And so if there's concerns from other board members around a particular aid, then they would need to address that with their board member.

[00:21:47] And so it does address that as well in terms of the expectations around policy 1030, code of conduct, policy 1035 around school board protocols, violations, and norms. And so just the expectation that our board aides are adhering to those policies as well because they are representing their respective board members.

[00:22:10] Thank you. But to be clear, for my purposes, if an aide were to commit some transgression in violation of our policies or of their NDA, if that specific member did not agree with a potential recommendation to terminate the aide, is that the end of the conversation?

[00:22:32] Is there any other recourse? So beginning on lines 219, it is, I'm going to get the exact letter and number for you if you give me a second, section E under number 4D. And it talks about while the board at large may not have oversight over individual board aides per policy 1035, board members could face disciplinary actions.

[00:22:55] And it gives you some examples there for the acts of their respective board aides conduct. So that's where that's captured, it's captured there. Okay, and thank you. Going along with that, you mentioned the references to policies, I believe, 1030 and 1035.

[00:23:13] I believe the language currently in this is that aides should, quote, be aware of those policies. In your mind, what is that conveying? Are aides subject to, required to follow these policies in as much as, obviously, some terms are only going to be applicable to members themselves?

[00:23:33] Ms. Donahue, that is my understanding. I'd like to ask Division Council for any interpretation. they may have in terms of being aware, but it's my understanding that we'd say they need to be aware of it. It's also because they are representing their board members and what are the expectations for board members and so representing them in that capacity that they should be aware of the expectations of the board members and thus the aides.

[00:23:52] But I'd like to ask for clarification from Division Council. - Thank you, Dr. Smith. Yes, I believe that's the intent and purpose of including that. - Thank you, Mr. Allen and Dr. Smith. So aides are not, as of right now, aides are not required to follow those policies, to adhere to those policies.

[00:24:18] - Thank you, Ms. Donahue. Pursuant to the plain language, that's a reasonable interpretation, but if there's a lack of clarity or if the committee so chooses to provide clarity around that, it could so choose. - Okay, thank you, Mr. Allen. For consideration for my colleagues, I would support some changes, additional changes to this policy to make it more clear that the provisions policies 1030 and 1035 that could apply to board aides that the aids be required

[00:24:48] and expected to follow those policies I do have two other questions if the chair will indulge me thank you so my first question is with regard to leave and I apologize that I did not flag specific line numbers here but I noted that there is one provision that states something about um i believe getting permission from the member if the aid is going to take leave and but then in the next provision states there is no personal leave

[00:25:28] so can you can you please clarify how those provisions work together do you can you tell me which section you're referring to if you don't mind i i have one pulled up i just want to make sure i am i neglected to write down page numbers so i'm not sure either i'm line 120 and 124 Thank you, Ms. Catherine.

[00:25:54] - Yes, and so, Ms. Donahue, in reference to this, the intent here is that board aides really serve in terms of hourly pay, and so they're only paid for which time that they work, and so they don't receive leave, and I wanna read this again in case there's, if there needs any clarity to make sure that is clear, but they are paid hourly for the work that they serve, and as you know, some weeks it might be 10 hours, some weeks it might be 40, anywhere in between, and so it's really only paid for the hours in which they work, and they do not have leave.

[00:26:26] So if you feel like we need to be more clear in that policy and make changes, happy to do that. Thank you, Dr. Smith. I gather that was likely the intent here. I just was confused by those three words, and leave taken after hours worked. My last question is with regard to political activity.

[00:26:46] There's a prohibition in here, which I do believe is appropriate, restricting board aides from engaging in political activity while they are on member time. I don't recall seeing a definition of political activity in this policy.

[00:27:04] I realize we do define it in other policies, so I was wondering about that. So I think in terms of that, if we feel like there needs to be a separate definition here, we can do that.

[00:27:21] We can also make a reference to where it is defined in other policies, if that would be helpful. But again, we want to make sure everybody's clear on this. We're happy to take your direction on that. If you'd like a separate definition or for us to pull it from another place or make a reference, we're happy to do that. I guess my biggest question with regard to that is I believe in other policies, LCPS defines political activity specifically as advocating for or against a specific political candidate, political party, a person running in an election or a matter that is before or subject to an election for a referendum or other matter.

[00:27:58] And so in my mind, I am curious, would that extend to matters that may come before the board that are of public focus and disagreement that the board may have to decide on?

[00:28:17] I guess, for example, if the board has a vote on policy 80-40 coming up, is it acceptable for board aides to be commenting on board time for or against that policy or any other policy that the board is facing a decision about?

[00:28:40] My presumption is right now, if we go with the traditional definition of political activity, that it would not encompass such circumstances. So I guess that's my – the question that I am throwing out there is do my co-members think that it needs to be broader, if it is legally permitted to be broader, Mr. Allen?

[00:29:05] Yes, I would start with that question. Under the way the policy is currently written, does it include perhaps even organizing activities or speakers? And if it – well, I guess we'll start with that. Thank you.

[00:29:20] As I understand it, you know, board members are politically elected. This contemplates more so, as I understand it, kind of campaigning and those types of political activities. I mean, school board members are entitled to have political views and opinions and are elected on those.

[00:29:41] And so to quash that, I think, would be legally problematic for either a board member or their board aide who is working in tandem with that board member. Thank you. Ms. Donahue, do you have any further questions? I do. Thank you. sure thank you um i understand that with the entire board now employing at least one or more aids i i do appreciate the need to kind of clarify the roles and the process related as i spoke about you know school board communication i think this was the next step too as this is not new new but

[00:30:16] it is relatively new um and to really understand especially those boundaries between the board member and their aide, but also the board member and the staff, and kind of navigate all of that in terms of what is, you know, a perceivable request, how can we get the communication in terms of data in a timely manner, but we also want to ensure that the board is not inundating staff with data requests, and honestly, like, when I read this policy, I am a little concerned that we are crossing over into sort of a question of professionalism

[00:30:54] in terms of trust and maybe the policy is built to make sure that those boundaries are very clear and I'm okay with establishing some of that but I do think some of these lines are fuzzy and that we need to kind of hash this out and I think Ms. Donahue brought up a one of the points that I was also going to talk about which is this idea of can you still be you in the public and have your views and participate in the local government process as a board aid?

[00:31:23] Or are we actually asking them to not do that? And I heard you say, Ms. Chandler, that you took upon the view that you put that on the back burner. But is that what we're, I feel like that was maybe a personal choice at the time. Are we going to, I guess I'm asking my colleagues, are we going to ask our board aides to do that?

[00:31:43] Because they are parents in our community. And it talks about in policy 1035, section A3, it talks about board members, and it's about school board, maintaining awareness of different roles that school board members play, such as board members, citizen, parent. I mean, I'm on a PTA, but I'm also a school board member, and there are boundaries there.

[00:32:02] And I understand why those boundaries exist, but I'm still allowed to be on my PTA. So I guess I have some, I take a little bit of concern and issue with mandating through policy that they cannot participate in local government when it affects them.

[00:32:19] A lot of our aides are involved in school board happenings because they're here at every meeting with us. They obviously have an interest in the work that we do. So I would like to kind of flush that out a little bit more, especially as it pertains to Section B to Line J, or J, not Line J, but J, and ask that question, do we believe that being a board aide means you forsake your ability to participate in the local government and to use your First Amendment rights to participate if they personally disagree, even with you or with other board members?

[00:32:54] I think it's a gray area, and I would appreciate especially your insight, Ms. Chandler, having walked the path. And I'll just add one more thing, because there's one more thing I want you to elaborate on, is in terms of the political nature is, you know, you did campaign while you were a staff aide.

[00:33:10] And so how do we define those boundaries, not only just participating in meetings, but where do we draw those lines? because is coming to a board meeting, is that a campaign activity? If you then use that in your campaign materials to report out what the board talked about, that's public information, but you're also reporting to a staff aide.

[00:33:29] So I'm not trying to make it too, too complicated, but I also think we could draw some lines that maybe we're not comfortable with if we set these things in policy. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. It is a very interesting question, and I would really look forward to having a fuller discussion about it, perhaps as we move towards action.

[00:33:49] I will say perhaps an easy line of delineation would be around whether or not you're getting paid while you're here, especially if you're participating in activism. And I would say that, I mean, are you going to speak?

[00:34:04] I personally chose, I did participate in public comment quite a lot from 2017 until I was hired to serve as a staff aide. And even while I was on the campaign trail, I never spoke at public comment because I was asked as part of my job duties to be at the school board meeting, to observe the school board meeting, to take notes and to understand exactly what was happening so I could better serve the community.

[00:34:30] In terms of my own experience, I certainly acknowledge that I was currently serving as the school board aide, but beyond that, that factual piece of it, I don't believe it was a significant part of my campaign, and I definitely don't think even there were any campaign materials that would have been taken

while I was on the clock, so to speak. That feels like a good delineation to me. Of course, I would be happy to hear from staff if you have any other thoughts.

[00:35:05] Yeah, thanks for that clarification, Ms. Chandler. I think that's how we've interpreted it as well. It's about when you're getting paid for the work, when you're receiving compensation, that you are on LCPS time and that, so you're completing LCPS activities and work.

[00:35:21] And so that would not include the restricted and prohibited activities that shared in this policy. And so we would want to make sure that's clear, but that's how we've interpreted as well as when you are receiving payment for hours worked during that time.

[00:35:38] - Mr. Allen, do you have anything to add? - Thank you, Madam Chair. That's my understanding as well. I would, in respect to letter J that Ms. Chernoff pointed out, it does say either publicly or privately.

[00:35:54] So I think if there are fuzzy lines that need to be clarified for your consideration. And I think the spirit of that was to really preserve the school board's decision making and its reputation.

[00:36:11] And it's a decision for this committee and the board at large, whether they would like to retain the language or the spirit of the language that applies to school board members to refrain from conduct that may interfere with the school board's operations or decisions.

[00:36:30] - Thank you. - Let's see, Mr. Ruff? - I just wanted to respond to that. I appreciate that and I do think it deserves more conversation specifically when we're thinking about participating because I know that that is a concern and I do think that as a board member, like, we should definitely know if our aid is going to participate in that. I think that that's up to you. You need to have that communication with your aid. But I think it is also important that if the board member feels okay, and there's something on the table that affects an aid, that

[00:37:06] we need to be very clear if that is not allowed or is, and what we're comfortable with. Because to me, that just, it sort of feels like an infringement on your rights as a public member of the community. And we didn't set that out in the beginning when we hired them. So now we're putting this in place and it feels like retroactively, we're going to say, no, you can't speak at public comment. You can't have an opinion personally because you serve me. That feels retroactively unfair to me. So that's, I'm just putting that on the table. I have some concerns and I'll probably put forth some amendments and would be happy to share those via staff to make

[00:37:43] sure that we can get that in place. And then I have one other question. I don't know if anyone wanted to respond to that. I have one other question. Can you just, Wes, can you, Mr. Allen, sorry. Oops. Mr. Allen, can you please clarify why there is such a need to outline the confidentiality parts of this when they do sign an NDA? Is that not duplicative language?

[00:38:09] - Thank you, Mr. Chernoff. That's a great question. From my review of the NDA and this policy, there did seem to be discrepancies, and so we are trying to reconcile in policy, and then that's why there's a clarification that any time we do freshen up this policy, the school board freshens up this policy, then the NDA should, to the extent there's any material updates to this policy, be consistent with the NDA.

[00:38:36] And in terms of the language regarding confidentiality the treatment of confidential information, they were currently at odds, and so that's why there's more specified language here to bring harmony to those discrepancies. Okay, I may need further clarification with you on that at a later time. I

just want to make sure that I'm kind of still confused about the need to sign an NDA, but then to also have this basically says they can't have confidential information. That's kind of the way that I read it, so just feel like that's a little a little bit contradictory,

[00:39:14] but maybe that's what you're saying. - Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. That's precisely what I was saying. The policy 2610 and its current iteration is at odds with the NDA, and so the current policy 2610 indicates that school board aides are not entitled to have confidential information at all currently, but that's subject to your decision making if you want to amend that bring it closer in line with what's currently in the NDAs. So happy to have you all consider that.

[00:39:52] Yeah, I'd like those to be aligned. I think that that makes more sense. And then if we keep the clause in there about when the NDA is updated, that the policy follows the NDA, that would be my recommendation. That seems to make more sense. But again, we can continue to have those conversations. And overall, I just want to make sure that we're maintaining professional respect of aides and trusting them and trusting board members to make sure that they have that communication and oversight because they do report to us.

[00:40:22] They don't report to staff. There are employees, not LCPS employees, as the policy states. So I don't know how we want to proceed, if we want to continue to have this as information and present our amendments at the next meeting or if we should do that in between. I would be open to what the chair would direct us on that.

[00:40:41] Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. Ms. Donahue, do you have any more questions or comments? Thank you, Chair Chandler. I did want to follow up briefly. I appreciate Ms. Chernoff raising that issue because it's not something that had jumped out to me when I was reading the policy so much.

[00:40:57] But to the extent that it's clear board aides are not permitted to have access to specific categories of information that a layperson might consider confidential, such as attorney-client communications or private personnel matters, I think that's very clear and agreed upon.

[00:41:17] And the gray area would come into instances that don't fall into those categories, such as if my board aide knows how I'm going to vote on a particular matter that's coming before the school board or the committee, or someone else's board aide knows how I'm going to vote on a particular matter that's going to come before the committee or before the full board.

[00:41:44] I would not feel comfortable ever with the possibility that that person might disclose that information without my knowledge or approval. So I agree with you that we need to make sure that we're being very clear in the language of the policy and the NDA about what information our aides are permitted to have access to and what we are expecting them, while they may have access to it, to not disclose beyond their conversations directly with their own members.

[00:42:14] Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Donahue. I guess just as we wrap up this conversation, I would like to reflect back on some of the ways this policy has changed since it was created, I believe, in 2020. I do believe at some point in the past the school board had the right to approve whether or not a school board aide was hired.

[00:42:38] I believe that the entire board had the ability to vote on the school board aides. Does anybody have any information about that? That was before my time. I can't speak to it. I'm sorry. I was worried about that.

[00:42:54] I also believe that when I was hired, I was an LCPS employee. I definitely had to serve as, I didn't qualify for insurance, but certainly didn't have any hesitations about signing an NDA.

[00:43:11] That felt like a very important piece in terms of trust between a member and an aide. I believe a great deal of the, when we started to talk as a school board this year, the hope was to put more information into the policy, or to, we started talking about having, you know, standards of norms, but I definitely got the sense that many of the school board members would feel more comfortable having something codified into policy. So from that perspective,

[00:43:50] I definitely think it warrants more conversation. And if you would like to do a straw poll, thumbs up, just to have it come back for information next time, I would be happy to do that. So Ms. Donahue, would you like to discuss?

[00:44:09] Certainly to your discretion, Chair Chandler, and I would not want to be the one stating in the way if that's the majority wish. My suggestion would be an agreeing that it is, we need to take our time and get this right. We obviously have some issues to talk through however we know that we have some issues to talk through we've had some good discussions here already this is something that as we are about to go into the summer break when the board will be meeting less regularly between now and September I'm a little bit reluctant to say well let's put it on for information again because we could

[00:44:46] put it on for action come prepared with our amendments proposals be prepared to discuss and if at the end of that discussion we still feel like we are not in a position to send this to the full board we could choose I believe and please correct me staff if I'm wrong but we could choose to rather than vote on whether sending it to the board or not we could choose to put it on for the next committee meeting instead well this doesn't happen very often but you may have flipped my perspective I'm sure not very willing to yes absolutely and then um

[00:45:22] We can ironically work through our aides and staff to make sure that we are all informed about the different amendments because it would be nice to have that work kind of ready to go. But I can be amenable to that also and to keep the ball moving. Well, thank you both for that lively discussion.

[00:45:39] And seeing no further objection, policy 2610 will come back as an action item next month. With that, now we will move on to our discussion items, starting with item 6.1, the 2025 legislative program.

[00:45:56] I'll actually be presenting today. Each year, LCPS and the Loudoun County School Board develops and adopts the Loudoun County School Board legislative program. The legislative program allows us to share the board's legislative goals and budgetary priorities with our elected officials at the Commonwealth and federal levels.

[00:46:17] As you can see from our legislative activities timeline, we are bringing this forward to provide an overview of the process that we will use to develop our 2025 legislative program.

[00:46:35] As the chair of the committee, I will be reaching out to all of our school board members to seek ideas on new positions and feedback on our previous positions. And this will continue as an information item at our June committee meeting.

[00:46:51] Are there any discussion or questions? Yes, Ms. Scherner. I just wanted to thank you for your work on this. I'm really looking forward to this process. We were right the day, I think, after two days after

being elected, we were invited to the legislative breakfast, so this kind of feels full circle to kind of continue on this journey.

[00:47:11] So thank you for your continued work and your communication through staff to make sure that we know what's coming up and what's going on on the Hill. So I really appreciate it and looking forward to getting there. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. Ms. Donahue, do you have any questions or concerns?

[00:47:29] No, thank you. All right. Well, thank you so much. The last item on our agenda today for discussion is item 6.02, the Joint Committee on Collective Bargaining. Ms. Donahue will present.

[00:47:45] Ms. Donahue, you have the floor. Thank you very much, Chair Chandler. So I was privileged to be selected as the chair of the Joint Committee on Collective Bargaining. And I participated in that with eight other individuals that this committee selected.

[00:48:05] We met, we had two fairly lengthy substantive meetings. The recordings of those meetings, the audio recordings of those meetings are available. The minutes are available. I wrote a summary of what I felt were the most important salient points to come out of those meetings.

[00:48:28] I submitted as a report to my co-members of this committee, and that is available on board docs. That being said, I went into the process of the joint committee in the hope of being able to come to some consensus viewpoints on the...

[00:48:49] So our mandate, as you certainly know, was to discuss the eight issues raised by the LEA in their December 7th letter to the full school board regarding the draft resolution on collective bargaining. My hope going into the committee was that we would be able to come to some joint consensus, universal agreements about how to address those different points.

[00:49:12] We were not able to do that, and that was a source of disappointment for me and for other people. That being said, I am still choosing to view the committee's time as successful for two reasons, primarily. The first, because, as was alluded to by some of our speakers, LEA wanted to have a seat at the table and have a better opportunity to relate their concerns to the school board and to the community than what is afforded through the public comment process.

[00:49:40] And this afforded them the opportunity to do that. And secondly, I felt that it was extremely helpful for me and hopefully for others that we were able to substantially flesh out why these issues were of such significant importance and why the people who held the positions that they do held those positions, the reasons for them. We were able to talk through those in a way that was simply not possible in LEA's letter, certainly identified those eight issues that they had concerns over, but there's not room in that letter to have eight hours of discussion about why those

[00:50:19] issues matter. So for me, I found it very useful to have those conversations to really get in the weeds about why they all matter. So that's what happened. We had our eight hours of meetings. We did not come to any universal consensus positions about the eight issues, but we did. I felt that over the course of those discussions, we crystallized the positions and had good discussions

[00:50:54] about the reasons pro and con the different sides of those different positions so we are now hereby returning consideration of the draft resolution back to this committee for further steps um thank you miss donahue um i would like to take a moment to thank you specifically for spearheading this effort

um i know um it may not have reached a universal consensus or perhaps even been a comfortable process.

[00:51:27] But I definitely appreciate the work that you did as chair of the committee, and I especially appreciated your report. It was very helpful to me in terms of better understanding exactly what happened. I'm sorry, Madam Chair, if I could add one other thing. I had stated at the conclusion of our last meeting of the joint committee that my intention was to draft a summary and then circulate it among the other joint committee members for their review and input as to the content and I was simply not able to complete an initial draft

[00:52:00] in insufficient time ahead of time to be able to circulate it and so the views in that report are mine and mine alone and I do apologize to my fellow committee members that I was not able to follow through on my intent to have it be more from the actual joint committee rather than just from me. Well, thank you for that clarification. Like I said, I do believe on this side of the process, after having many, many, many conversations over the last few weeks,

[00:52:33] conversations in the community with LEA members, with senior staff, with other members of the committee, that it might not have been possible for us to get to this point of clarity, although perhaps we don't have universal consensus, I am heartened to see that my perspective from my own conversations is that we've grown closer in understanding, and I just wanted to thank you again for your leadership and hard work, and also to thank each member of the committee and each member of the division leadership and each member of the LEA leadership

[00:53:11] for investing their time in this process. I know it hasn't been an easy process, but that said, we all know that change is hard. This is really a new process, it's a new process for all Virginians, and it is my hope as we continue to do this work that we'll grow together.

[00:53:31] We have longstanding relationships in the community, and I know that we'll be able to rely on each other and have that trust as we move forward in this process. So with that, my hope for this committee meeting is to assess the committee's position on the best ways to move forward, and I'll look forward to hearing from my colleagues on the committee for their perspectives. Before we dive in, I just wanted to say a few things, too, in summary, because we've put a lot of work in on this end, and I've thought long and hard about this

[00:54:08] conversation that we're about to have. In preparation, I have attended both joint sessions and listened, as well as engaged all the members of the panel separately to gain further insight into where we can potentially go next. Except for you.

[00:54:23] Legally, I can't talk to her. Very true. Also, you didn't legally talk to me. I didn't, but you weren't on it. I wasn't on the committee, but you didn't have any conversations. Yes, good clarification, Ms. Donahue. I appreciate the oversight. Like Ms. Donahue, I was disappointed with LEA's decision to walk away from the joint committee and opportunity for a mediator.

[00:54:43] As a member of this LAP committee, when I supported the joint meeting with my vote, It was my understanding that the mediator recommendations would be the outcome. When the last board approved collective bargaining and then subsequently handed the process over to us to complete, I met with LEA and talked about the potential for a joint committee.

[00:55:03] My understanding at that time was that this was a way for LEA to have a seat at the table to discuss the proposed resolution and their recommended changes and work towards a compromise. I voted to support that effort, even though LEA may or may not end up being the elected union. I felt that their work at the time they had invested to get to that point was very valuable and deserved that seat at the table.

[00:55:26] So when the joint committee ended with LEA stating that they had already compromised to get to the eight items in this letter, I felt a little discouraged because I was under the impression that I was supporting a conversation in good faith to work towards compromise. In light of this result, it is now up to us, this committee and eventually the full board, to make the best decisions for all stakeholders involved.

[00:55:47] My goal is simple moving forward. We must be in partnership together. Partnership requires give and take. It also implies that we presume the best in one another. That is where I want to land. One of the largest pieces of feedback I hear concerning union negotiating is that it can turn into an all or nothing stalemate and then nobody wins.

[00:56:08] Call me an idealist, but I think we have an opportunity to do better than that going forward. As a constant supporter of educators and as one myself, I can speak with confidence that we value setting a good example for our students, and we want to represent our profession and LCPS well.

[00:56:24] We teach our students to work together every day. We have a unique opportunity to be that example through this process, so let's embrace it. The suggestions and compromises I will propose come from a place of wanting what is best for all of LCPS. We have to keep our purpose in mind, and that is our students and supporting them.

[00:56:44] That is my highest priority, and it would go well for us to partner together as a division, as a potential union representative, and as a school board, because we all have skin in this game, and that is to provide the absolute best for our kids. We must never lose sight of that goal.

[00:57:00] So I come today open and ready to discuss, and I look forward to finding our new path together as a committee and then as a full board. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. Let's see, Ms. Donahue, do you have any further comments? Thank you, Chair Chandler. I just wanted to say that while Ms. Chernoff correctly stated that I was disappointed in the outcome of the joint committee in that we did not reach any universal consensus positions, I feel that I must clarify that I do not share the characterization that Ms. Chernoff stated of LEA walking away from the table.

[00:57:41] Apologies and totally understand. Thank you, friends. So we have the ability to make some decisions today in terms of the best way to move forward. Would anyone have a proposal or a suggestion?

[00:57:59] Ms. Donahue? Thank you, Chair Chandler. I struggled with what I thought would be the best way to move forward at this juncture. I absolutely think it's worthwhile for us to talk through the issues. However, as I have learned from recent personal experience, it is easy to get sidetracked or go down rabbit holes while talking about these issues.

[00:58:25] As you know, if you watched or listened to the meetings, we spent easily and more than a single hour on a single topic at many times, which again, I don't mean to suggest that if we were to do that here, it would be a waste of time.

[00:58:41] But I am also mindful that there are five members of the full school board who have not had any part of this process yet. Dr. Rashid was on the joint committee with me, and obviously the two of you

are now here for this conversation. And while I certainly would not have any objection to discussing each of the eight issues and doing straw polls or even doing votes on positions to take, I must say that I anticipate that we will be rehashing this again, which may not be helpful as far as what do we do now today in this meeting.

[00:59:23] Thank you, Ms. Donahue. Ms. Scherner? i'm ready to work through the eight points and you know we've i know i believe all of us have met with lea and and with staff and i'm i've i'm ready so i i would like us to work through the eight items i my anticipation is that we've closed a lot of those loops that's my hope is that we like you said missed on here we've crystallized i think it was you or was it you whoever said that beautiful word crystallized where the positions are i i have a very clear understanding of where everybody kind of lands, and I think it's time to work through the eight

[01:00:00] items, and I think it's our responsibility as committee members to make adjustments and amendments to the resolution and then present why and how we got there to our full board members. I would like to see us embark on that process in the next hour. That would be my recommendation. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. I would say I am in agreement. I also feel ready. I feel like I've gotten certainly a better sense from all of the conversations that I've had over the last couple weeks of many of the parties in process of their perspectives and

[01:00:38] I certainly feel like I've solidified my own position on many of these issues and I'm looking, I think it's important for us to use the process that we have in place to put something forward and I also will refer back to what I heard in public comment. I do feel that two years and eight and a half months is a long time and would like to move on to the next stage if we can get to that place today to at least move it forward. Sure. Ms. Chernoff? As teachers

[01:01:14] often do, we set timers. So I don't know if Ms. Donnie was worried about rabbit holes and discussions. Maybe to use our time well, we could set a goal and have a timer to kind of keep us honest and when the timer goes off maybe say are we at a good place to kind of move forward or not I'm not sure if that's something we really want to get to a micromanaging level but it may help facilitate the conversation well I do have it I do have a timer right here so I say we give it a go it works for teachers it works for us how much time do we we have a good let's see we're going

[01:01:54] go through the points we have 55 minutes one five minutes eight minutes seven minutes so right let's go i mean i'm i was ela guys literacy not math okay okay now um as a point of clarification um since this is currently a discussion we would need a motion um to suspend the rules to move forward i believe in order to make this um to take this item up and and actually work on

[01:02:29] it today, so we would need to, someone would need to make a motion to make this an action item. Madam Chair, just to, it's within your discretion where the items fall within. It's only when it's an information to action, which you would need to suspend if you were kind of jumping up to, making this an action item at this time, but just to discuss it further.

[01:02:56] We can have any discussions that we want to have. And then is there any format or structure that we need to hold in mind as we get close to the end of the time? If it was the committee's leisure to make this an action item, let's say at that juncture, you would want to move.

[01:03:19] If that's kind of the anticipation of this committee, you could suspend the rules now to move this from a discussion item to action item. But I don't see that you need to take any suspension of the rules

to make a discussion chat information, if that helps. Okay. Thanks for that clarification.

[01:03:36] On that point, I say we dive in. I'm going to set the timer for seven minutes. I would like to know, my thought would be to go in line item order, but I'm open to other suggestions. Okay.

[01:03:52] Sure. All right. So in terms of the points that we have, starting on line 92, I noticed in one of the the drafts, there was a request to move the comma. Would anyone like to jump into the discussion there? Yes, Ms. Donahue. Thank you, Chair Chandler. Yes, the third, the number three in LEA's letter to the board dealt with the definition of confidential employees, which appears in the

[01:04:29] draft resolution at lines 92 through 104. And the significance of this definition comes into play because confidential employees are not eligible to participate in unions. So employees who fall under this definition of confidential are excluded from the union process. The LEA had proposed

[01:04:55] removing lines 101 through 103 as those lines specify all employees within the departments of HRTD, Business and Financial Services, and the Department of Digital Innovation as being confidential. There was, I believe, universal agreement that some employees are confidential and may appropriately be excluded from the ability to access or participate in unions.

[01:05:33] My understanding is that the point of disagreement was how expansive that definition should be. And there was a proposal to simply, at line 92, wherein the definition of confidential employee states an employee whose job duties require access to confidential, comma, budgetary or fiscal information, comma, et cetera, the suggestion was to remove the comma after confidential so that confidential then becomes a modifier of the other types of information rather than a standalone category of information.

[01:06:17] Thank you, Ms. Donahue. Ms. Chernoff, do you have any discussion on this point? That was my understanding as well, was to take it away from being a category, but to make sure that if there are people in those, I'm just clarifying, if there are people in those categories that do not have access to confidential information, that they would be exempt or be able to participate. I will just defer to legal and make sure that that can be sussed out through

[01:06:49] the removal of that comma. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. I don't think that it, as a practical matter, can. I don't think that's kind of the panacea that's going to address, you know, this concern. It's certainly within your discretion. I know other divisions have done it, at least one, but I know others who have kept that comma in because it is subject, still subject to debate if it's a modifier or not. So it's not necessarily a legal matter, but it doesn't provide the clarity or the resolution that I think addresses the spirit of this concern. But perhaps, I mean,

[01:07:29] Through your discussions, there's other resolutions to address that. Ms. Donoghue. Thank you, Chair Chandler. The suggestion regarding the removal of the comma was one that was made during the pendency of our discussions.

[01:07:45] The original proposal by the LEA, as I mentioned, was to delete those three lines because that is in the part of the definition of confidential employees where there is a definition. Confidential employees mean employees whose job duties require access to varying categories of information.

[01:08:07] And then it goes on to state confidential employees include but are not limited to employees who work in or for this very list of divisions. I don't personally have strong feelings about the comma. I do

have strong feelings that I support removing those three categorical, those three categories of employees on lines 101 through 103.

[01:08:35] Okay. Given that I'm keeping an eye on our timer and we're approaching two minutes, on the point of the comma, could you please share with me your perspective? Keep it or strike it. I suppose that that may depend on if staff has a better idea for how to...

[01:09:01] So it feels like it's necessary to tie the two pieces together? May I ask a clarifying question, Ms. Donahue? I'm just trying to understand.

[01:09:18] Are you trying to make sure that... I think it's important to have the categories, but to have the language that says, if they are not privy to the confidential information, they may participate. Is there a way for us... Is that what the comma accomplishes? I don't think you're saying it doesn't Mr. Allen correct thank you I it's a subject for debate and doesn't provide clarity one way or the other I think okay I mean that's a lot of emphasis to put on a tiny comma right I want to make sure that we do the right thing here um Miss Willoughby if it's appropriate and you feel comfortable I would share and is it okay if I share what we spoke about

[01:09:57] in our conversation? Okay, thank you. In terms of the information, and honestly, Ms. Bolin, too, in our conversation together, one of the potential compromises that we discussed was removing HRTD as, I guess I should say, clarifying that HRTD only exists in the administrative offices.

[01:10:24] There are no school-based staff who do not have access to confidential information in HRTD. So perhaps all of HRTD would be included in that category of confidential information. And then Ms. Willoughby pointed out that there are certainly school-based staff, especially in her department, who work as nutrition workers and are cafeteria employees who might like to be part of a union, and it would be appropriate for them because they don't necessarily have access to confidential information.

[01:10:56] And I have to say, I'm very pleased with the idea of that compromise, and I think we could, in that same way, move forward with DDI. We will have to sort and clarify who has access to confidential information, but I think it's possible to do that.

[01:11:16] And I would be interested if, Ms. Donna, you see a way to do that in terms of language. Thank you, Chair Chandler. I, during our joint committee meetings, I did put that question out if there was a way to assess or a better way to delineate those employees within these departments who not merely have access to confidential information, but do in fact regularly access confidential information in the execution of their responsibilities. And my memory is the

[01:11:51] response from staff was that it was not possible to cut those lines. That being said, I understand that Mr. Smith from DDI is going through that process of identifying which employees may fall under those divisions. I do feel that it is also worth noting that all of the employee, I believe, and I assume staff will correct me if I'm wrong about this, but employees who have access to confidential information in these specific departments, and I believe in the rest of the LCPS administration,

[01:12:31] are required to sign NDAs similar to our own board aides. Is that correct? No, we're not required to sign NDAs. I don't know if Mr. Allen can clarify. I actually think if Ms. Boland may have...

[01:12:50] I'll bring a microphone to her. So if I can just clarify two points. I think what Ms. Donahue is remembering from clarifying previously in regards to not being able to separate was actually when I was

speaking.

[01:13:13] And again, it would be almost impossible for me to separate similar to what I said in our conversations, which is why I would advocate for all of HRTD remaining as confidential employees. We do have HRTD employees as well as several other departments where employees sign confidentiality agreements.

[01:13:36] Those are not NDAs. They're not legal documents. So they are very different. If we went that direction, we would have to get those legally reviewed and look at them from a different standard than the way that they're utilized actually within our departments.

[01:13:54] Thank you. Ms. Donahue? Thank you, Chair Chandler. I just wanted to make two points, and the first is, and I don't mean to disrespect Ms. Bolin, but she was on the joint committee, and I am not entirely comfortable with Ms.

[01:14:15] Bolin making comments in this setting if we're not affording the same opportunity to other committee members who were on the joint committee. My other point was, oh, I misremembered. It is confidentiality agreements rather than NDAs, and I understand that those are a different legal instrument.

[01:14:35] However, presumably, the administration does, in fact, rely on them to hold employees accountable for not violating them. That the expectation is, if those are signed, then they are going to be followed. And frankly, that makes me wonder why this needs to be in this definition at all.

[01:14:56] But to the extent that it is, I also don't understand why, if we have a definition of confidential employees, And that is defined by the information that they have access to, why it is then necessary to go on to say employees in these specific categories are also, who work for these specific departments, are included as confidential.

[01:15:25] Ms. Donahue, as a point of clarification, would you like to extend an opportunity to speak to anyone? I mean, there are at least two other members of the joint committee in the room. Is that correct? Yes. Are there more than two? There are exactly two, Ms. Brené and Ms. Sullivan.

[01:15:48] Would either of you like to speak to this point? Oh, yes. Mr. Allen? Just as a point of clarification, Ms. Willoughby was also. Right.

[01:16:09] If the invitation, Chair Chandler, is to obtain input from other members of the Joint Committee, then yes, I would support that. Okay, thank you. Ms. Chernoff, are you comfortable? Okay. Ms. Sullivan? There was a lot of conversation around all of that, so could you say specifically what you'd like me to give you feedback on?

[01:16:34] Okay. So I think if I'm pausing and paraphrasing, I'm going to try and throw in as many as I can. I think what we're trying to discern is what does the comma mean? Is it essential? And then also, do we need the titles of all of these departments as confidential if we have the definition of what a confidential employee is?

[01:16:56] Also, there was a suggestion on the table about that HRTD, all of those are confidential employees, so that should stay, but that the others could be sorted out, like the nutrition workers in the business and finance department, could be sorted out and clarified with more specific language to make sure that people that are not privy to confidential information would be allowed to participate in the bargaining unit.

[01:17:23] So you laid that out very well, and what we have put in our last suggestion for the revision takes care of those things. So if the board needs more clarity, then there might need to be revision to the language. But I think as we have it now, we feel we understand who are confidential employees and who are not.

[01:17:44] And the way it's written has the folks that are confidential are people that we can accept that are confidential, like the entirety of HRTD. Did that cover all of your questions? Thank you.

[01:18:00] I would, I'm still thinking through this, and I will point out we're about 33 seconds left here, but I would like to capture in some way, I mean, if, you know, I'll defer to counsel Mr. Allen and also Ms. Donahue to you, do we need to strike anything from line 97 or add anything to indemnify that there are, I mean, if we, leave the language as is, do we have enough space to have all of these categories caught

[01:18:39] appropriately? Thank you, Madam Chair. As a practical matter, I do think that it's too nascent to discern which employees within these departments are coming in contact or access confidential or could come in contact or access confidential information and so it may take as a

[01:19:14] practical matter a first round of a collective bargaining agreement to really pinpoint the categorization so i'm not i'm not sure it does sound like from miss willoughby's willoughby's input that there are at least some folks within department of business and financial services that would be a caveat to this.

[01:19:36] But in terms of HRTD, it sounds like perhaps not at the school-based level and perhaps from DDI, depending on what they're accessing and if they're accessing the principal's computer, they could come in contact with that. So I think it's too early to tell as a practical matter and this gives a good foundation, but this is a living, breathing document for the board to revisit.

[01:20:00] So once we discern that, or the division discerns that, then perhaps more clarification can be added. Ms. Donahue, do you have any comments? I would, no, not at this time.

[01:20:23] I would suggest that we invite Ms. Sullivan to comment. Ms. Sullivan, would you like to comment? That and where it is. We've done a whole lot of having conversations around that to make sure we are clear.

[01:20:41] And I don't have any other things to suggest in terms of clarification. fine thanks so then I will ask another question from a legal perspective if we strike so I would suggest first and foremost that on line 101 we leave it as is make no changes on line 102 if we we would need to strike employees within to to clarify that it's not the whole department And that might also be the case in terms of line 103 as well.

[01:21:22] And then if we take the comma out, have we solidified the legal language to ensure that we can make the distinction as we work through the process who is a confidential employee and who is not?

[01:21:39] Thank you, Madam Chair. One thought that just came to me that may be a solution here is to keep an employees within both the division of BFS and DDI, but put a comma after as applicable, right? Because then that gives the leeway to discern this person does come in contact with confidential information.

[01:22:01] They're not going to be or that's going to be applicable this as a confidential employee. So perhaps that's that's an avenue to explore. Thank you, Mr. Allen. Well, I'll start with my colleagues on the committee. Do you have any initial thoughts on that suggestion?

[01:22:19] Ms. Donahue? Thank you, Chair Chandler. I'm sorry, I'm not sure where Mr. Allen is referring to, the as applicable. Yes. Is that an addition that is being suggested? How would that read specifically?

[01:22:36] So, starting at line 96 and paraphrasing as applicable. Confidential employees include, comma, but are not limited to, comma, employees who work in or for going to line 102, employees within the Department of Business and Financial Services, comma, as this provision applies to and going to 103, employees within the Department of Digital Innovation, comma, as this provision applies to.

[01:23:12] - Thank you. - Thank you, Mr. Allen. Ms. Chernoff, do you have any comments or concerns? I think that's a great solution. Ms. Donahue, are you comfortable? If I may. Sure. Chair Chandler, thank you. My understanding from the conversations that we had previously was that the division position, that LCPS's position that was being advocated was all employees that fall within these three departments are confidential and therefore excluded from collective bargaining.

[01:23:42] If that is not LCPS's position, that it is only certain employees within those departments, then I would ask, why do we need this language at all? Presumably, all employees in LCPS in all departments are either eligible to be a part of collective bargaining or not if they are confidential, regardless of which department they're in.

[01:24:10] Ms. Sullivan? Why didn't we think of that before? I think that provides perfect clarity. Is there any way that we could see that in writing?

[01:24:33] Are you talking about the as applicable, or are you talking about deleting? I'd like to capture what Ms. Donahue just suggested.

[01:25:07] That's okay.

[01:25:52] Would you? Okay.

[01:26:14] I'm going to ask Ms. Donahue to restate her position, and then Ms. Chernoff will have the opportunity to raise a question. Thank you, Chair Chandler. So my suggestion, if the intent of lines 98 through 104 is not to exclude all employees who work within those specific offices and departments, I query why we need those categories there at all.

[01:26:46] Could we not just say on line 92, change and to any, so it reads confidential employee means any employee whose job duties require access, et cetera, and end the definition after the conclusion of the sentence on line 96, or effectuate school policies in the fields of labor or employee relations, period, and cut confidential employees include but are not limited to.

[01:27:17] Thank you so much for that clarification. Ms. Donahue, Ms. Chernoff? I just need some clarification on if those departments then are protected because I believe that those were put in there for a very specific reason due to the level of confidentiality in my discussions with staff and just want to make sure, I mean, I don't think they were put in there arbitrarily, so I just would like to get a little further clarification about Because it felt like we were compromising by adding the as applicable, which would allow us to determine that as we go, so to speak, rather than just blanketly getting rid of those departments.

[01:27:55] I think that there's something we're losing in there, but I'm not 100% clarity on that. So if someone could speak to that, that would be helpful. Given that Ms. Sullivan had the opportunity to articulate her position, I would be happy to hear from staff.

[01:28:14] Ms. Chernoff, do you have a specific direction in which you would like to? I would like Ms. Boland to speak to directly why those departments were put in there. Please, Ms. Boland, and why they should not be removed, in your opinion. Thank you so much.

[01:28:31] So I can't speak to why they were put in there. I can just speak to why I do not think, from an HRTD perspective, I would not like to see HRTD removed. If that call out on line 101 were to be removed, then the generic language remains.

[01:28:50] Who is deciding who is then confidential? If HRTD, as a department, all employees within HRTD are not outlined. If I recall, during the joint committee, we spoke about, for example, administrative assistants and how one of my administrative assistants within the department might support recruitment.

[01:29:13] So their level of confidential access is different than the administrative assistant supporting my workplace relations director, but it's the same position. Are we then going to start characterizing who's eligible based on the work that they do and not the position? So if I have a meeting with all administrative assistants, I then have to ask one to leave. I would be concerned about who ultimately then would be deciding who is a confidential employee within hrted and what process then do we go through is that going before the full school board are we

[01:29:51] pulling out a list if that comes out i think that begins another discussion a never-ending discussion um and and how do we get to a an answer i would based off of that i would feel more comfortable with adding the provision in there with as it applies or you use such nice language mr allen i didn't write it down but um i would feel better about that just so that we have that protection in place, and then we also are parsing out who doesn't have contact.

[01:30:26] I don't see the conflict there, but that's my vote. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. Ms. Donahue. Thank you, Chair Chandler. In response to that, I would suggest who determines a confidential employee.

[01:30:42] We have a definition here. This is why we wrote a definition. It's determined by what access to which information the employees have. And to the extent that there may be a concern of who is the final arbiter, of where does this fall under, no one has expressed that concern before today, to my knowledge.

[01:31:05] And you could say the same question about employees who don't fall into these seven categories on lines 98 to 104. What if there is a question about an employee who doesn't work in one of those departments or offices about whether they fall into the category of confidential?

[01:31:23] I would have assumed that it is based on do they have to sign a confidentiality agreement because they have access to confidential information, which is what we've defined here. So I still support removing that language.

[01:31:40] Yeah, I will mention that we've gone over time probably three times, and then I didn't reset the timer. I am really struggling with this point.

[01:31:55] I think it's probably one of the areas where we are likely to spend the most time. Some of the other issues seem like they might move fast. I would suggest that we move on to the next one and come back to this one. Are we comfortable with that?

[01:32:12] Okay, so timer set. Let's go to line 161. Or no, 160.

[01:32:37] I don't want to force you to call on me, but if you would like me to table set. The lines on line 160 through 164 have to deal, have to do with the scope of how many topics can be bargained in the

collective bargaining negotiations.

[01:33:05] My understanding from our conversations on the joint committee are there is no disagreement as to the first round. So at the first step, once a resolution is approved and a bargaining representative is selected and negotiations begin, I believe everyone is comfortable saying there are four topics.

[01:33:28] There will be no more than four topics will be subject to negotiation during that first round. So this language specifically pertains to subsequent rounds of negotiation. So if the first contract is a two-year contract, coming up to the end of those two years, the parties will be engaging again in collective bargaining to come to a new contract.

[01:33:49] This language limits each successor round of collective bargaining to two additional topics. Additional, I think it is important to note, on top of the original four for the second round, the four plus two from the third round, etc.

[01:34:11] LEA's original proposal was to remove that language and have no limits on the number of topics that could be subject to collective bargaining in successive rounds of negotiations. We talked fairly extensively during one of our joint committee meetings about some possible compromises that, for example, would stagger up the number of topics from year to year or from round of bargaining to round of bargaining.

[01:34:50] So to me, that was a solution that made sense, not limiting to two additional topics every round, but also not saying we will have no limits, although I understand there are some divisions that have no limits.

[01:35:06] So we did not get to the point of, I don't recall us getting to the point of discussing very much in the way of specific changes, but I would suggest that my fellow members consider something like in the first subsequent round of negotiations, there can be up to four additional topics.

[01:35:41] In the next round, it can be five or six. In the following round, eight, then ten, or so forth, if we do feel comfortable saying there could be some future round that is unlimited.

[01:36:00] Thank you, Ms. Donahue. I initially, I guess my reaction, having read many, many versions of this document, might be to go back to the original suggestion of striking from line 160 and through 164 at the word resolution and then perhaps adding some additional language. I am not sure. I guess my

[01:36:32] understanding, and I'd be happy to hear further clarification, is that the school board, whichever future school board is renegotiating would have the ability to decline, and I wouldn't necessarily want to hamstring them by setting a number of topics, I guess. I just feel a little resistant to that idea, and I did notice in one of the drafts, let's see, let me go back. I have so many

[01:37:07] papers, right? Okay, and to be honest, I guess if, as we continue to go forward, I think labeling and dating these documents would be extremely helpful. Okay, so in this document, it looks like, okay, so first and foremost, I would ask, in each successor collective bargaining agreement, should that be successor or successive?

[01:37:41] Would anyone like to speak to that? Right. It seems like it should be successive to me, not successful. Well, if we're going to get nitpicky, if we're going to get technical and nitpicky, I would think perhaps in each successive round of negotiating, because it's not, right, we're talking about the negotiating leading to the agreement, not the agreement itself.

[01:38:08] I didn't think we were getting into those kind of details. But that is the sentence, which LEA proposed striking from that through the end of that sentence on line 164, which I would have no problem with.

[01:38:25] Okay, so that's something that we could do. I think I would be comfortable with that too. I just don't see the point. in in set presetting or predetermined number um in that uh let's see if i if i could add thank you um i i do believe the the concern expressed on the other side of this issue was a concern about are we ever going to be able to get to a resolution if we don't put some kind of limit on the number of topics that are available which i understand that concern but as as i think has been already

[01:39:04] alluded to in our conversation here today, it will be in the best interest of everyone who is involved in this process to reach an agreement. Thank you, Ms. Donahue. Ms. Chernoff? My only concern is I just want to make sure that we do this well.

[01:39:21] I think that that's really important. It's like you mentioned, it's new to all Virginians. It's new to all districts. We've had multiple conversations about we could look at other districts, but we don't know how that's working out yet, which is problematic in some ways. So, for me, I would like to keep the four, and then I'm open to opening it up to more the next year, but I'm not comfortable with unlimited because then I think it can go sideways.

[01:39:49] So, that's what I'm trying to avoid. So, I think that it would be interesting to add on to that, keeping in mind that it's cumulative. So, I'm open to a suggestion. The only thing I'm really opposed to is the second round being unlimited.

[01:40:04] I do think we should cap the second round because we're still learning at that point. Beyond that, I could be open to more discussion, but I think the first and second years need some kind of definitive boundary where we can evaluate as a board, or another board will evaluate what would be, what's been done well, what worked.

[01:40:22] Understanding that the board has purview here also, ultimately. And in the joint committee, the consensus was? So I, there was not a specific.

[01:40:38] Not a universal, right? There certainly was not a universal agreement. My memory is that there was majority support to eliminate this language, but beyond that, whether there were any additions made, I don't think I could accurately represent that there was an even majority consensus about that.

[01:41:08] I mean, I guess the majority consensus is it should be more than two, but I don't believe that we ever coalesced with majority support around either a specific number or whether there should be a limit or should not be any limits. I have notes from the joint committee here of what Ms. Sullivan and Ms. Brunet suggested.

[01:41:27] Would that be helpful? Sure. And correct me if I mistranscribed them. So Ms. Sullivan suggested first round six, second round six, then unlimited. Ms. Brunet suggested six and then 30 and then unlimited.

[01:41:43] So that was what the two of them had put on the table. So my recommendation based off of that would be four, then six, then unlimited, I guess, would be what I would look at. Would anyone else like to speak to this, Ms. Brunet?

[01:42:03] I'd like to ask a question. Thank you. Do you mean six new ones? Yes. Right, so four, then six plus four would be ten. Does anyone see a path forward to capture this in language?

[01:42:24] So it's necessary for us to strike. Oh, no, okay. So then we could change the word two to four and add for the, well, so you wouldn't say the next agreement?

[01:42:47] Instead of in each successor, I think we would have to change in the next successive negotiations. The bargaining representative and designated board members and or designees may each make proposals to bargain up to change two to six additional bargaining topics, here and after negotiated topics.

[01:43:15] We have not actually gotten to the... And adding in, I don't know, colon or semi-colon or period, I guess. And in the following round of negotiation, copy and paste the previous language.

[01:43:39] Exclusive bargaining representative and designated board members may each make proposals to bargain up to four negotiated topics. Thank you.

[01:43:59] And then we'd probably need to add a sentence that states after the third round of, or the third successive round of collective bargaining negotiations, there will be no limits on bargaining topics.

[01:44:21] Ms. Chernoff, are you comfortable? Yes. I am also comfortable with this. Would anyone else like to speak? Ms. Sullivan? I would just say that what is in the provision, too, is also allowing for both sides to determine together the number.

[01:44:39] So it doesn't have to be prescribed in the resolution what the amount is. That could be the initial part of bargaining each time a new contract is bargained. And as you all have been good about trying to correct yourselves, that it wouldn't be a yearly thing. The contract could be three years long.

[01:44:57] Yeah. Thank you. Okay. Would anyone on staff like to make a comment? I'm seeing no comments, I guess. We are comfortable with this language.

[01:45:14] Ms. Donahue, can I count on you to... add those edits to our official document? Yes, Chair Chandler. Thank you. Glad to. Thank you so much. Okay, again, with the timer, we've lost. Moving on.

[01:45:30] We made a decision. We made a decision, though. Yay. Let's honor it. Okay. Moving on, I believe, in chronological order on page six, let's see.

[01:45:47] Line 193. 93, right, to hold group meetings with members of the bargaining unit. So, in this case, there are lots of suggestions. I find, especially after reading the report, I am quite comfortable with the language that Albemarle put forth. Does anybody have any Yeah, I have two. I think I have four copies. I've read them all.

[01:46:21] Let's see. So, here we are. We're talking about the rights of exclusive bargaining representatives and let's see what I think I would like to see is looking starting at line 102 when we're well maybe not starting there I would like to capture in some way from a school safety perspective the possibility of outlining exactly

[01:46:57] how the protocols would work when someone comes to visit the school, and in Ms. Donahue's report on page 9, I did like the draft language, to hold meetings with members of the bargaining unit, to meet with bargaining unit employees in designated school division areas during the workday when

employees are on break or in other non-duty status, and to conduct group work site meetings during meal periods and other breaks, as well as before and after the work day.

[01:47:32] Group meetings shall be permitted in designated spaces. The union representative shall provide written notice three business days in advance. So we have three business days here. I guess I would just like to see if we could seek to clarify this and strengthen it, especially in terms of where a union representative is not a current LCPS employee so in this agreement the union representative shall provide written notice three business days in advance of a group meeting of the date and time

[01:48:08] expected capacity needs and if the union representative is not a current LCPS employee the name of the union representative who will be subject to standard security screening process is applicable to all visitors to LCPS facilities the location and designated meeting space will be agreed upon by both the union representative and the principal or his her designee. That stood out to me. I'm certainly open to hear what other people think in terms of the best way to capture this in the agreement. Ms. Donahue. Thank you, Chair Chandler. So I'm

[01:48:44] partial to that language because I drafted it, but I'm not specifically wedded to it. The suggestion of the Albemarle language came up after we had already wordsmithed this a fair amount. So I had worked on drafting the language in the summary prior to reviewing Alba Morrow's language. I'm not opposed to adopting Alba Morrow's language with some edits, as you suggested.

[01:49:15] My one thing that I did want to note and propose possible change for either. In my conversations and thinking through this subsequent to the last joint committee meeting we had really struggled with the notion of individual versus group meetings and I came around to thinking perhaps the concern is not so much with whether it is an individual meeting or group meeting as it is with whether it is a pre-planned meeting versus a spur of the moment meeting. One of the concerns that was

[01:49:55] raised during the joint committee conversations was, hypothetically, if a situation arises that an employee is not expecting, has not been made aware of, that develops organically over the course of a day, it would not fall under this language currently, especially with requiring the three days of advance notice.

[01:50:18] I do still support the advance notice requirement, particularly for pre-planned meetings, but but I do believe that there needs to be some clarification in this section to make it very clear that there, I suppose, is or is not.

[01:50:34] I would suggest that it is appropriately, that the language should be clear, that it is permissible for if that situation arises where an employee has circumstances that come up during the day that were not expected to them, and therefore they could not plan out in advance, but they need the support of their union representative, they should have the opportunity to do that.

[01:50:54] and I don't find it inappropriate to be able to use school facilities to do so. Ms. Chernoff, do you have any comments on this? I'm trying to process through that language.

[01:51:13] My understanding as of yesterday was just to add a line after 201 to add those access indicators for individual access, so following the protocols through Raptor or whatever it is, Keeping in mind that while we were speaking with LEA, it may not end up being LEA.

[01:51:37] I think we've established that. But making sure that those protocols that you would need to access a building are in place. Because some of our LEA are LCPS employees, so that would fall within that. But if it were someone else, they might not be that. So I just want to make sure we have provision in that language.

[01:51:55] But I do think that that was a compromise that was willing to be made, was keeping it as is. And correct me if I'm wrong. I see some nodding. But to add in the provision, as you're speaking about, Ms. Donahue, for when there needs to be individual access, adding in those protocols that would be followed for that.

[01:52:13] And that did not necessarily include the three days notice, but that it did require that they go to the building, that they follow the approval to have access, and that someone knows that they're coming, that they're not just showing up. Does that capture what we spoke about?

[01:52:32] Ms. Donahue? Well, I don't want to. So I would like to make a correction that one thing that I was not comfortable with in this draft language is line 198 that says the request is approved.

[01:52:51] I think it is appropriate to give the individual school facilities advance notice when advance notice is possible for any pre-planned meetings. Because absolutely every principal has the right to know who is going to be in their schools.

[01:53:08] That being said, because we are talking about the union representatives for the employees of the school, I was not comfortable with the idea that a principal or their designee could decline or refuse to provide a space for these meetings.

[01:53:26] So that is why in our proposed compromise language, we took out that portion that says request is approved, because I don't think it's a matter of seeking approval. I think it is a matter of providing notice. And as to the concern about if someone is coming in at last minute because a circumstance develops, those people will still be subject to the same screening procedures that are in place for all visitors to an LCPS facility.

[01:53:57] Thank you, Ms. Donahue. Ms. Sullivan, it looked like you had something. I think what Ms. Donahue covered it well. I just want to make sure that we're all understanding that the part with the individual, especially with, for the moment, need, there would be the confidentiality that that would not be you go to this room, down this hall, they have a space that they go to, the individual who's having someone come in would have a space for them, but that would not be designated to them by administration, because that would need confidentiality, that meeting would need confidentiality, and so there would need to be a space where those conversations could

[01:54:35] happen that were not predetermined by staff. Thank you. I was going to add to that, for that reason, we also added language in the proposed compromise to indicate that spaces, when the union representative provides notice to the school of a need for space to hold meetings, that the space designated for those meetings would be agreed upon by both parties, by both the principal's designee and the union rep.

[01:55:13] Oh, yes, Ms. Chernoff. Okay, I need some clarification because I'm a little bit, that confused me a bit, so I just want to make sure that I'm on the right page here. First of all, in line 193B, It's to hold group meetings that the request would need to approve, be approved.

[01:55:29] I want to hold to that for the group meetings. I think that that's, you guys are fine. Yeah, okay, we're getting that. It's great. What I think is we need another section that outlines individual access for these other portions that would need to be added after the group section.

[01:55:45] I want to understand this space designation because I don't know if you've, are we saying that there needs to be a space that is provided to staff? Because, I mean, some specialists work out of closets at this point in our buildings.

[01:56:00] Like, just to be frank, you guys know this, so I know that's not new information for you. But we need to be very clear about what we're asking buildings to do, because if we're asking them to clear a space or we're putting that on a staff member, I guess I just need clarification around what you mean when you say a space.

[01:56:16] Does that mean the individual who's requesting the meeting, the staff member would provide this space? Because you don't want the principal, it's confidential, so you wouldn't want someone else designating a space. That's correct. But are we talking about their classroom?

[01:56:35] Are we talking about you want a separate confidential space? Because I'm not sure that separate confidential spaces, at least in elementary school, exist or could be provided logistically. I don't think we're talking about anything being provided. I think that person should know, holy cow, let's go in the ladies' room.

[01:56:53] Let's go, like, I just had a FBI special agent come and interview me about somebody just this last week. And we could not find a space, so we sat outside the cafeteria. But it's true, you're on camera, so I guess my administrator could have seen that.

[01:57:12] But when it's urgent, you do what you need to do. And no, I would never say the principal needs to clear a classroom so that I can meet with my union rep or any space, or any space. But there are meeting spaces, I guess you wouldn't want to do that in the office, but there are other places.

[01:57:33] A staff workroom, your classroom if you happen to be lucky enough to have that without students at that time. A colleague's room that's not being used at that time, perhaps. Yeah, I guess my only other concern is that it is not happening during their work contract time, because that's their contract time.

[01:57:55] So I guess my only worry about putting provisional language about where to meet is it restricts us down, and the confidential piece, as you just mentioned, makes it tricky too, because if it's in view of a camera or other employees, it's no longer confidential. So I don't know that I'm there yet, and I apologize.

[01:58:12] I hadn't really worked that piece out, but I am in support of adding the individual access language and really outlining those points, much of which to match what is in the group meetings except for I could I could get away from the request is approved I mean I was thinking the request is approved by the staff member that asked for it but I guess that would be implied so I need to noodle on this a little more before I take your point Ms. Sullivan I do want to point out that we're at four and would like to get a general consensus as to whether or not we continue or

[01:58:50] perhaps schedule a work session maybe even as early as next week from the committee well I have to get my kids, so I would prefer we do a work session. We were talking about just us. I mean, we have to make the decision. You would make that decision. Yes, indeed. I don't like to do anything without you,

my friend. Ms. Donahue, what are your thoughts? Thank you, Chair Chandler. My recommendation would be that we refer this to the full board and ask them to schedule it for a work session and as an information

[01:59:30] item. As it is now to move through the language with everybody in the room. I understand your hesitation about that, Chair Chandler, but as I said at the beginning of this conversation, I suspect that even if we move through all eight of these issues today or some combination of today and a work session next week or the following week, there are other board members who will want to

[02:00:03] have more conversation about these issues and I fear that if we if we take all the time talking about it now or in two weeks and then send it to the board just as an information item that we will the same situation will unfold there well we were we will be talking for extended periods of time about the issues and and not that we shouldn't be devoting time to talking about them but

[02:00:33] But this has been pending for a very long time, and I advocate that we go ahead and send it to the full board to try and make some forward progress. Ms. Sullivan?

[02:00:50] I would suggest to get another meeting scheduled of this committee because that is the way most of the committee work happens is there comes a substantial recommendation from a committee. And no matter what that order is, there will still be significant discussion from the full board.

[02:01:11] So setting up a work session between now and the June 11th, I believe it is, school board meeting, so that there is time that this item could be an information item at the June 11th meeting and then an action item at the June 25th meeting, I suppose.

[02:01:30] So I would suggest that that's what's needed is more time for this committee, that that happens within the committee between now and the next school board meeting, so it can still fall on the first meeting of the June school board meeting calendar.

[02:01:47] - Ms. Chernoff. - I think that's ambitious, but I respect the opinion. I also respect the governance process, and this has come to us now, so I would prefer it stay with us, and we've done the homework, we've done the legwork. I think that, I hope that our board members would trust the streamlined version of what we get to, And I think it would delay the process further if we went to the full board because I think it would just keep bouncing back.

[02:02:13] So I would be more in favor of a work session and, you know, let's get as much of it done as we can, keeping in mind that we do not want to stall. We want to keep going. But we did, I think we made some good headway today. I mean, I think we were able to synthesize and get somewhere. So I think that there's hope.

[02:02:29] Thank you. Ms. Donahue. Thank you, Chair Chandler. I was going to suggest, and you might have already been going in this direction, that if you are inclined to schedule a work session, we may need to check with staff if it's possible to even to schedule a work session and still get this on, for example, the June 11th or June 25th agendas for the full board.

[02:02:54] - I would assume that we would have to have the work session next week. Yes, Ms. Casserly and Dr. Smith. - We'd be happy to look to see what we can schedule and take a look at that. I can't speak for the agenda in terms of the chair sets that agenda for the school board.

[02:03:14] And so we do have a retreat scheduled for the 11th. And I know we've started to do some planning with the chair around that. But I can't speak for the chair in terms of that, but we could look for

next week to see what might be available. I will say, I do agree.

[02:03:31] I would like to continue to work together in the committee to make sure that we have the tightest possible proposal. I am also wondering if we have to have an official LAMP committee meeting or if it would be possible to have an administrative meeting that might include certain key players.

[02:03:52] And again, I would ask if my, I guess, if more than one of us that serves on the committee wants to be at the meeting, it would have to be an official LAMP meeting. I believe that to be true. That's correct, as I understand it.

[02:04:10] Okay, so I will ask staff to please try to identify a two-hour time frame next week, and I guess we'll have to do that fairly quickly since we have to give three days' notice. But I do, like I said at the very beginning, I am so heartened by our willingness to work together.

[02:04:33] And I am thankful to everyone who has put in innumerable hours and getting us to the place where we were able to have this conversation today. So with that, I will ask, I guess we don't have to make an official motion to table because we are in discussion.

[02:04:55] and i will just ask is there any new business okay miss sure not i have to pick up my kids and i have new business um i would just like to put it on the radar that the auditor general's office has been working on a policy for over a year and it has come to my attention just recently that that is in the works and i know we're busy with a lot of other things but i think to streamline and make that process of auditing more efficient um and to really have some teeth there to be able to get the access to the things that they need, that that would be of utmost importance to get on an agenda soon.

[02:05:31] Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. That's also been in front of my mind, and I really just wanted to see if we could move forward with this, but I am 100% in support of bringing that forward as an information item at the next LAMP meeting. That is not the work session, but the scheduled meeting in June.

[02:05:48] Ms. Donahue, are you in agreement or have any comments on that issue? No, thank you, Chair Chandler. Thank you. Is there any further new business? No? Seeing no further new business, we are now adjourned. Thank you so much for being here today.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com