



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Legislative Audit and Policy Committee Meeting, Thursday, June 20, 2024

Date Thursday, June 20, 2024
Place Loudoun County Public Schools / School Board meeting (see BoardDocs / LCPS-TV)
Length 1h 28m (video)

- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): <https://player.vimeo.com/video/964675044?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 June 20, 2024. We will begin with public comment. Sign up to make in-person public comments occurred prior to the start of the committee meeting. The meeting will be audio recorded and posted in board docs. Today we have three speakers signed up for public comment.

[00:00:23] we will allow three minutes. Our first speaker is Andrea Weiskopf. She will be followed by Sandy Sullivan. Good morning. So nice to be at a meeting where I don't have to take personal leave

[00:00:54] to attend. First, I have a concern, concerns from the last meeting. One, a staff member and a school board member were communicating in secret, all while stating that the LEA couldn't speak because the staff member was not allowed to speak publicly. I have never FOIA'd before.

[00:01:21] I will do it again. The two staff members who speak the most are not educators. We've got a lawyer and an HRTD specialist who keep using LCPS language to describe the draft instead of proposed language, setting up a dichotomy between LEA language and making it seem as though this

[00:01:56] has to be LCPS language. Last time, Mr. Allen claimed not to have seen language before from the LEA's suggestions. If that's the case, then he's incompetent. And I have concerns as a Loudon taxpayer.

If he has seen it, then he lied. I suggest you find out. Either way, he was working for a delay, and it worked. Finally, why is Spence's contract so generous,

[00:02:35] but you're being so miserly with your educators? Frankly, I'd like to have his lawyer negotiating my contract. I'm fine with what he makes. This is a big position. We're a huge organization.

[00:02:52] But why are you so generous with him, but miserly to those of us who are in the schools and have direct contact with students? Thank you. Black Lives Matter. Thank you.

[00:03:07] Our next speaker is Sandy Sullivan, who will be followed by Tracy Lane. A few years, nine months, four weeks, and one day. 1,029 days ago. Make today the day to really move forward with the collective bargaining resolution.

[00:03:27] This process for Loudoun educators to gain collective bargaining began two years, nine months, four weeks, and one day ago. 1,029 days ago. Vote on the resolution. Move this forward to the full board next Tuesday's meeting. Your educators are counting on you to pave the way for the best working conditions for them.

[00:03:47] Educator working conditions are student learning conditions. Set up LCPS educators and students for success. Thank you. Our next speaker will be Tracy Lane. Hi, my name is Tracy Lane. I teach at Loudoun County High School. I'm an English teacher.

[00:04:10] And I don't have anything written because I spent my morning in the curriculum development and helping align our English content with the new standards. And it was a phenomenal experience. It was really nice to being a participant in making the decisions about what's going to happen in our classrooms and with our students since we are the experts.

[00:04:34] It was really wonderful to be included in this. My reason for bringing this up is for us, that's a lot of what collective bargaining is about. We need you guys to move this out of committee. We need a vote on it. We need an election, and we need it six months ago, a year ago.

[00:04:50] Like, this is really getting ridiculous. If we took 22 months as an educator to perform the things that you guys expect us to perform in our roles, we would not have jobs anymore. Thank you. Thank you. We're now going to move on to item 2.1, approval of the June 7th, 2024 draft minutes.

[00:05:12] Could I please have a motion to approve the June 7th, 2024 meeting minutes? Oh, Ms. Donahue? I move to approve the minutes. Thank you. Seconded by Ms. Scherner?

[00:05:30] Yes, seconded. Thank you. The motion has been properly made and seconded. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Aye. Seeing none opposed, the motion passes unanimously with all committee members present. With that, we will move on to our information items, starting with item 3.1, Policy 3410, Office of the Auditor General.

[00:05:56] Mr. Ahmad Woods, the Auditor General, will present. Mr. Woods, the floor is yours. Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Chandler, members of the committee. Today, I'm presenting information item 3.1, Policy 3410, Office of the Auditor General.

[00:06:14] This policy will serve as the blueprint for how the OAG will operate and allows the OAG to have an independent, disciplined, and systematic approach to its duties. I'm glad to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

[00:06:30] Thank you, Mr. Woods. Are there any questions or comments from the committee? Ms. Chernoff? I just wanted to thank you for putting this in front of us and kind of helping us since we've been on board to understand the process of how the auditing works.

[00:06:47] I think that this is a very valuable piece that we have here in terms of checks and balance and a way to kind of look into our practices and find areas for growth. And so I appreciate the work that you've done on this. I have no questions about the policy and fully support it as is. Thank you.

[00:07:04] Ms. Zonohue? Pardon me. That's from long ago. Yeah, there we go. Thank you. On my part, I'll just say I completely concur with Ms. Chernoff.

[00:07:21] I understand that this policy is very straightforward and guided by the founding principles of the standard, its standards, to the language that's often used by the institute of internal auditors um and also very similar to what some of our neighbors are doing so i'm thank you for putting this forward and i will look forward to finalizing the policy next up we'll move on to 3.2 our 2025 legislative program we did expect mr charlie jackson our legislative consultant today but he is feeling under the weather dr smith thank you for leading us in our discussion today on the additions and proposed

[00:07:57] changes to the program thank you chair chandler members of the committee i'm pleased to present you today with the first draft of the 2025 loudon county school board legislative program as you know this is a year-long process and we'll plan to present and discuss these items today then again in our august meeting and we would hope for action on the program uh for enduring in committee during the month of september so that we can take it to the full board in october and then our legislative breakfast in November as we kick off the general assembly session in January. So you've seen that timeline that we presented to you earlier this spring

[00:08:35] and so this is just in alignment with that timeline. We begin our work with the legislative program from the previous year and you're familiar with this program and contents as you were able to join us at last year's legislative breakfast as you came on board in November and you were able to utilize our legislative positions as a part of our advocacy He worked last year at the VSBA Capital Conference in January.

[00:08:56] Working with board members and staff, several updates, additions, changes, and deletions are being proposed. And I'd like to take the next several minutes to walk you through these proposals for your discussion and consideration. You may notice this year we've rearranged the program to begin with five key priorities.

[00:09:12] They are enact the JLARC recommendations and fully fund Virginia public schools. Continued support for a Loudon-based recovery school. audit of higher education teacher preparation programs, comprehensive student mental health policy and funding, and commitments to the teaching profession.

[00:09:32] The first priority, enact JLARC recommendations and fully fund Virginia's public schools, is a continuation from last year's program, and we've updated it to recommend the specific legislative actions for the 2025 General Assembly session. A new priority position has been added this year based on board member feedback and staff feedback, advocating for support for a recovery school.

[00:09:54] We've worked with Ms. Tedrick Richardson and her team on this item, and you'll see that it provides the rationale, benefits, and proposed legislative measures. Since this may be a new concept for

some, we felt like it was important to include a more detailed description of the benefits and proposed actions.

[00:10:11] Conference of Student Mental Health Policy and Funding was listed in last year's program, and you'll see here that we are taking it a step further this year, asking that the General Assembly work to put together a work group between members of the Senate Ed and Health, Senate Finance and Appropriations Committees, and the House Education and Appropriations Committees, along with relevant education and mental health stakeholders around the Commonwealth to prepare a comprehensive policy and funding proposal to be enacted at the 2026 General Assembly.

[00:10:41] Finally, the last priority here is commitments to the teaching profession, and this remains a key strategy of ours, and we've updated it to continue to keep it a priority to support the recruitment and retention of our exemplary staff. I'll now highlight a few of the additions and changes within our state policy positions.

[00:10:58] As discussed at the recent board retreat, we are proposing a new legislative position on support for special education transition programs and services. This position advocates for the establishment and funding of transition centers for students with disabilities, emphasizing career and technical education, or CTE, skills to facilitate their workforce integration and enhance their independence and quality of life.

[00:11:21] We've made a slight change to the free school meals for all students, but just to update for the FY24 school meal debt, which just closed at \$160,000, which has increased from the previous year.

[00:11:37] We are fortunate to have a Feed It Forward donation of \$52,000 to apply to that amount, so it brings it down to \$108,000, but it's still a huge need in our schools and our community. Last month, the school board voted to approve a VSBA statewide proposal that would require the Virginia Department of Education to review and prioritize the list of state-mandated teacher training and professional learning each year.

[00:12:01] This item also asked VDOE to allow for some training requirements to coincide with the teacher evaluation or the licensure renewal cycle, and that item has been added to our program. The next several items are in the program from the previous year, and they remain as areas of need.

[00:12:18] This includes addressing the teacher and substitute shortage, retain unspent appropriations, pre-K for all, and unfunded state mandates. The next proposed position is firearm safe storage information for school communities. This item was adopted by the board for consideration by VSBA as a statewide position, and we have traditionally also included these positions in our legislative program.

[00:12:42] This item requires school districts to provide information on firearm safe storage laws and evidence-based best practices to students and families in their communities on an annual basis. Electric buses and infrastructure and proper reporting of student arrests remain from last year's program.

[00:12:58] We are recommending a new position on parental and community notification for drug overdoses, which captures our continued advocacy for notification regardless of the location in which it may occur. The last four positions in our program are recommended for continued advocacy from last year's work, and they include attendance requirements for accreditation, supports for dual enrollment, recognizing and supporting a balanced assessment model, and a federal policy position on the expansion of JROTC offerings.

[00:13:29] In terms of deletions, you may notice three positions from last year that are being recommended for removal. These include diplomas for students with disabilities, regional governing board for Thomas Jefferson High School of Science and Technology, and broadband access. These items were the positions from the previous board and we received feedback that they may not be the top priority of the current board.

[00:13:50] The hazing education curriculum item was also being recommended for removal since we were successful in getting the legislation passed during last year's General Assembly session to address this priority. Finally, the item on Title IX regulations was recommended for removal due to the recent federal regulation changes and it's not included in the current draft.

[00:14:09] However, we will defer direction from the committee on moving forward. Chair Chandler, that concludes my overview of the 2025 legislative program. Thank you, Dr. Smith. Are there any questions or comments from the committee? Okay, seeing none, thank you.

[00:14:26] Again, we will move on to item 3.3, Policy 2610, Loudoun County School Board Aids. Last month, we chose to bring this back as an information item to continue working on the policy. Dr. Smith, do you have any points that you'd like to make to kick off this discussion?

[00:14:46] Thank you, Chair. we did put this item out for public feedback it did receive i believe five pieces of feedback which we've uploaded in board docs for your review and we've taken a look at that and we don't have any recommended changes at this time thank you um is there any discussion or um comments from the committee ms shirnoff i appreciate that and um a lot of you know this is a learning curve and in speaking with staff it it kind of came to my attention and i i thought i had done this in the last meeting but i guess i hadn't but um there's one thing i would like for us to consider today

[00:15:24] and that's to reconcile some of the language around confidentiality and ndas and you know as i'm working through this policy i and i've been you know trying to kind of figure out we're new to the board we have staff aids for the first time and they're relatively new to us and sort of really accomplish the why of this policy and what we are trying to accomplish and I really feel like it still needs a bit of work and I've expressed that to the staff and so I am coming to you today to kind of talk through some of those

[00:16:01] things that are on my mind in terms of things that maybe we could consider as a committee and so if you are open to it I would like to share those okay so the first thing is that the policy clearly states in section a1a that the staff board aides are appointed by and serve solely at the pleasure discretion and the will of the respective school board members there is thus no establishment time frame for the length of any particular staff boards appointment nevertheless when a board member leaves their position on the board the appointment of their respective staff board aid ends as well and I feel like several sections that come next seem to be a little bit of an overreach in my

[00:16:40] opinion in some ways as board aides are under our discretion there are employees and they're not elected officials but it seems that we want to hold them to the same standard as elected officials and so I would like to hear from the committee that's sort of the first bucket around where that where you fall on that understanding that a hundred percent the consequences that are outlined in the sections would definitely apply to not only the board aides if they fell if they violated policies or act in a manner that is not professional or if they shared confidential information that

[00:17:17] definitely those consequences would fall not only to the board aide but also to us as board members I think that that's pretty clearly outlined and I support that I support that I think that that makes the most sense but I do wonder if all the other pieces are redundant or and you know just maybe not need to be there so that's kind of the first thought I had around it and as I'm reading through it I'm you know trying to understand the biggest bucket for me is the confidentiality piece so I maintain my statements from the last

[00:17:54] meeting and I do think that the language around confidentiality right now as it sits in the policy is in conflict or some of it is unnecessary in light of section 3b where they have to sign an NDA and I would really like for us to consider to direct staff to try and reconcile some of that language and I have this specific so I don't know if you want me to go into the specific lines but or we want to have a discussion about that potentially first I will defer to you as the chair but I've done some of the work but I want to make sure that you know we could we could think about that in terms of if they sign

[00:18:30] an NDA to keep things confidential is it necessary but then we have this whole piece that they have no access to confidential information so to me those two things are they don't they don't coexist well in my mind well thank you so much for that um interesting perspective i do appreciate your thoughts and i'm grateful um that you have taken such a careful approach to considering how you feel about this policy um i do think it would be wise if we had a discussion and and then um let's

[00:19:04] come back and and see where we get to with the specifics okay um thank you um miss donahue i don't want to put you on the spot but do you have any comments or concerns thank you chair chandler um excuse me uh i had the same i had similar thoughts to ms chernoff uh which i i think that i either raised or agreed uh in the last meeting that i felt like there was some tension or perhaps a lack of clarity uh regarding the confidential information versus privileged information and

[00:19:40] the NDA versus the requirements of this policy that I think would benefit from some clarification. And I do have -- I did have some concerns with the language that prohibits staff aides from criticizing LCPS in their personal capacity.

[00:20:09] I don't have any issue with a requirement that board aides not be allowed to criticize the school board in their capacity as board aides, but I have some concerns with extending that to their personal interactions.

[00:20:34] I think that was all I had. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Donahue. I want to start with a question and I will ask dr. Smith could you let me or could you clarify for us what the current budget allotment is for staff aids so that was that changed most recently in FY 24 when there was a part of that FY 24 budget the board allocated nine hundred thousand dollars across the board for the entire school board aids in that budget line for to the school

[00:21:12] board so it is approximately a hundred thousand dollars per board member across all nine board members thank you dr. Smith as a committee and as a school board we have engaged in lots of conversations in public over the course of this year since we came on to the board and one of the things that I have learned about how we work together is that many of us are rule followers and and we definitely appreciate our responsibility to establish and model effective policies for the

[00:21:46] division. I believe this policy, although it may not be perfect as it stands, is wholly appropriate and will support this board's efforts at clear communication, transparency, and working together in the

spirit of bipartisanship. Bipartisanship is very important to me as a person. I am here on the school board as an endorsed Democrat. I'm also a person that grew up in South Carolina, which means that if I hadn't been friends with Republicans, I wouldn't have had any friends.

[00:22:24] I also worked in a bipartisan environment when I came to Washington, and I found at that time we were able to accomplish amazing things because we were working together. And that's my hope for our work here on the school board. I want us to be able to work together. And as it stands, there are two policies that govern school board members. Policy 1030, Code of Conduct for School Board Members, which dates back to 1973. And Policy 1035, which the norms, protocols,

[00:23:03] and violations, refers to how to handle the norms, protocols, and violations. These policies cover the need to show respect for each other and to work together, as well as the need to maintain the confidentiality of information.

[00:23:23] Additionally, given that the salaries of staff aides are funded by taxpayer dollars, I find it's important that we establish clear guidelines and expectations for the work that the staff aides perform in support of the division and the school board.

[00:23:39] We have a fiscal responsibility to ensure that this allocation is spent as it was intended in support of students and not for political purposes. On the issue of free speech, in my family, we share this idea with our kids quite a lot.

[00:23:56] You absolutely are guaranteed in this country freedom of speech, and it is one of the most important rights that any American can have. But it doesn't guarantee freedom from consequences. And I believe this policy outlines a clear set of expectations that will allow us to work together and understand what works for us and what doesn't.

[00:24:19] It is completely appropriate to ask the staff aides to decline to engage in political activism if they are on the clock. This is aligned with what we would expect from any other LCPS employee, even though the staff aides serve at the will of the school board members.

[00:24:38] When I've thought back on this and, of course, have had the opportunity to serve on both sides of this conversation as a staff aide and as a school board member, I find that one of the considerations that I think would perhaps be an easy solution is to take the staff to change the language around serving at the will of the member and bring the staff aides back into the umbrella of LCPS.

[00:25:06] Something to consider, but I'm happy to have a discussion. Ms. Chernoff? Thank you, Ms. Chandler. I definitely understand where you're coming from, although I'm trying not to look at this through the lens of politics.

[00:25:25] I would like to look at it in terms of just logistics of what an aide does, what their role is, how that sits. And I absolutely agree that we need a policy. Like, I want to be very clear. We need a policy to outline this. I take taxpayer dollars seriously as well, and it is ultimately taxpayer funded.

[00:25:44] But I do think a differentiation of roles is from a school board member. I think that that just needs to be more clearly stated and outlined. And I have no, I have utmost respect for policies 1030 and 1035 and how that that has helped guide our work and operate together.

[00:26:04] And I believe that has been beneficial for us. And obviously there is an awareness, I think, of that in terms, I think that that's mentioned in the policy. What I'm really more concerned about is some of

the language that Ann brought up around their personal opinions.

[00:26:20] And if we, as I mentioned last meeting, I don't know, and this is a committee question and a school board question, but I don't know if we're asking them to not participate in local government. So if we're talking specifically about public comment, do we need to outline that in here, that that could not be paid time if they chose to participate?

[00:26:39] And also, if they're criticizing or defaming or crossing any of those lines, that we ourselves would be held accountable. I think that that's a fair way to look at it. I just want to make sure that it's clear. And right now, to me, the language takes it to a place where I don't think that that is clearly defined in terms of at least Section J.

[00:27:01] I think it's B2J. Is that correct? Yeah. B2J, which was what Anne was referencing earlier. So I would be open to them still participating in the public, knowing that those actions would be, we would be accountable for that.

[00:27:21] But also, I agree with Ann privately. I think that that is something that I would like removed or addressed in a different way. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. Ms. Donahue?

[00:27:38] Thank you, Chair Chandler. Following up on some of these comments and your reference, Ms. Chandler, to no activism while you're on the clock for LCPS, this policy is clear that aides may not be compelled or permitted to perform personal activities for their member during work hours, which I support.

[00:28:02] I think that's a good breakdown. I am curious about how we monitor that and enforce it particularly because the aides like everyone else do have the right to participate in their government that if a board aide for example is at a board meeting or committee meeting and wants to speak are they putting in for the hours that they're at that meeting if they're there for their member how do we how do we address that that's one of

[00:28:33] my that's one of my concerns I share similar thoughts and that's why I think we're just quite not there yet but one of the things that you touched on and actually that I've really appreciated about your work miss Donahue with our school board policies is the cross-reference and the the due diligence to make sure that we have those definitions in place and I think in terms of activism there's a lot of different belief systems around what is activism and what is not is simply holding political beliefs and stating that activism I don't know I think that there should be some if we're gonna add

[00:29:12] those kinds of specifics in or keep them we need to do some work and I get I mean I don't mean to like keep reiterating but I just feel like there's needs to be some more time for us to really get to a place where we feel like this isn't a good place that's just where I'm at miss Donahue thank you chair Chandler I I tend to agree.

[00:29:37] I also was stunned that we only received five pieces of feedback on this policy. I also, particularly in light of what you were just saying, Ms. Chernoff, there are places in this policy that talk about not performing political activity or campaigning, and then in other places also say no personal activities.

[00:30:03] And those are different restrictions, and I have not thought about the tension or possible disparity between those requirements or prohibitions. And I am leaning towards thinking that perhaps we

should not vote on this today, but extend the time for comment and additional thoughts of our own and put it on the August agenda.

[00:30:35] the good news is it is an information item right so we definitely I don't intend in making that comment to limit any further discussion but I do think it is an appropriate time to say we certainly have the ability if there's no objection to bring this back as an action item in August after the recess which would give us plenty of time to work on the policy and in a greater depth to make sure that we get it right. Thank you for that clarification, Chair Chandler. I think that

[00:31:13] makes sense. Thank you so much, Ms. Donahue. Thank you, Ms. Chandler, for being open to the discussion, and I obviously agree. One of the things that did come to my attention, like I said last time, is I thought that I had sort of been clear in directing us to go back to the drawing board about confidentiality and sort of directing staff to look at reconciling some of that language.

[00:31:34] it turns out i was not clear in that so i am asking the committee now to follow the process and to say if we could agree that that particular space needs to be sort of reconciled i guess is the right word i think mr allen is that correct reconcile the language is that would that be the appropriate ask thank you mr schernoff uh yes if that's the will of the committee so that particularly i think does need looking at because i i do feel that there are certain contradictions and redundancies that we probably could absolve with looking at NDA versus confidential information.

[00:32:11] Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. I'm definitely in agreement. Ms. Donahue? Yes, thank you. Thank you, Chair Chandler. I also agree. And if staff is reconciling language, I would request that we also look to these prohibitions on political activities, campaigning activities, personal activities, and ensure that we have some consistency, and if we want different categories to be in this policy, to be clear

[00:32:44] about what those categories, what activities those categories contain, and under what circumstances one may be applicable but not the other. Thank you, Ms. Donahue, and I would reiterate my support for that effort as well.

[00:33:00] I think it would be very important for us to make sure that we align all of our policies so that we are treating our employees, whether or not they serve at the will of the school board member or our LCPS employees clearly understand what the expectations are so that there isn't any gray area.

[00:33:19] Mr. Allen, do you have any comments that you would like to make on this issue at this time? Thank you, Madam Chair. Just as two points of clarification, if I'm understanding correctly to inform staffs, um proposed changes one is is it the will of the committee to then bring policy 7524 which is staff participation in political activities and applied that into this policy 2610 that is the will of this committee thank you and in clarification number two so currently the policy 2610 which

[00:33:57] is currently in effect um provides that staff aids will not be provided confidential personnel information, information protected under FERPA, or any other confidential information by LCPS staff unless required to do so by law. And then, of course, the NDA, there's tensions there that provides more access to confidential information on a basis as the board aid seats fit, essentially. So which way would the committee prefer to incorporate changes to reconcile those tensions? Does that make sense? Would you want the terms of the NDA, which provides

[00:34:32] broader access to confidential information be massaged into the proposed 2610, or is the committee's preference as to what 2610 currently reads with kind of a prohibition on sharing of

confidential information?

[00:34:54] Thank you, Mr. Allen, for that question. With that, I'll ask for clarification from the committee. Ms. Donahue? Thank you, Ms. Chandler, and thank you, Mr. Allen. I have a hard time contextualizing what the different categories are.

[00:35:10] Would you be able to give us any hypothetical examples of how confidential is different from privileged, is different from the other words that we're using? Certainly, Ms. Donahue, I'll try. So as the policy currently reads, it's confidential personnel information.

[00:35:30] So any advisory or update regarding a personnel matter that might, you know, as you're aware, any kind of decision regarding a personnel matter, the board is privy to because the board has to act on.

[00:35:48] And so based on that information, is it the committee's will to have that information shared with their board aide? Could that be helpful to the board member in their fulfillment of their duties? That's one consideration. student matters sometimes student discipline matters come before the board members and and there's names and personally identifiable information shared with board members as school officials with the illegitimate educational interest and is that information that board members feel could be shared with board aids to help them fulfill their duties and then of course

[00:36:24] there's attorney-client privilege which even the nda currently reads is highly confidential and should not be shared with board aides thank you ms chandler thank you for that mr allen that additional clarifying information was very helpful for me um so in my from my perspective i think that it would i would like to be able to share some of this with the aids um for example if we had if we were in the position of needing to review a personnel matter that had several

[00:36:59] hundreds of pages of documents would be enormously helpful to have input and assistance from the aid, although I am certainly sensitive to confidentiality issues. As you were talking I was trying to think if it was feasible or would be unduly burdensome to redact materials like that if we wanted to to share them with our aides so that names, other personally identifiable information is not visible but

[00:37:34] we could still have the benefit of the support of our aides. If you have any input or comment to that suggestion. Ms. Chernoff.

[00:37:51] Thank you, Chair Chandler. I would tend to agree with Ms. Donahue on this. Again, I support like Section IV, A, B, C, D, and E remaining if there's an NDA in place that specifically outlines not disclosing that information had some discussions with the board of supervisors and their the way that they run with their aids and their policies and I don't know if you all have reached out to that to me that seems like the closest example of elected officials that we have personal contact with that have aids and they have access to confidential information is my understanding but there are rules in place that you don't share that and so

[00:38:30] I think this is a conversation this is about trust right like we put this in the policy we if we have clear backing to the policy for the consequences that are in place for sharing said confidential information and they sign an NDA saying they're not going to do that with certain exceptions I think makes might make sense that we could work out I really I err on that side because like Miss Donahue said this is a big job and a lot of the things that we are lifting have that veil on it to be honest. And right now they don't have access to that information. And so that work falls to us.

[00:39:05] And while we've signed up for doing that work, I do think when Mr. Allen asks, would it be helpful to accomplishing the work of your job? It would. Definitely in certain cases. Again, understanding ultimately, whatever that relationship is, it is a reflection of us ourselves. And we are taking that ownership. And so that's where I would tend to fall is more confidentiality being shared, but the NDA being very secure. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. I would like to perhaps suggest after my question that we move on, I want to make sure that we have adequate time to deal with the next item on our

[00:39:43] agenda, which is the fiscal year 25 audit plan. But before we close out this discussion, knowing that it will come back in August, Mr. Allen, could you please clarify what the consequences would be if confidential information was shared under the existing NDA, and what consequences exist currently if a school board member would be held accountable in the event that confidential information was disclosed.

[00:40:17] So, thank you, Madam Chair. I'll start with the latter. Under current policy, and I think the proposed changes to Policy 2610 state this rather expressly, But really it's incumbent upon the board member, the respective board member for the board aid, any action they would face the possible consequences under policy 1035 for the conduct or potential alleged misconduct of their board aid.

[00:40:53] And it would be ultimately up to the respective board member to terminate their board aid, for lack of a better phrasing there. Under the NDA, there does provide some language for consequences on confidential information. If you give me a chance, that's under Section 8 and injunctive relief, which reads as follows. Each party acknowledges, and party being there's a board member and then their board aide, so each party acknowledges that unauthorized disclosure or use of confidential information provided to the board aid may cause substantial

[00:41:33] harm and damage to the Loudoun County School Board and or the assigned board member, which may be difficult to ascertain and which may not be adequately compensated by damages at law. Therefore, each party agrees that in the event of a breach or threatened breach of the terms of this agreement, the disclosure shall be entitled to an injunction prohibiting any unauthorized disclosure or further use of its confidential information. Any such injunctive relief shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of, any appropriate monetary damages and or termination

[00:42:06] of employment. So that's what the NDA currently reads. Thank you, Mr. Allen. You've certainly given us a lot to think about. And with that, we're going to move on to our action items. We'll start with item 4.1, Office of the Auditor General, Fiscal Year 25 Audit Plan. Mr. Woods, the floor is yours. Thank you. Pleasure to present to you OAG's fiscal year 25 audit universe, which will allow you all to select and approve audits the OAG will perform in fiscal year 25.

[00:42:42] The audits you approved today will serve as OAG's fiscal year 25 audit plan. To help with your decision, I do have a few recommendations. First, I recommend the LA&P committee re-approve all fiscal year 24 carryover audits. Second, I recommend the LAAP committee does not approve the consultant procurement practices audit. At this time, I think there are other audits in the universe that are higher risk and are a better use of our resources. Lastly, I recommend the

[00:43:18] LAAP committee approve three to four audits from the FY25 audit universe. And those are all my recommendations. I am glad to answer any questions and welcome the discussion. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Woods. I'm happy to kick off this discussion.

[00:43:35] I definitely agree with your recommendation to carry over the fiscal year 24 audits. I would like to see, from my perspective, the Jefferson contracts, school board and staff communication, although I'm happy to have a little bit further clarification, But I do believe that this is relating to confidential information that's not subject to FOIA and can be made restricted.

[00:44:08] And then I am also interested in the registrar's information management and data integrity. I think that's very important. And the transportation management audit. Are there any other comments or concerns?

[00:44:24] Oh, Ms. Chernoff. Thank you, Chair Chandler. I agree. So that is good news, I think. I also want to just note that something was brought to my attention was that we are asking for, and I still support it, but we're asking for an audit for the ID badging, but we're also paying for an update in our badging through end-of-year funds.

[00:44:49] And so in speaking with Mr. Woods, it was brought to my attention that it doesn't mean that those three have to go first. We could potentially wait until those changes are in place and then have the audit to see how successful that is working, which I would tend to think that would be a really good idea. But in terms of supporting safety and security, I definitely support keeping it.

[00:45:09] And my four are the same as Ms. Chandler's in terms of wanting to look at. And I also want people to understand that the school board and staff communication would be an internal audit process, which would include a lot of confidential, enclosed meeting potentially information and really working on how to build some efficiency there as we are a new board I think that that would be supportive and this is a big this is a big organization and there's a lot of channels to work through and so I think looking at all of that for me in order to do my job well would be very

[00:45:44] very beneficial thank you thank you mr. not miss Donahue thank you chair Chandler thank you mr. Woods for your recommendations I also support continuing the carry on carry over of the fiscal year 2024 audits I I would say my priority of choice for the FY25 universe is the transportation management audit I don't have particular opposition to the other proposals I am

[00:46:17] curious mr. woods how you how you determine the workflow and the order if If we approve four additional FY25 audits, how do you determine in what order? Do you work on multiple ones at the same time, or how do you determine what order you do those in?

[00:46:37] It just depends on the factors. So given the badging may be updated, that one could be pushed back. Also, we can decide order today, or we can decide order based on risk. And so that's usually how we determine order.

[00:46:53] Also, school year. Some things are better suited to do during the school year, similar to the SPED audit. That's something you want to do during the school year. Other audits we can do at any time. Badging you can do at any time. But because there is an update in the process, then it can be pushed back.

[00:47:11] And so we can have that discussion now how we want to proceed with the audits now. But outside of the badging, I would prefer that we do the IT third-party risk and the audit of LCPS staff support and advocacy resources first, and then we can push back the security pass and ID badging to the back of the line.

[00:47:35] Thank you, Mr. Woods. And sorry, where would transportation management fall in your proposed possible timeline? Well, depending on the appetite of the committee, we can start that. It could be the third in line after IT third-party risk audit and audit of LCPS staff support and advocacy resources.

[00:47:57] And so you'd have the top two FY24 carryovers, and then you'd have the transportation, and then we'd work from there. So that would be one. So IT third-party risk first, support and advocacy resources second, transportation management audit third.

[00:48:15] Thank you. Thank you. Ms. Chernoff, not to put you on the spot. I do like to do that quite a bit. I would be interested in hearing if you agree with that prioritization and which other options you think would fall in line. I would also like to say just to table set that I would love to be able to move on to our next item by two o'clock. Completely agree. I thank you Chair Chandler for asking. I agree with Ms. Donahue. I think transportation is kind of on the top of a lot

[00:48:55] our minds as we're looking at early start times that was definitely something that i was caring about deeply so and we've talked about a lot so i do believe that that would support that so i'd like to see that up there um i think jefferson contracts and would maybe also have a budget implication so i would be um curious to see how those different contracts and ftes could evolve from there so i would have that next and then i'm open to the rest but i would fully support transportation being the third. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. Ms. Donahue? I agree. No objection.

[00:49:34] I also agree with this order. And then just as a point of clarification, if we keep the carryover, we are still looking to submit four on the list? Correct. No more than four. No more than four. Yes. So that four total including the carryover? If you include the carryovers, there will be a total is seven, so no more than four from the FY25 list. Okay. With that, I would be happy to go on the record to say that I would probably slot the registrar as five, although I hate, but given the

[00:50:12] level of risk and then school board and staff communication is six, I would be comfortable in that area. Sure. So if I do, I'll just make sure that I've captured this and I'd be happy to hear any clarifications. We are going to slot at the number one position, carryover audit, IT third party risk audit. And the number two slot, audit of the LCPS staff support and advocacy resources.

[00:50:42] Then we would move into the fiscal year 25 audit universe and pull as number three, the LCPS transportation management audit. Number four would be the Jefferson Contracts Administration. Five, registrar information management and data integrity.

[00:50:59] And six, school board and staff communications. And then I would leave seven to be the pass and ID badging audit. That's a great. Thank you for that clarification. All right.

[00:51:17] All right. Seeing that we're in agreement, I will make a motion that we carry over the fiscal year 24 carryover audits and include in the order that we just discussed the new fiscal year 25 audit universe to include the lcps transportation management audit the jefferson contracts administration the registrar information management and data integrity and the school board and staff communication and with this motion we will send it to the full board as an

[00:51:56] information item. Second. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. The motion is properly moved and seconded. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Seeing none opposed, the motion passes unanimously with all committee members present. With that, we come to the last item on our agenda

[00:52:19] today, which is item 4.02, collective bargaining. Okay, so to bring us back into the heart of this work with the help of my staff aide, we have updated our slides. So what you see here is what we presented at the LAMP meeting on June 7th. And if I could have the next slide, please.

[00:52:53] We updated this slide to show the consensus that was reached in terms of the positions at the last meeting. So please reflect on the slide, and we'll discuss the actual, if we are in agreement and have captured this accurately.

[00:53:15] Next slide, please. This was presented on June 7th, and next slide, please. This is the positions that were reached at the time, and the proposed draft language, which we have also updated the draft to ease the transition if we're able to come to a conclusion today.

[00:53:42] And next slide, please. We have a proposal that was presented at our last meeting, and next slide, please, the consensus that we reached at that time. and then next slide please this is on the evergreen clause after our discussion we've got

[00:54:07] to the point next slide please and I would like to note we should perhaps come back to this after the end of our discussion today to make sure that we're all in agreement I do recall that Ms. Donahue had not been comfortable making a decision at that time.

[00:54:33] So that is reflected here, and we'll continue moving through the slide deck. We have, and the next slide, please, the consensus, and we'll move on.

[00:54:54] Okay, so that actually, if you could go forward to just one more, our positions here were in agreement. Let's see, or did we go back to the beginning? Okay. We had some colorful slides for the work that we need to do today.

[00:55:22] Okay. All right. So I'd like to start here today in terms of looking at the items, the subjects that are LCPS to the extent required, authorized and permitted by law.

[00:55:49] Thus, the board retains exclusive rights, which shall be prohibitive subjects of collective bargaining, including but not limited to the rights. In this particular language, I find that I'm supportive of the LEA position.

[00:56:05] I believe if we left the language as it exists, there wouldn't be any subjects left over which to collectively bargain. With that said, I'm happy to open the discussion, open the floor to further discussion. Ms. Donahue?

[00:56:30] Thank you, Ms. Chandler. I'm comfortable striking the language. Thank you.

[00:56:44] Ms. Chernoff? I am still confused about this a little bit, but I think that the language in the draft that we have would preclude the ability to bargain many things, and that is a concern of mine.

[00:57:03] The other piece of this is just legally, I just want to make sure that the board retains the ultimate authority. I had looked at some of the other agreements, like at Fairfax. I'm hesitant to pull in other language at this time, though, because it seems that you two are in alignment, and so I don't know that that would be productive at this time.

[00:57:26] So I think we should move forward. Okay, thank you. It looks like we have a consensus on Section 4A, and we will move on to the next slide. Okay, this is Section 1, lines 156 to 164.

[00:57:46] The current language reads, working conditions means during the term of the first collective bargaining agreement negotiated between the board and the exclusive bargaining representative, a maximum of four. Oh, wait, I'm going to, we've had quite a lot of discussion about this one, actually.

[00:58:04] And we do have a proposed compromise. This goes back to the first conversation that we had. And I would say in terms of this particular edit, I would be in favor of the proposed compromise.

[00:58:26] And it would be helpful, I think, if I could hear from my committee members if we have captured the compromise appropriately.

[00:58:57] Ms. Donohue?

[00:59:21] Thank you, Ms. Chandler. am I correct that this the the proposal at the top the LCPS language is adding some more descriptive information around categories of working conditions that was not previously part of this draft because I don't I don't recall seeing

[00:59:51] this language before I'm gonna go back to my clean copy that I worked from from the beginning and let's check miss Chandler if I may the slides that we worked off of last time had that same language so it was we have had this language this is not new

[01:00:28] language right I thank you for that clarification I believe that to be true as well I think in reflecting back on our conversation on the first day the proposal that came into place was that we limit the negotiations so that in line 162, so let me go back. In order to update the current language, we would need to add to 160 in the following two successive rounds of

[01:01:05] collective bargaining. So the goal would be to put some limitations on the second and third rounds of collective bargaining and then we would replace so for the second and third rounds of collective bargaining it would be limited to two new topics correct and then at line 162

[01:01:33] we would make that six and that would be for the third so we have the second and third the fourth round and then after that there would be no more limitation on the bargaining topics that is my

[01:01:57] understanding from our meeting our last la and p meeting not the work session thank you miss donnie thank you miss chandler that's also consistent with my recollection of our discussion that first round of negotiation can be up to four topics the first renewal discussions for first

[01:02:35] renewal would be an additional six for a total of 10 on top of the previous four, then the next round an additional six on top of that, and then the next round unlimited. And I'm fine with that.

[01:02:53] I appreciate Ms. Chernoff pointing out that the language I was asking about before was in the previous slides, although I will point out these slides were not posted before our last meeting, So I did not see them before we had our last meeting.

[01:03:09] And when we did have our last meeting, I was focused on the numbers. So I support what we've discussed about the numbers of working conditions. And I feel very strongly that we need to get this out of committee today. But that being said, I want to put an asterisk on my position that I want to spend some more time reflecting on this added language around the working conditions and I I may be fine with it the next time we see it but I or I may suggest changes but I don't want to hold this up thank you thank you Miss Donahue I'm also in

[01:03:48] favor of the compromise language so I'll refer to that as the school board language madam chair if I may just as a clarification so all are on the same page. The way that lines 161 and 162 currently read, it mentions that each may make proposals to bargain up to blank additional bargaining topics. So if each are -- if we're placing the two with the six, would that be 12? Should it be three? Each may make three for a total of six. I had this question last time when we met, but I reserved it for now, I guess.

[01:04:25] Thank you, Mr. Allen. I think I'm comfortable with the numbers as they stand. Okay. Thank you for that clarification. With that, we'll move on. Section 7A, Clause 1, at lines 358 and 361.

[01:04:46] In this, we are looking at the types of employees and or authorization cards signed by employees. The foregoing items will be accepted as evidence of the employee's wish only if signed within 24 months prior to the date on which the employee organization submitted its election request.

[01:05:07] LEA is suggesting that we strike. The foregoing item will be accepted as evidence of the employee's wish only if signed within the 24 months prior to the date on which the employee organization submitted its election request. The LCPS position will be agreeable to striking the expiration date as set forth in lines 358 and 361 on the condition that there is clarifying language in the LCPS collective bargaining resolution, the no authorization card signed prior to the adoption of the LCPS collective bargaining resolution will be accepted as evidence for the certification of the

[01:05:41] exclusive bargaining representative. Ms. Donohue. Thank you, Ms. Chandler. I support striking the sentence the foregoing items and I do not support the suggestion to add authorization cards signed prior to the adoption of the resolution will not be accepted and I would like to add I think that would be an unreasonable and onerous requirement because it would mean that every card collected

[01:06:14] by LEA to this point is not valid and they would have to start this process all over again. Thank you, Ms. Donahue. Ms. Chernoff? I agree that I don't want them to have to start over completely.

[01:06:30] I would ask for clarification when we're talking about this second part as evidence of certification in terms of the resolution part. That is, if they were to recertify, if they had to start over, that would be to a 30% threshold, not 51, correct?

[01:06:46] Just understanding the difference there. This is specifically about triggering the election, correct? Is that correct, Bueller? Thank you, Ms. Chernoff.

[01:07:01] That's my understanding. This is, yeah, a process in terms of certifying up in the organization that they're interested in this organization as a potential exclusive bargaining representative. The only other interest I have is to just make sure that it's understood that those employees are still employees of LCPS.

[01:07:24] So I don't know if we need to add language to clarify that. And then I don't know. I know I have spoken with LEA about this potential for a compromise. I don't see it here, and I don't know if we need it, but thinking about not starting over, that I am fully with you, Ms. Donahue. Don't want that. Will not let that happen.

[01:07:46] but thinking about the people that did sign those cards sending out an email and just saying hey we're getting ready to have an election if you still stand by that second box that you checked email if you if you don't stand by that so having people that wanted to opt out send an email and say i no longer

want to be a part of that offering an opportunity for that not to say yes but to opt out for a short amount of time just to make sure that we are opening that door for it

[01:08:20] to be fair and to keep us in alignment with what would happen with an election, but also to make sure that LEA absolutely does not have to go out and get 30% cards again. So that had been something that we had talked about. I don't know if that would be something that we could decide logistically later, but if we should add language to clarify that they must still be employees, they can't be cards of people who have left and then potentially re-certifying the cards through an opt-out only process.

[01:08:53] If that made any sense, I don't know. Thank you, Ms. Chernoff. I think one of the things in reflecting back on this process, it is new for almost all Virginians. It's certainly new for us as a school board, and I appreciate all the work and all the effort that we've made in terms of working through this together to come to a better understanding.

[01:09:16] I will go, I'm happy to say that I actually support the LEA language as it stands. In this case, in reflecting on the fact that the cards are used to trigger an election, and the election requires, under the law, that you have the option to say, I choose none, I feel like there's enough room there for that to be acceptable.

[01:09:44] So, with that, oh, yes, Ms. Donahue. Thank you. I just wanted to add one other comment in addition to, I was going to make the same point you did. Thank you. But my understanding is that when the cards were certified to trigger this process, that LEA did not include cards from people who were no longer at LCPS.

[01:10:10] That would be my only stipulation. So it looks like we've reached consensus on the three remaining issues. So let's go back and look at the ones in which we had some further questions.

[01:10:28] So for the room, I will ask that we go back to this slide. And unfortunately, I don't have the number. I'm sorry. But if we could go to Section 9, Clause 1, lines 653 to 659.

[01:11:08] I will go on the record as stating that my position hasn't changed. I still support the LCPS language for this clause. Ms. Chernoff? Thank you, Chair Chandler. Mine also stands the same. I did want to capture, Ms. Donahue, that you had noted a request for more time.

[01:11:28] So I just wanted to be able to come back and see where you were on this one.

[01:12:06] I apologize, Ms. Chandler, but there's a lot of different boxes on here. So my bottom line is I don't agree with language that would allow the board to unilaterally extend contract terms in the event of an impasse.

[01:12:30] I'm trying to look at this to assess if I'm really just looking at two proposals or not. Just two? Yes, just two. All right. Then I support the LEA language.

[01:12:45] Okay. So I can capture your vote. thank you for that but with that the consensus would move it towards the LCPS language knowing that we aren't necessarily done with the discussion as it will go before the full board and then I would also ask if we could move

[01:13:05] to section 1 the slide that refers to lines 102 and 104 I will also go on the record again and say my position has not changed I am in favor of the compromise

[01:13:44] language that was brought forward in terms of collaborating with both the departments here at LCPS and and the legal department and with the LEA I think this is a great compromise for us so my position hasn't changed I would support the LCPS school board option to add at line I believe 102 the phrase as this provision applies such that school-based employees would not fall within the definition of confidential employees but I did want to bring this

[01:14:24] back because we had noted that you might want to discuss it further I would may I yes please thank you thank you mr. so I think I put the question out at our last meeting if we are now talking about making these qualifications two lines 102 and 103 and looking at the following slide which has the definition of confidential employee i i still don't understand why if we have this definition of confidential employee and it is defined by what

[01:15:04] employees what information employees have access to why we then also need these lines that specifically identify entire departments. Thank you, Ms. Donahue.

[01:15:23] Did you want to direct that in terms of a further question, or just happy to have that on the record? I mean, I guess I would -- anyone in staff has thoughts on why we need this additional language, why we can't just end the definition of confidential employee, which says, or employee in any department.

[01:15:53] I don't understand why we're singling out these three. I'm happy to try to respond, Ms. Donahue. You know, I know that Mr. Allen last time spoke to the comma, and I think we just want to be clear about confidential employees that have access to information and that who should and shouldn't be included, so we want to be clear about that so that anybody that reads it, regardless if you've been a part of this conversation or not, they're clear in terms of what we mean by confidential employees.

[01:16:27] And I think that's back to this section that we, in terms of the language, we do, we did come with the language that said, you know, there are some school-based folks that this would not apply to. And so trying to make sure we are clear about who might have access to some of that information and who might not.

[01:16:42] And so I think to your question, Ms. Donahue, I think, unfortunately, I think it comes back to the comma, the conversation we had last time around really, is it confidential, budgetary, and fiscal information or confidential, comma, budgetary or fiscal information? personnel data and all that the others that go with that so at least that's my interpretation of that in terms of our discussion last time and we just want to be clear about who's included and who is not and we want we do want to include as many people as possible but obviously want to be clear and be careful about anyone that might have access to confidential information thank you Dr.

[01:17:18] Smith when I reflect on this you know I guess I would just like to ask another other question. In terms of this document, if we got to the third successive round and decided that this qualification wasn't working for us, how could the document be changed?

[01:17:44] Thank you, Madam Chair. The board, within the constraints of the prior collective bargaining agreements that have been executed, the board could potentially move to amend this resolution to clarify. And I think after a couple of rounds of collective bargaining, there would be a better sense of which employees fall within and which have access to potentially confidential information pursuant to this. But I think this provides clarity, as Dr. Smith referenced, and also helps

[01:18:20] streamline the whole election and our eligibility process. Thank you, Mr. Allen. Ms. Chernoff? My agreement on this was contingent on the fact that I did agree to get rid of the comma. I know it's going to go down in history as the great comma of 2024.

[01:18:40] So I would like to stick with that plan, and so my position has not changed. Okay, thank you. With that, our consensus is reached, although our conversation is not over, so we will move on. That language will be reflected in the draft.

[01:18:55] And we have one last, I believe, if we could move to Section 3, lines 193 to 202 on building access.

[01:19:21] Oh, could we go just one more? Sorry about all of our boxes. Just wanted an interesting visual to help us focus in on our work. In this case, we are bringing this back up today.

[01:19:39] i want to make sure that we have captured this adequately so what we've done here is again reach a compromise based on the committee's wishes so that we strike the request is approved and then we are changing the language so that it reflects the performance

[01:20:12] of job duties as opposed to contracted job duties wait or let's see okay so it's there we would strike the word performance of and it would just read contracted job duties great all right so i am in support of this combined compromise um ms chernoff i am as well thank you and uh ms donoghue thank you ms chandler my only other suggestion was uh obviously i support removing the language

[01:20:49] that says the request is approved, but in the prior phrase that says a written request for the use of facility premises, I would suggest that we change request to notice. Okay, Ms. Donahue, I'm just going to ask you to repeat that.

[01:21:04] I want to make sure I'm in exactly the right place. A written request for the use of facility premises is submitted to the site supervisor at least three business days in advance of the meeting. I would suggest that we change request to notice.

[01:21:22] And I don't recall if we in-depth discussed last time what happens when, if there is, this applies to pre-scheduled meetings. And there have been some concerns raised about what if a situation develops that results in an employee wanting to speak to their union representative, such that there is not time to provide three days advance written notice to the school.

[01:21:58] I guess it would start with a question, which would be, is the line that Ms. Donahue is referring to in alignment with other policies for which we ask school members or community members to access our buildings?

[01:22:22] Yes, Madam Chair, that is correct. Currently, Regulation 6310 governs that, and it provides for three business days in advance of the meeting. Thank you so much, Mr. Allen.

[01:22:38] I think in terms of when I reflected on this, and I guess I would suggest that in terms of the phrase at the top, to hold individual and group meetings, would it be possible or change the language in any significant way if we saw the first section B as being related to group meetings and the second section C as being individual meetings so that there might be more rigidity around pre-scheduled group meetings

[01:23:14] and more flexibility in the event that there was a need for an emergency or an individual meeting. Ms. Chandler, do you mind repeating that for me one more time? Sure. Capture that. Okay, so I'm looking at the clean copy.

[01:23:31] And it's possible that the language on our slide isn't exactly right, but I want to look at line 193 under the rights of exclusive bargaining representatives as it stands now to hold group meetings with members of the bargaining unit provided that.

[01:23:48] And then we have this, so these are group meetings where you would have time to plan and give adequate notice. And then if we look at C, so in adding the new proposed language by the LEA after line 202, this is referring to access individual employees.

[01:24:14] so in that event it's not necessarily a pre-planned meeting so it wouldn't require as much rigidity in terms of access dr. Smith or miss Chandler I appreciate that clarification I think I'm on okay I do appreciate that clarification and so as I understand it section B would stay as is and then you

[01:24:51] would add that additional language under two under section C which starts at 204 I think that would help because I think one of the things that I think about is when especially when you're talking about group meetings we have reservations in our buildings all the time with different things going on so I would I appreciate wanting to follow that same process for group meetings individual meetings I think we understand that and want to make sure they have access as well so I think that makes a lot of sense thank you Dr. Smith and just to clarify the compromise would still strike the request is approved I am comfortable with that

[01:25:29] I would love to hear from my colleagues. Ms. Donahue? Thank you, Ms. Chandler. I think I am also comfortable with that, although I would maybe suggest that we take Section B and give it two subsections, one for group meetings and one for individual meetings.

[01:25:52] And I would also suggest that the language of any non-LCPS staff must follow existing LCPS safety and security policy and procedures. I suggest that should apply to both, but I also think it's important to have clear differentiation between group and individual meeting needs.

[01:26:21] All right, so it looks like we're in agreement. I'm just going to flip through again. Ms. Donahue, could I please ask you to put that in writing so that we capture it accurately? Yes. Thank you. Okay. With that, I believe we have reached consensus on the proposed changes to the draft, and therefore, I would ask Ms. Donahue.

[01:26:47] Ms. Chandler, I would like to make a motion that the LANP committee forward the draft resolution on collective bargaining as amended pursuant to our discussions to the full board for its consideration.

[01:27:06] I second. Thank you so much. The motion has been made and properly seconded. All those in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. The motion is unanimous. The motion passes unanimously with all committee members present.

[01:27:26] Let's see. That brings us, let's see. We will now move on to new business.

[01:27:42] Is there any new business? Seeing none. The June.

[01:27:59] The June 20th, 2024, Legislative Audit and Policy Committee meeting is adjourned. Thank you for joining us.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com