



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County Public Schools, Curriculum & Instruction Committee Meeting, Wednesday, May 7, 2025

Date Wednesday, May 7, 2025
Place LCPS Administration Building / School Board Room, Ashburn, Virginia
Length 33m (video)

- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): <https://player.vimeo.com/video/1082389773?rel=0>

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 2026-10-13. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:00] Good afternoon my name is Lauren Chernoff and I am calling this curriculum and instruction meeting on May 7th 2025 to order I am the chair of this committee and I am joined tonight by my esteemed colleague Dr. Dean Dr. Rashid will not be joining us tonight so it's just the two of us we will begin our meeting with public comment so tonight we have one speaker so you will have three minutes and our first speaker tonight and only is miss andrea weisskopf go ahead when you're ready

[00:00:33] three minutes i have time to teach you all about adverbs let's do it don't tempt me um i do have a good adverb joke but um so i was reading over the policy about generative ai which was a little difficult because there are so many attachments but not on you it's good you had that many comments on it but it's obvious that no one in here has ever been gaslit by a student pretending that they didn't use AI very obvious none of

[00:01:12] you have been gaslit by a student saying they didn't use AI I am concerned that it says teachers are supposed to have transparency but students are not I I would also like to see that students should only be using it under teacher direction.

[00:01:35] I'm not a luddite, but I also don't use a lot of generative AI. I'm afraid of becoming more stupid. But students need specific guidance when to use it. The policy, I believe, just says they could use it for learning and creativity, but they need to be told to do it only under teacher guidance thank you Black Lives Matter thank you all right that concludes public comment for today so we will go ahead and

[00:02:09] move on to our agenda items item 3.1 is approval of the draft minutes for April 2nd meeting 2025 are there any changes or needed adjustments for the minutes okay I will make a motion to approve the draft minutes for April 2nd do I have a second a second it has been properly moved and seconded all those in favor aye any opposed none and so the minutes are approved that takes us to our action items tonight on 4.01 is policy 5440 the literacy plan this was brought to us last

[00:02:47] time as an information item and then went out for feedback from our various groups and so I will turn it over to mr neil slevin to intro it and then we can have some discussion thank you sure enough i am going to have no introduction and turn it over to mr thank you uh and it's all good joined as well by miss neil here tonight to talk about the feedback that we see from the policy and some small adjustments that we made and also wanted to address i think the focus of a lot

[00:03:23] of the feedback and how we might incorporate that in other ways so we made one small change to the policy based on feedback that came from an lcps employee in the public feedback they commented that the wording that we used in lines 25 through 27 was not clear and so we did make an adjustment there to say providing additional support for students who demonstrate substantial deficiencies on student assessment screeners and diagnostic tools which may include reading intervention services that's a slight tweak of what was there before but hopefully clarifies that we're using our tools to identify those students who need additional supports in literacy as

[00:04:03] part of the plan. I also wanted to, based on the other feedback that we received, the purpose of this policy is really to outline exactly what goes into our division literacy plan and to lay out the components of it.

[00:04:18] A lot of the feedback that we received was really valuable and I think can drive some good discussions as we talk about what goes in our plan, what's part of our curriculum. So we did not make any changes to this because this policy really does lay out the components of the literacy plan as outlined in the Virginia Literacy Act.

[00:04:35] And the feedback that we received, much of it generates some good information for us to use as we go about revising the plan and including those discussions as part of our curriculum discussions and things of that nature. And that plan will come, I think, to CNI in June with our revised plan to take into account K through eight we expand the Virginia Literacy Act next year so happy to take any questions or any additional concerns or comments from the feedback that we received as well Dr. Deans did you have any comments I was going to say something very similar so

[00:05:14] thank you mr. Roundsley I know SIAC is a little bit behind in their policy review they're reviewing it tonight so they will let us know and then when it gets to the full board they feel very comfortable with it going to the full board even though they're reviewing it tonight and like you said I was able to talked to Miss Crotty last night and it sounds like a lot of it is related to MTSS structures different interventions accessibility different sensory opportunities for all learners so I think all those things are more plan oriented she did ask me if there was going to be a regulation and I sort of said I think the regulation in this case is the plan and that seemed to check that box so I think we're good to go as well as MSAC I found their comments to be

[00:05:53] so thoughtful and you know I echo so much of that in terms of the love of reading and kids seeing themselves in books and having diverse texts and I was really encouraged by what they said but it was like this is a plan thing so I understand that rationale and support that as well and then I am going to

make a motion here in a minute to add the word to add a word on line five that just includes research and evidence-based I think I don't think that that would give staff any heartburn and I apologize for doing it in the 11th hour but I think I would hope that

[00:06:33] most evidence-based things are research-based as well but sometimes those things as we've learned in the past don't necessarily go hand in hand as the pendulum does swing so I will make that motion in a minute but other than that I also feel confident that this is a good high-level outline

[00:06:52] line and that it's ready to move forward. So staff has no concern. Wonderful. So with that, I will make a motion that this committee move the literacy plan policy 5440 to the full board.

[00:07:16] Do I have a second? A second. One. And then I will make an amendment. And I would like to move that on line five, we add the words research and before the word evidence. And so it would read the vision for the letter the vision for literacy in loudon county public schools is to provide every student with high quality research research and evidence-based literacy instruction necessary to become lifelong readers etc okay is that captured do i have a second second all right so that is properly moved and seconded so we are voting on the amendment all those in favor say aye

[00:07:50] aye any opposed none so we will go ahead and move to the base motion now which is to move this literacy plan policy to the full board all those in favor say aye aye any opposed none and that is done all right with that we will move to item number four point are we in four 4.02 policy 5430 use of general generative artificial intelligence is there anything that staff would like to go over before we make a motion thank you so like the literacy plan where

[00:08:28] we received thoughtful feedback from our community and we appreciate that input and based on that feedback staff has made some edits to the policy that I'm happy to walk the committee through first there there are many themes and questions about the appropriate use of AI related to student use similar to the comments made by our public speaker tonight and like other comments within the feedback received many of those concerns are addressed in the regulations that will accompany this policy once it's passed by the by the by the board

[00:09:04] and those are posted in public and in board docs and so for example there is a regulation on pathways inciting of artificial intelligence where it outlines different scenarios where a teacher would permit students to use generative AI different models and different purposes within within the classroom and some common language within LCPS when we're talking with students about the use of AI there's also information in there around how we would disclose the use of AI and work products at the direction of teachers as well as cite the work professionally because that's a world in which our students will be entering and there is also a regulation around privacy and

[00:09:44] data protection when using artificial intelligence which addressed many of the concerns raised in our feedback from the community there were also some really good ideas and comments on the policy itself so I'll start with line 35 we changed section C from monitoring review and appropriate usage to monitoring review simply because the public feedback was you're actually not talking about appropriate usage in this section you have a whole section about staff use and you don't do it in section C so we focus that on monitoring review where we talk about the annual review and compliance

[00:10:20] oversight of the tools that we use on section D2D we did strike out only using generative AI tools that are provided by the school division to ensure the adequate data and privacy protections that was

based on the feedback that why are we saying that to teachers and not students like they were wondering why it wasn't in both sections and as you'll see by my next comment we did add a section four under section d regarding the prohibited use of gender ai and that is where we added

[00:10:57] the using tools that aren't approved by lcbs and that would apply across all the three groups mentioned in the policy i'm not sure which particular group suggested adding a prohibit use of gender ai but just because of the importance of this topic we thought it was good feedback and added that in so prohibit use of generative ai using gender ai tools that are not provided or authorized. The section B, 4B, was actually feedback from SEAC. They gave input about using generative AI for eligibility decisions, IEP generation, or placement decisions without the

[00:11:33] review of a human, which is something we, is really important to us as we think about AI. So we expanded that to grading and course design. We don't want a teacher just to develop a lesson plan without actually reading it and making sure it meets what we're trying to accomplish in our classroom and then finally the big one section 4c sharing personally identifiable information with gender of AI programs so with that I'm happy to answer any questions or receive additional feedback on this policy we did have a spotlight last night so I just want to thank John Champ High School and the teachers there for sharing a little bit about some of our

[00:12:12] high schools are using that tool and I think the instructional technology facilitator did a great job of how the work we've been doing has been supporting him and his role so I'm hopeful this policy and the regulations will support our teachers as they move into the world of generative AI in the classroom. Thank you Mr. Slevin. Dr. Deans do you have any comments? I have a question in relation to our public speaker tonight I'm wondering if in section D for student

[00:12:51] teacher and staff use of generative AI if I know that a lot of this is outlined in the regulation but I'm wondering if it might if it would if it might be helpful to add in the section under students a bullet two bullets actually a D that would maybe say only using generative AI when directed by a teacher or an educator and then maybe adding E I like the point about transparency I think that the honesty and ethics are clearly addressed but I do like the

[00:13:25] idea about transparency so possibly in section e and i literally just drafted this so would appreciate your feedback maybe saying something being transparent and honest about how and why they use generative ai to support their own learning so that it kind of mirrors the teacher

[00:13:44] piece on transparency so it's a b and c now that would add a d and an e would it be a similar statement transparency for students transparency about how and why they're using generative ai

[00:14:11] And I just said to support their own learning, being transparent about how and why they are using generative AI to support their own learning.

[00:14:35] It kind of reiterates that part about the honesty part is already addressed, I feel like, but I feel like this being transparent is just saying why you did it. And I do think that there is some nuance in terms of knowing when or not a kid used it, and this would back teachers up in that.

[00:15:00] I don't have a concern with that. What I'm mulling over is are our future classrooms, and this is a sincere question, going to be lockstep in any move a student makes with using an AI tool will be directed by the teacher?

[00:15:19] And so when you think about the pathways document related to using generative AI as a coach, so it says here the teacher will help decide which tiers applies to an assignment. Is the spirit of the amendment to be responsive to the direction of the teacher regarding the appropriate use of AI for a particular assignment, as opposed to a big carve-out?

[00:15:49] Like, what if a student potentially is using it to keep themselves organized? Yeah, no, I hear what you're saying, and I was thinking about the presentation last night from the teachers. They said, like, well, we would tell them to do this, and then through their questioning, they would discover that this also could support them, and then they would come back.

[00:16:06] And so it wasn't always, like, the original assignment was directed. So maybe we need to do some more thinking about that before it goes to the full board. But I do like the idea of adding a Section D with the transparency piece.

[00:16:24] Does that give you any heartburn? So you would be concerned about sending it to the full board without? No, no, I mean, we're going to send it tonight, hopefully. Potentially bring another amendment. Potentially, if I can, yeah, reach out to educators and, you know, talk about that piece a little bit more about teacher-directed, because I hear your point as well, but I would feel comfortable adding in the amendment for the transparency line tonight.

[00:16:54] I think there's a way, I don't, I'm not concerned about the transparency one, and I think there's a way to word it that really supports the intent of the regulation and just would lead people there. Yeah. So I can work on something as well, and we could have some conversations about that as moves to the full board if you're comfortable with that that sounds great so with that did you have anything you wanted to add so with that i will make a motion to move policy 54 30 use of generative artificial intelligence to the full board do i have a second second all right and then i'm going

[00:17:29] to make an amendment so i'm going to make an amendment that after line 58 we add a section d to the student use of generative ai and we're going it's going to say being transparent about how and why they use generative ai to support their own learning do i have a second second is there any discussion right and then e would be we're going to mull that over between now and when

[00:18:04] it gets to the full board okay because we're uncertain um all right so we have a motion and it has been properly seconded so we will now vote on the amendment to add a section d all those in favor say aye aye there are none opposed so that passes and now we will go to the base motion as amended and vote for the policy to be sent to the full board that has also been properly moved and seconded so now we will vote all those in favor aye aye none opposed so policy 5430 will also move to the full board thank you and now we will move on to

[00:18:43] item number five point oh one which is our information item tonight review of policy 5070 field trips and I will toss it over to good afternoon so we're bringing this policy back the rash the reason for this policies review is it's under its five-year review it's part of our strategic plan goal one goal one empowering students and aligned actions 1.2 a little bit of background last time

[00:19:20] this policy was revised was December 3rd 2019 we brought forth this information on April 2nd we received some feedback from the committee and added those points into the policy and we also know that there are some concerns about adding some language to the regulation the regulation hasn't been

approved yet by cabinet but I'll tell you the language that I was looking for to to address the inclement weather that she brought forth it did go out to public comment it did

[00:19:57] receive one one public feedback comment and that was centered around if there is an appeal process if a principal was to deny the request of a field trip made by a teacher there is no appeal process that's an operational decision the approval process is outlined on page two under letter C the approval process field trips will be approved by the school principal and the Department of

[00:20:31] school leadership also the only other changes that you might notice from the redline version to the clean version is we identified definitions to align with the regulation and also align with current practices and terms that are used when we're entering trips in a trip finder and obviously having common language between school-based administrators and our support staff at

[00:21:09] transportation believe there's a question about discipline and that was that's actually already cited in policy under letter E on page three student safety accountability and supervision and at this time I can read the statement mission off that we were looking at adding into regulation because I know we discussed not adding a inclement weather statement into policy but you would prefer to see it in regulation so we said the superintendent

[00:21:47] or their designee has the authority to cancel or postpone field trips due to inclement weather or other conditions that may pose a risk to the safety of students and staff based on the recommendations from the chief operation officer transportation services facility services and the office of safety and security if hazardous weather develops during a field trip the designated field trip organizer may assess the situation and consult with school administration of relevant division personnel to determine the safest course of action in the event that a school sponsored trip or

[00:22:25] activity is canceled students and staff are prohibited from self transporting to participate or represent their school at the affected event I'm available for questions thank you to think about that for a minute Dr. Dees, did you have anything you wanted to add about field trips?

[00:22:53] Who contributed to that statement that you just read? I shared it with Ms. Mitchell. And so I'm on most of these calls when we're making weather decisions.

[00:23:11] So those people involved, I don't meet with the superintendent, but I do meet with the chief operations officer, transportation facilities, and the office of safety and security. Basically a few well at any time we know that there's potential inclement whether we meet probably a day before just to start Developing a plan the final decision always rest with the superintendent or designee Depending on his availability or her availability So has there been question about the self-transporting

[00:23:50] Etc. That should not be a choice of the families, right? So the reason we brought this up was in the last meeting, Ms. Chernoff discussed where there was a competition for our fine arts in Tyson's, and we closed schools that day, and some sponsors took it upon themselves to go down there, and parents self-transported them, but they're representing our schools, right?

[00:24:21] So if there's an accident, we'd be liable for them transporting themselves. And obviously, even though we canceled schools, that sponsor is an employee of LCPS, and we did close schools, which means we canceled all activities. But they chose to go down there.

[00:24:37] So this language would prohibit that from ever occurring. It wasn't overidentified in previous regulations as prohibited. It and our sponsor the sponsors have access to the policy as well as the regulation and if that is so then yes it should be put in while you're putting it in the regulation instead of in the policy I guess is my question so regulation is something it was never written in policy and I honestly wouldn't

[00:25:12] not mission often I talked last week or back see on April 2nd sorry she mentioned it would she would like to see a statement drafted in regulation regarding this so I added that was because of the circumstances that we had and over this past winter involving an ice storm and students wanting to go compete at an event in Tyson's corner I definitely think it should be added I'm not sure that some of the regulations are hidden from the from all eyes because I wouldn't

[00:25:50] know to read the policy and the regulation until I got on the board but don't you have sponsors who are community people would they know to read the policy as well as the regulation that's a question so are yes these sponsors are actually LCPS staff members so they are responsible they sign a contract so they're responsible for knowing and operating under our

[00:26:16] policies and regulations cabinet does we would just make you aware and the next step update once once the regulations approved by cabinet thank you yeah I don't know that I would be totally opposed to adding a cancellation piece into the actual policy since there is planning and stuff in here one of the things as I combed through the very lengthy regulation which is I think why

[00:26:55] it's probably not all policy because it's lengthy in it a lot of it is dependent on different circumstances so I think it would be excessive to be in the policy but I don't I don't know that I I mean there's approval of field trips in here i know the planning piece is in the regulation i don't know i'm gonna think about can i think about that a little bit if the cancellation piece some piece of that would be in here i mean i don't know it's but they're tied together so i don't i just need to think about it but i do appreciate the statement my only comment to that is is there provision for i mean like we

[00:27:34] talked about is there provision for if there's a nice day in lcps because of something in the west but the D.C. area is unaffected, and they still want to go. Like, would LCPS make that call? Is that sort of assumed, or it's like school's out too bad?

[00:27:50] Because for some of these, these are really big opportunities for these kids that I would hate to see them miss if it's an ice storm in Percival, and it's really not going to affect those kids. I mean, I know it's hard to make those game-time decisions based off of policy and regulation, but could there be a clause for something like that, or is that too sticky?

[00:28:09] We have participated in events when schools are closed, and we typically make those decisions around noon that day. So you'll hear that after-school activities, a decision regarding them might be made at noon.

[00:28:30] So obviously most of the times when we close schools, it's based on a forecast, and sometimes those forecasts are correct, sometimes they're not. And when you're talking about the D.C. area, we are aware, like we give a list of the priority of these events, like a state-level competition, and when those events aren't going to be made up or provided an opportunity, we do take that into consideration.

[00:28:58] So does the organizers of those events. And I understand sometimes unforeseen circumstances prohibits those organizers from being able to reschedule those events. And it's unfortunate for our

students.

[00:29:14] But at the same time, we try to think through and make sure we're making the best decision possible. And sometimes, I'm going to give you some scenarios. we have provided alternative meeting spot spaces because we know like we weren't our facility service team wasn't able to get in and clear the parking lot so we might meet at a secondary location so we can ensure getting these people to their either regional or state-level competitions but those are all things that we do consider when we're making these final decisions so do

[00:29:48] you think that that statement that you just read prohibits that ability no because it's allowing us to make a recommendation to the superintendent so while my name's not identified as one of those people in there I am on that committee so I always advocate for the safest possible balance no I appreciate that so thank you for your work on that I feel confident moving forward I think it provides a little more clarity and consistency for us which will be helpful

[00:30:23] in terms of the policy I had a couple of we went through this at the LEAF committee and sort of had a couple of things I do still think that it would be nice to have some language either in the opening paragraph or in the section about student safety and accountability about where applicable like that where policy discipline policies are applicable and SR&R it still applies when you're not here like when you're not on school campus but you're on a field trip like those things still apply so just some extra clarity on that I don't know if at the end of the first paragraph something like all LCPS policy

[00:31:03] applicable LCPS policies you know will be enforced as this is seen as an extension of the school setting I don't something like that makes it a little bit more obvious that we're still holding you to those standards even though you're not at school and that is that is addressed in policy 8350 because school-sponsored activities but I can I can try to add some verbiage here I just

[00:31:39] feel like it's that section on safe it just feels fluffy to me okay so just a little bit tightening up and then this flipped my mind from the fall but in terms of choosing a field trip location I know we talk about accessibility we talk about safety but also I know that um and SEAC just sent me their stuff like just a few minutes ago so it's not on board docs I'll send it to you um but it talks about adding the word

[00:32:13] inclusion so I think there have been times where different places have been selected for field trips that may endorse signage or different things that would make particular groups of students feel uncomfortable being in that place and so by adding the word inclusion I think that that tightens that up a bit so whether that's maybe in section B on number seven that's what I was thinking accessibility just adding the words and inclusion of the field trip for all students I think that that sufficiently addresses that I know we did get a lot of emails back in

[00:32:52] the fall and one of the leaf members did remind me of said circumstance and how that affected their child so I think that that is something worth noting we want to be true to our values here in LCPS and I think that that extends to field trip opportunities as well that was really it for me yes I think with those couple of things we'd probably be ready to have this as action at our next C&I meeting okay thank you thank you guys alrighty with that we will move on

[00:33:31] to item six new business is there any new business tonight okay seeing none the may 7th 2025 curriculum and instruction meeting is now adjourned drive safely



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com