MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Legislative and Policy Committee Meeting, Wednesday, November 11, 2026

Date	Wednesday, November 11, 2026
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/1243966011?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 2026-11-12. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:10] Good evening. I called the November 11, 2026 legislative and policy committee meeting to order. Welcome everybody. I believe sign up for public comment occurred before the meeting. I do not see anyone here for public comment, so we will move from item two of the agenda, item three, which is the draft minutes for the October 28, 2026 meeting.

[00:00:34] Has everyone had an opportunity to review those meeting minutes? Any changes? all right i will entertain a motion to approve the the meeting minutes i'd like to make an emotion as well to approve the meeting minutes thank you second thank you both the motion uh mrs griffiths has made the motion to approve the meeting minutes from the october 28th 2026 legislative and policy committee meeting um with the second from dr rasheed all in favor say aye aye aye all opposed hearing none um the motion passes three to zero with all school board members present voting yes

[00:01:13] um now we will move forward to um item four of our action items this is 4.01 is policy 2220 clerk and i will turn it over to dr bergen thank you chair svensson uh by way of reminder this policy was before you at your last meeting policy 2220 clerk is uh up for its five-year review having last been reviewed in november of 2021 the proposed changes before you align with current

[00:01:49] practice and provide additional clarity. The minor revisions are tracking the language of the code and standardizing the language across our policies. As is our custom, we put the policy out for

feedback and we did receive feedback from MSAC. It's displayed on the screen. You also have a copy of it in your packets. It's available to the public, attached to the agenda item. The first a bit of feedback occurs at lines 9 and 10 in reference to others the concern being raised by the feedback is others is not defined and could be anyone and

[00:02:26] should that be defined and should others be trained I spoke with the clerk to ask who others might be that the clerk might normally call upon and typically the only other the clerk might call upon is the deputy clerk so if it's the will of the committee you you staff is agnostic we're okay with the word others if you are not we could substitute others with deputy clerk if you want to be responsive to that feedback I would like me to pause there before going on to the second see if you want to entertain any motions with that um sure I I can and mr. Allen do I guess for technical reason do we need to make a

[00:03:05] motion to be on the base motion for the purposes of the committee or can we just vote to amend vote on the amendment and then move to the motion thank you church I think either approach is fine for the committee level, but as long as the action taken reflects the amendments and you can vote on the base motion to close it out at the end.

[00:03:30] Great, thank you. All right, so I will make a motion to, in the red line version for policy 2220 at line 9, replace the word others with the deputy clerk.

[00:03:49] Second. Dr. Rashid so I've made a motion to amend that language Dr. Rashid has seconded any discussion on the motion Right hearing none all members in favor of the motion Say aye Aye All opposed hearing none the motion passes three to zero with all school board members present voting yes And we'll return to Dr. Bergen for further discussion on the policy Second bit of feedback on this policy occurs at lines 11 and 12

[00:04:27] in the use of the word may in the sentence the clerk may maintain records in electronic format let's speak with the clerk about this again the recommendation was changed to shall we do have some records that are in paper copy of particularly historical records many of the historical records have been archived into an electronic format and just about everything we do currently would be an electronic format but change the word to shall would not match our practice so again staff is agnostic we're okay with the word may but I'll defer to the committee and that

[00:05:02] concludes the feedback on this policy thank you dr. Bergen I'm also comfortable with the word may here any further discussion no all right I will entertain a motion to move this policy as amended to the full board as an information item second thank you dr. she'd has moved to forward policy 2220 as amended to the full board as an information item mrs. Griffiths has

[00:05:37] seconded any further discussion all members in favor say aye aye aye that passes three to zero with all school board members present voting yes with that we will move on to item 4.02 which is policy 2430 school board agenda I'll turn it over to dr. Bergen to present this policy was also reviewed at your last meeting for information policy 2430 as was before the board last in August of 2023 so it's only been a couple of years it's not a five-year change the

[00:06:15] changes proposed changes are to bring the policy in alignment with changes in state law state code updates require staff to bring the policy to the committee to reflect these recent changes which we reviewed with the committee in detail at your last meeting would be happy to go back and address any questions that we weren't able to address in the last meeting relative to the changes it went out for

feedback we did not receive any feedback from our advisories however there is one amendment posted by a member of the committee so I will stop there the administration has no more feedback to provide

[00:06:53] and turn it back over to the chair thank you dr. Bergen members any further discussion on this policy. Ms. Griffiths. Thank you, Chair Svensson. I do have an amendment to this policy. Red lines five to six.

[00:07:11] The agenda shall be published on the school division's official website prior to the meeting. As it's always been, the amendment should read, the agenda and all supporting materials shall be published on the school division's official website at least three days prior to all official school board meetings.

[00:07:31] that's my amendment i don't know if you want me to speak to it further uh yes you please do um the reasoning behind this is um it's always been three days prior i believe that if you don't have three days prior in there we'll we'll get documents for the board um and for the public to read at the very last minute and they would be unprepared um i think putting through at least three days in there should guarantee that the school board and the public get to see the information posted. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. And is there a second for the motion? I will second

[00:08:10] the motion. So we are officially on that amendment. Board members, any further discussion on the amendment? Yes, Dr. Rashid. Is this three business days? If I may ask, Mr. Allen, what was it before three business days or actually oh if i may before you go ahead um when we get the information posted for our school board meetings it goes into the week and you post it friday and then it goes into the weekend right so i don't know if it's necessarily business days correct thank you

[00:08:49] mrs griffith uh to my understanding from practice of the school board clerk uh will post on the friday before the tuesday meeting so that's three that would be three calendar days as opposed to three business days but I would recommend specificity should the committee approve mrs. Griffith's amendment I just wanted to verify is this also what is the current I understand the policies written as is but what is the practice of LCPS if you can refresh my memory is it three days

[00:09:24] that we recommend just to reinforce that thank you dr. Rasheed so the the current practice is that the proposed agenda is published on the school Division's official website prior to the meeting and that's required by 2.23707 so that's why we're proposing this language on five and six I will say for consideration and you you may want to move that under time limitations section C which starts on line 20 that seems like a more appropriate place for this

[00:10:00] provision I did not catch that until reviewing the proposed amendment but the current practice is the three calendar days for the proposed agenda and supporting documents to be posted to board docs before the full school board meeting three calendar days is what you're saying that's correct thank you no thank you dr. Bergen yes three so Friday Monday Tuesday three business

[00:10:36] days that's correct sorry misspoke earlier and mr. Allen just to clarify where this practice comes from because that that three business days is not in this policy so do you know the origin of that practice thank you chair Swenson the so there is a requirement for the notice of meetings to be posted three business days prior to a meeting as the school board currently has in practice they and every January at the annual organizational meeting sets the

[00:11:15] schedule for the the business meetings of the school board uh and post that and those get added to the school division's official website so you're well in compliance with that requirement so um so

that's the only that's the requirement that we have to have three days notice of the meeting itself but not there's no legal requirement um that we have to have it hosted three day three business days like the agenda and supporting materials posted three days before that is correct so for the what's required under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act

[00:11:54] is that at the same time that the school board members receive supporting documentation the public receives supporting documentation and that's achieved in the current practice through the posting on the board docs I see and and as the existing policy states board members receive agenda items are made aware of agenda items at least two days prior to the meeting is that if that's at lines 22 to 23 of the red line version yes chair Svensson that's the current practice the school board pursuant to policy 24 324 30 and dr.

[00:12:34] Rashid one last question if for this detail in lines 5 to 6 including the amendment is there any specificity regarding or maybe I just don't maybe I'm not reading the other sentences if there's any way to tie it to being specific to either school board documents as the school board meeting or or committee documents.

[00:12:56] - Thank you, Dr. Rasheed. I would make a recommendation to clarify. I think in Mrs. Griffith's proposed amendment, the phrase is official school board meetings. I don't have it in front of school board meetings, but I think for clarity's sake, thank you.

[00:13:16] Clarity's sake, this committee may wanna consider distinguishing between full school board meetings versus committee meetings. - And with that, I don't know if Mrs. Griffiths would like to do a friendly amendment to that to be having a specificity. Thank you. I would. Thank you very much.

[00:13:35] And just for clarity of the record, what is the friendly amendment and change to the existing language in the amendment? Yes, that would be great. So the amendment I put forward was the agenda and all supporting materials shall be published on the school division's official website at least three days prior to all official school board meetings.

[00:14:07] But as a friendly amendment, we could add committee meetings as well and have the proper verbiage for that or advisement on the proper verbiage on how to read that, how it should read.

[00:14:23] Thank you so much. And Mr. Allen, I didn't know, you talked about general policy for school board meetings in terms of uploading documents and amendments. What is the policy or current practice, maybe not written down, for committee meetings? Thank you, Dr. Rashid.

[00:14:43] So currently committee meetings would follow conceivably the 2430 convention which doesn't specify this with as much prescription as Mrs. Griffith's proposed amendment does. I'm sorry 24th line 2430?

[00:15:02] No policy 2430 so it follows the school board agenda. Okay so you're saying that we still it's just the same as we as we do for regular school board meetings versus committee meetings. Correct under the current iteration or version of this policy so perhaps the friendly amendment would make mrs griffith's amendment read the agenda and all supporting materials shall be published on the school division's website at least three um days prior to um all school board meetings just deleting the word official just because

[00:15:38] the committee meeting is a school board meeting okay yeah that's okay so mrs griffith says that that works um and then in terms of a friendly amendment also i know we had discussed specificity about um business days or his calendar days but would you accept um the insertion of the word business days as well mrs griffiths um as far as the difference between business and calendar um i i just want to clarify again mr allen um when we post on a friday and it goes into the

[00:16:15] weekend you're you're still considering friday because it goes late friday night okay you're still considering friday monday and tuesday because tuesday is partial because then we have the meeting so um is there any way to clarify between the two or it's pretty much the same or thank you mrs griffith so it's my understanding and and this would be through administration and the board clerk and their interpretation given that it currently there is no uh such timeline

[00:16:49] here um i guess two days is what this and and so it's certainly within your purview as the committee to make the recommendation of the full board what you think would be an appropriate um time so currently all i can say is because the business and calendar is kind of murky but we know that friday at five typically is when it's posted in advance of the tuesday 4 30 meeting so the discretion is this committee is to make a recommendation to the full board and that would be calendar, you know, going Friday, Monday, Tuesday, that would be calendar?

[00:17:27] Yes, yes, that would be. It's not business because the business day usually ends at five. Is that correct? That's a longstanding practice. I guess we would use calendar then. One question, so one concern I have about the existing policy and potential changes here is that I think it's straightforward enough that agenda items are posted at least two prior to the meeting under the current policy but and and most supporting documents but I mean from time to time there are supporting documents that it

[00:18:05] new information has come in or there has been you know last-minute changes and that gets posted and so I'm worried about constraining the ability to update or edit supporting materials that are added to the agenda that to the agenda item itself so i am curious to hear dr berger mr allen your thoughts on that and welcome feedback from my colleagues yeah administration have the same concern um we you know it's rare we we don't

[00:18:44] have supporting documents in place uh the board the public have it on the friday before uh from the time they receive it on friday through saturday sunday monday tuesday up to the time of the board meeting but there are occasions where there are changes because we receive questions or new information and we update so we we then send out notice when we have replaced a document or added a document oftentimes board members are giving us amendments as well you know so there are other supporting documents that are added to an agenda right up until the time the meeting

[00:19:17] begins I think it's for clarity I'll defer to legal the three days or is there a legal requirement, Mr. Allen, for the topics, the notice of meeting and topics.

[00:19:34] Thank you, Dr. Bergen. So the new requirement under Virginia law that is being proposed for insertion on section H, starting at line 66, discusses that items added to the agenda after the meeting commences would not be actionable unless in some specified circumstances And so, yes, the idea is the agenda has to be locked in if you want an item to be acted on

[00:20:09] without not falling within any of these prescribed exceptions prior to the meeting's commencement. And to clarify, that does not include supporting materials. Is that right, Mr. Allen? That is

correct.

[00:20:26] So, Chair Spinson, in terms to address your concern, the committee could consider an additional sentence that reads the school board will consider supporting materials added prior to the, or before the meeting's commencement, or language to that effect to provide for that flexibility, that there could be supporting materials to include board members in the mints that are posted prior to the meeting, just prior to the meeting.

[00:20:55] Could you restate the proposed language again regarding the supporting materials? Yes, Chair Swenson, I had indicated language to the effect of the school board will consider supporting materials posted prior to the commencement of the meeting.

[00:21:26] You could also add a notwithstanding or something as a connector. Well, I guess there are supporting materials, though, that are offered during the course of a meeting, for instance, like an amendment. So, yes, Mrs. Griffiths.

[00:21:44] Thank you, Chair Svensson. I think as we currently do it, it is three days before. And if there's any changes, we all get a notice that says something was changed to board docs. Today, I was just trying to clarify it in the policy just to make sure that it stays that way.

[00:22:05] What I don't want to see is, and this has happened, presentations are missing from the actual agenda. And we've gotten them an hour prior to the meeting. I really did not know what was going to be in the presentation.

[00:22:23] So that's what I don't want to see. So when adding the three days, that was part of it. But, of course, minor changes. Let's say the presentation is uploaded and somebody needs to make a change to it or an update.

[00:22:39] I get that. But the bulk of the presentation was there. So we got to view it before changes might have been made. That is my concern, and that is why I brought up the three days for the first paragraph.

[00:22:55] Thank you. Yes, Dr. Rashid. Thank you. I was just curious, if we make these three days, this amendment, does that mean, and again, I'm just thinking out loud here, does that mean we can't make amendments on the dais last minute?

[00:23:16] Does that eliminate that, or should we add that in as an amendment to the amendment? I'm sorry, Dr. Rasheed, can you restate your question? Let's say a board member just wants to make an amendment right then and there on the dais and says, oh, you know, I'm just going to make an amendment.

[00:23:32] I just thought of it last minute during the presentation of that action item. Can they do that, or does this eliminate that, the three-day rule? Thank you for the clarification, Dr. Rasheed. Yes, board members can still make amendments on the dais without posting them in advance, and oftentimes board members might do so in hearing input from the community or in the dialogue with other board members, and so that's incidental, and under Robert's rules, that's appropriate.

[00:24:01] It's just the actual item that would be non-actionable if you put on kind of a separate topic that wasn't included on the agenda beforehand, unless it's an emergency or foreclosed. Okay, thank you.

[00:24:16] I guess my concern, confusion, is related. Maybe it's the definition of the phrase supporting document. Like, is an amendment a supporting document or is that some other set of documents we're

referring to? Thank you, Chair Swenson.

[00:24:38] An amendment isn't a supporting document. However, the practice of the school board to avoid any surprises. They've been posting amendments, but I think it's clear. And just to avoid any confusion, you could clarify that in this proposed language to just crystallize that supporting document.

[00:24:58] amendments are not considered supporting documents. Sorry, amendments that are posted as a courtesy prior to the meeting do not constitute supporting documentation under this policy. Is there any other, whether, I guess, a motion other than an amendment?

[00:25:21] I'm trying to think of different types of materials that might not be supporting documents that we would want to ensure are not inadvertently excluded by the policy. Yes, Mrs. Griffiths.

[00:25:39] Thank you, Chair Spenson. Just to clarify again, you know, when I put this amendment forward, I knew it wasn't about amendments that happened on the dais. It was more so presentations or something separate, as you mentioned, Mr. Allen, something separate that nobody knew about, and it was not posted three days before, But maybe it was posted an hour prior to the meeting.

[00:26:09] This amendment does not have anything to do with anything that comes up on the dais in discussion or anything like that. So I just wanted to clarify that. But if we need to change the way it sounds so there's no confusion, I would be okay with that depending on how it sounds.

[00:26:28] Thank you. Thank you, Mrs. Griffiths. I appreciate that. Dr. Rashid. I was just going to ask, Mrs. Griffiths, if you would be willing to change the word maybe of supporting materials to maybe something more specific, or maybe we could write example, like supporting materials such as presentation, something to offer some sort of distinctive item that you are referring to.

[00:26:54] With regards to supporting materials, when the agenda is posted, the word supporting means to me all documents with an item on the agenda are there, which means that it would be if it's a presentation or if it's costs or estimates or anything like that, it should all be there at least three days prior because those are items that myself, other school board members, and the public would probably like to take a look at

[00:27:29] before in that three-day time um so when i say supporting documents that's what that means and i would like to keep it because they are supporting documents for the agenda um and i have uh spoken to um i've spoken to this before um that it should be when the agenda is posted we should have all the items there um this does not include discussions or anything like that this all the items should be listed there on the agenda. So if there's an item there, I would like to see supporting

[00:28:07] information for that item. Thank you. Yes, Dr. Rashid. Thank you, Chair. My only concern is the open interpretation of supporting materials. I understand the intention completely. I understand it. And I like that how it has the word agenda on it. It's just, it's more of a subjective term, even though I know like what supporting materials could mean, but i'm just worried in the future board members will say well i'm i'm supporting this to come forward this falls under this does not fall under supporting materials and then it becomes this i guess this interpretive type of uh challenge so that's why i was asking just for something

[00:28:45] more specific i appreciate that i'm just going to interject here just for clarity so um if i heard correctly uh it's looking like the committee's will is to have these apply to all meetings at the school board

and just for clarity that would any any meeting of an advisory committee would then be subject and be holding to this because that is advisory committees are committees of the school board. Thank you for that clarification Mr. Allen. Mrs. Griffiths. Thank you Chair

[00:29:23] Spenson. I have gotten I've had people come to me from the public and ask me where is the supporting documents for that item on the agenda. It's missing. If I may, as far as the verbiage per our discussion, Mr. Allen, to read the proposed agenda and all supporting materials shall be delivered to each board member at least three days prior to all meetings of the full school board. At the same time, those materials shall be published on the school division's official website. We were going to change official, I think you had mentioned that,

[00:30:02] Mr. Svensson notwithstanding foregoing the school board will consider supporting materials posted prior to and including during a meeting of the school board so that's per your thoughts Mr. Allen thank you Mrs. Griffiths I think that encapsulates the discussions I would say I didn't hear if you distinguish between calendar or business days and then the official I think that had been taken out before official school board meetings.

[00:30:35] But official website, that can stay. I can read it again. I guess, Mr. Allen, parliamentary procedure question. Can Mrs. Griffiths make a friendly amendment to her amendment or do we need to offer the friendly amendment? I think for this purpose, Mrs. Griffiths can kind of reset and she can rephrase her initial motion as such.

[00:31:01] And then you can get a second, and then discussion thereon. All right. Okay, before, I think maybe we'll just, for the record, we'll withdraw the motion, then we'll have Mr. Griffiths reintroduce it. One further item for consideration, Mrs. Griffiths, for introducing in the terms of a friendly amendment to this.

[00:31:21] I think Mr. Allen had noted that, notwithstanding that the current red line has this new language at lines five to six, that it might be more appropriate to put this in the section c under time limitations the lines 20 to 23 and it might make sense just to edit that language and add in what we're trying to add in

[00:31:49] here so i think miss griff are you are you withdrawing your prior amendment and then to tee up a new amendment which thank you chair svensson i can um to be perfectly honest i wouldn't

[00:32:17] mind still having it between five and six um if possible because we had uh on the red line the proposed agenda shall be published on the school division's official website prior to the meeting so it was there it was my first amendment original amendment was to add the three days now we're changing a lot of the language but i would like to have something at five and six if

[00:32:49] possible chair svensson understood um all right so if you if you're maybe we'll we'll reset with the new amendment that includes that new language so if you withdraw your existing one and and reintroduce the language and we'll get to that one thank you chair svensson i'll withdraw that first one and the revised language would be the proposed agenda and all supporting we hold on the The proposed agenda and all supporting materials shall be delivered to each board member at least three calendar days prior to all meetings of the full school board.

[00:33:25] At the same time, those materials shall be published on the school division's official website. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the school board will consider supporting materials posted prior to and

including during a meeting of the school board. Ms. Griffiths has made a motion.

[00:33:45] Do we have a second? Second. Dr. Rashid has seconded. And this language, Mr. Griffiths, for clarification, you're proposing to replace the language in the red line at length five to six? Five to six was my original amendment.

[00:34:04] And I would like to point out that that's in the first paragraph. So I think having to go further into the policy, you might not see it. I think it would stand out in the first paragraph if we were able to implement this. Thank you.

[00:34:20] Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. And the amendment that you have put forward is for meetings of the full school board. So for committee meetings, that wouldn't necessarily include committee meetings.

[00:34:39] So I just wanted to confirm that you want the full in front of the school board. Well, notwithstanding and foregoing, the school board will consider supporting materials posted prior to and including during a meeting of the school board.

[00:35:02] Yes, Dr. Rasheed, I will write it down for you here. All right. So I think that this amendment captures what's in the time limitation section, except for when agenda items and supporting documents are to be submitted to the division superintendent.

[00:35:35] And then it seems like we should still have that guidance, but the rest of that section might be duplicative if we move it up to the top of the policy. So I wonder, Mrs. Griffiths, if you'd consider a friendly amendment to add on a sentence to your amendment at the end of your amendment

[00:36:11] that reads agenda items and supporting documents should be submitted to the divisions who pretend it at least seven days prior to the meeting. Seven days? Which is what's currently in the policy.

[00:36:29] Sure, that would be fine. Okay, and part of that friendly amendment would be deleting lines 20 to 23, the time limitation section, and renumbering sections accordingly. That is correct, Mr. Spenson.

[00:36:45] All right, thank you. Dr. Rashid. I'm actually in support of the amendment. The only thing is, so you're saying eliminate the entire section of C, just so that it stands out in the first paragraph. So we're looking at standing out, but I did like the organization of time limitations.

[00:37:02] i i mean i'm not saying let's duplicate it over and over again i'm in support of it only if it stays in time limitations thank you all right um i agree the organization makes sense mrs griffis are you open to a friendly amendment of moving your language that you're proposing to the time limitation section um i do want to keep it at five to six but um uh if both of you are not in favor of that um it will have to move won't it um i mean this is a friendly amendment process

[00:37:41] but i i agree not a mean amendment process um yes i think it makes sense given that time limitations is called out with that that underline i agree with dr rashid that it it seems like it would go well in that section to replace that language chair spencer would it be a an amendment to an amendment or will she rescind and then do it again i i think it's friendly enough it may Mr. Allen, correct me if I'm wrong, that if Mrs. Griffiths accepts it, that will just be the amendment on the floor.

[00:38:11] That is correct, if Mrs. Griffiths, yes, so choose it. Mrs. Griffiths. And three days, is three days still there? Wait a minute.

[00:38:27] Yep, it's still there. Yeah, I'm fine with it as long as the three-day calendar day stays. Thank you. Thank you. All right, so for clarity of the record, and Mrs. Griffiths, correct me if I have gotten any of this wrong, the motion on the floor is to to strike the the red line language at five to six and edit lines 20 to 23 the time limitation section to read time limitations the proposed agenda and all

[00:39:03] supporting materials shall be delivered to each board member at least three calendar days prior to all meetings of the full school board at the same time those materials shall be published on on the school division's official website. Not withstanding the foregoing, the school board will consider supporting materials posted prior to and including during a meeting of the school board.

[00:39:24] Agenda items and supporting documents or other information should be submitted to the division's superintendent at least seven days prior to the meeting. - That's it, thank you very much. - That was made by Mrs. Griffiths, seconded by Dr. Rasheed. The only further discussion on this point was...

[00:39:43] sorry no no no you don't need to read it again the only further discussion on this point was um that it sounds like we're all in agreement in our interpretation that supporting materials does not include parliamentary motions such as amendments um i will ask mr allen do you think it is necessary to write that out in the policy or is supporting documents sufficiently clear to not include parliamentary motions such as amendments thank you chair smithson i appreciate the

[00:40:19] question i i think it's it's relatively clear as long as and you may want to raise this when it comes before the full board so it's on the record um that that's the interpretation of the board but the plain language supporting documents versus parliamentary motions it's pretty clear cut to me all right um we have taken uh enough time on this one all right uh all all in favor of mrs griffith's amendment say aye aye um all opposed all right uh hearing none um the amendment

[00:40:54] passes three to zero with all school board members present um and we are um are there any further amendments or discussion on this all right um so we will i will now entertain a motion to forward policy 2430 as amended to the full school board as an information item thank you chair spenson i'd like to make a motion to um approve 2430 and send to the full school board thank you thank you mrs griffiths is there a second second second by dr rasheed um any discussion uh all in favor

[00:41:34] say aye aye the motion passes three to zero with all school board members present um policy 2430 will is a is approved in the committee and will go to the full school board as an information item all right let's move to item 4.03 policy 3065 information security protection presented by mr smith if i can kick it off uh chair spenson oh yes please start sure this policy was up for information at your last meeting it's due for its five-year review it has been updated

[00:42:11] to add information regarding retention schedules a section on monitoring logging and vulnerability management and backup of recovery controls but we did receive feedback from MSAC in two parts I will speak to the second part after I ask mr. Smith to speak to the feedback on the first part which occurs at lines it was incorrectly posted in board docs by MSAC they said lines 30 to 33 it's actually at lines 38 to 40 of the red line Mr. Smith if you would speak to the

[00:42:46] feedback we receive from MSEC sure so the MSEC feedback for that top section basically the recommendations are to update the wording to include school resource officers a school resource officers do not use an LCPS account or an LCPS device they are completely governed by their sheriff's office accounts their sheriff's office devices so that they receive training through those offices so that would not

be pertinent to add in also the additional recommendation similar to how we don't embed student discipline across every

[00:43:22] single policy we have a student discipline policy we don't embed necessarily what happens to employees if they don't do something those are embedded in HR policies so that has been our stance is that we reference the HR policies when necessary because there's any laundry list of things that a staff member may do qualify for that so those were the at this point staff is not recommending any changes based off of that feedback thank you mr. Smith board members any questions about that feedback no all right any any further presentation on feedback received or anything else about the policy yes so

[00:44:01] the also on the screen under number two again the line reference is inaccurate the red line version would be at lines 48 and 49 it's really more of a comment than a recommendation from MSAC the comment was around the practice of LC so having access to our cameras and the recommendation that we have a discussion about review and discuss that practice that is being reviewed and discussed by the select committee of the school board with the review of the MOU

[00:44:37] there is another meeting of that select committee this week and that is an important add to the current mou it has been the practice of lcso to have access to the camera feed for some number of years going back several administrations for very good purposes when you know life life is at stake you know there are first responders responding to a an incident at a school the 911 center can't access the cameras it's being memorialized in the mou and a way of knowing when that occurs and reporting out on when how often that occurs and for what purpose

[00:45:12] so it really there are no amendments needed to this policy the just to wrap up this discussion that it was a comment from MSAC it recommended that we review and discuss this we agree and we are reviewing and discussing it in a different room at a different time we have no rec staff administration has no recommendations other than what we already presented when we brought this to you for information thank you dr. Bergen thank you mr. Smith yes I agree with MSAC it's an important discussion to have and we are having that in the in the select committee on the MOU where that will be further discussed and

[00:45:51] memorialize exactly when that those cameras are accessed and for what purpose board members any discussion on this policy okay I will entertain a motion to approve this policy 3065 at the committee level and forward it to the full school board as an information item so move thank you dr. Rashid I'm second thank you mr. Griffiths the motion's been made by dr. Rashid and a seconded by mrs. Griffiths all in favor say aye motion passes 3 to 0 with all

[00:46:27] school board members present policy 3065 will go to the full school board as an information item we will now move to policy or to item 4.04 regarding equal access to public education and protection of immigration and citizenship related information i will turn it over to dr bergen to present thank you chair svensson this is also a continuation of the discussion we had at the last meeting as you were are aware and we shared at the last meeting the general assembly passed a house bill 836 and due to this new state law requirement the

[00:47:04] board must now implement policies and procedures that provide for equal access to public education and protection of immigration and citizenship related information so coming through our policies our division council and administration identified six policies as listed out on this item 10 40 80 30 81 15 81 25 86 10 and 86 40. all six policies were posted for feedback and we did receive some feedback which i think i can quickly summarize for you it's in the chart that was posted

[00:47:42] this item and is on the screen the first four pieces of feedback relative to 86 40 86 10 81 25 and 81 15 are all to bring consistency as to how we refer to parents or individuals who have charge of their student so the recommendation is where we see words where it says students and parent to make sure we consistently say students parent guardian or another person associated with the

[00:48:21] student so the recommendation is to wherever we see students parent or another person associated with the student or we see students parent or guardian that we consistently say students parent guardian or another person associated with the student and this would occur again in 86 40 86 10 8125 and 8115 and I can give the line references and we could we can display them on the screen if that would be helpful to the committee to know where any policy could be making these changes I'll defer also to the legal counsel if you have any concerns about this recommendation that we received from a

[00:48:59] community member thank you dr. Bergen I would I value the consistent usage I would recommend that we keep consistent with what is set forth and code with reference to parents and guardians and so that would be my recommendation to the committee short of going through each of the applicable analogies code sections I I do know that it's the school board's practice and policy to say

[00:49:33] parent and guardians or parents or guardians additional language another person associated with the student gives me pause due to kind of the vague nature of that so my recommendation would be to use it consistently parent and guardian or parents or guardians thank you mr. Allen and thank you dr. Bergen for explanation of that school board members and any discussion on that

[00:50:08] particular piece of feedback no all right dr. Bergen I'll turn it back over to you to continue with the feedback absolutely chair Spenson so I'll check in with you now that we've had the clarity of students parent or guardian or parents and guardians would you like to consider those four policy we have no feedback on those four policies other than this I can give you the line numbers and we can we could take an amendment I don't know division counsel

[00:50:48] do we need to consider them each individually or could we look at the four policies at one time in order to make those to bring them all in into conformity. Thank you, Dr. Bergen. I believe if it's the committee's will, they can make a motion to direct staff throughout these policies to ensure there's consistent use of parent or legal guardian. And I did just confirm in the FERPA regulation, it does refer to parent or legal guardian of a student. So I would propose that if that's the will of this committee.

[00:51:29] dr. issued so just to be clear we're okay well we're what you're saying is for consistency sake for students parent guardian or another person associated with the student to be consistent to have all of them be listed like that or to be referred to as that well that was the recommendation from hem sack but based on this conversation and caution from legal counsel I I'm tracking with this conversation I would say we would consistently say students parent or legal guardian and we would not make reference to anywhere we see another person associated with the student we would strike it it does not cause it

[00:52:07] appears in some policies and not in others and so the individual who made the recommendation was to insert the or another person in each of the policies where we only see it once or twice legal counsel if I'm tracking with you correctly would strike it where it occurs and consistently refer to students parent or legal guardian dr. Sheen thank you again I was just wondering because I'm just thinking of situations where like what if the legal guardian has been taken away and they're being taken they're being taken care of by a loved one but they're not you know like situations happen so they're not

[00:52:43] really a legal guardian like that's the only thing that really gets me with with that part because you know situations do happen I understand where that you know that part or that verbiage comes from but I'm just so wary of that part I'm I'm sympathetic to your concern.

[00:53:17] And I think that looking at policy 8640, where there's a reference to the student's parent, guardian, or another person associated with the student, I think the use of that phrase is different than other places in policy when it's referring to whom information can be disclosed.

[00:53:41] I think that this instance is talking about you cannot disclose information concerning that student, the student's parent, or another person associated. And so I think the purpose of that language is different. So I'm comfortable with that language as is there. I mean, it's not referring to, they understand the point we were making earlier about the consistency, but if the phrase is being used in a different context, then I don't know that we need to align them all together.

[00:54:16] Yeah, and what's on the screen right now is 8640 and it's lines 474 to 480 there. And Chair Svensson, I will say, in looking at the VDOE guidance that was put out in August, they say parents, guardians, or caregivers in one phraseology.

[00:54:37] So that might provide extra clarification rather than just anyone associated with the DUNA. Yeah, that is a good point, Mr. Allen. Could we see on the screen the other instances where this phrase is used?

[00:54:56] We can, Mr. Spence, and I'm going to offer suggestion. I thought I found it helpful that we looked at this policy to see what language is here because they are subtle and they are different in each of the policies, and perhaps we do need to take them one at a time.

[00:55:13] For instance, this one doesn't have guardian in it. Others do. It's sort of hit or miss. This one says students, parent, or another person. We've had a robust conversation here, but what should that say? Should it say student, parent, legal guardian, or caregiver?

[00:55:32] I think is what you were, Wes, is that was the, I'm just tracking with the conversation. What would make the most sense? And then we can figure this one out and then go to the other three. Yep, understood.

[00:55:47] So I agree we should take them, the policies in turn. And Mr. Allen, for clarification, the existing language that we've typically been using is parent or legal guardian. That is correct. And I will just add, as an aside, I do see in the VDOE guidance it does use that language or other person associated with the student.

[00:56:10] That's in the VDOE guidance. It is, yes. Yes, Dr. Sheet. Thank you, Chair. I was wondering if the board would consider, instead of or another person associated with the student, I know it's very general, that word, if we could put or designated caregiver.

[00:56:39] And is that an amendment to the? Yes, yes, that would be an amendment. It would read, no LCPS employee, contractor, agent, or school resource officer shall threaten to disclose information relating to the actual or perceived immigration or citizenship status of a student, the student's parent, or designated caregiver.

[00:57:03] Thank you, Dr. Rasheed. Is there a second? I will second. For clarification, did your amendment include Guardian? My amendment included everything here. Maybe did I skip over it?

[00:57:22] Oh, okay, okay. My apologies. Should I? If you would like to add in the word legal guardian, because it's not currently in the policy, but if you'd like to add it. Yes, please. Okay. My amendment would read the following. No LCPS employee, contractor, agent, or school resource officer shall threaten to disclose information relating to the actual or perceived immigration or citizenship status of a student, the student's parent, guardian, or designated caregiver.

[00:57:53] Thank you, Dr. Rasheed. I will second. I would like to offer a friendly amendment. So this phrasing also appears earlier in that same paragraph.

[00:58:10] So I think just for ease of amendments, we might wanna just take care of it all at once. And because this is relating to the disclosure of information to it, I am comfortable with the broader another person associated with the student because I think this is not disclosing information about the student to some other person.

[00:58:32] This is about us disclosing information to somebody else in the public about citizenship status of someone. So I would be comfortable keeping language as is but adding legal guardian.

[00:58:48] - Me too, thank you. - All right, thank you. So maybe Dr. Rashid, if you withdraw your amendment. - I'd like to withdraw my amendment, thank you. - Thank you, Dr. Rashid. And so I'll offer an amendment here. So it would read disclosure of information concerning the actual or perceived immigration or citizenship status of a student, the student's parent, the student's legal guardian, or another person associated with the student shall be governed by Virginia Code section 22.1-2.2 and applicable federal and state law.

[00:59:17] No LCPS employee, contractor, agent, or school resource officer shall threaten to disclose information relating to the actual perceived immigration or citizenship status of a student, the student's parent, the student's legal guardian, or another person associated with the student. - Second. - Thank you, Dr. Sheet.

[00:59:33] Mrs. Griffiths. - Thank you, Chair Svensson. Why is the word threaten in there? - Thank you, Mrs. Griffiths. So that tracks the language of the new code provision, which is 22.1, 2.2, C4A.

[00:59:53] So that tracks that language. And just for clarification for that specific provision, that also tracks the language, the another person associated with the student that comes from that same code section. - Thank you, any further discussion on this amendment?

[01:00:13] All right, all in favor say aye. - Aye. - All opposed? - Nay. - The motion passes two to one with Dr. Rashid and myself voting yes and Mrs. Griffiths voting no. We will now move on to the next policy where this language occurred.

[01:00:32] - 8610 and it would be the same conversation with an amendment, potential amendment at line 110. So if we're tracking with the action of the committee on the last item and in keeping with the recommendation that we received from the public at line 110 where it ends with student's parent, we would extend that to use the same language that you just adopted in the previous policy.

[01:01:06] - Thank you, Dr. Bergen. All right, so I'll introduce an amendment here. For policy 8610, we'll revise the section um starting at lines 107 it's immigration and citizenship related information to read except to the extent required by state or federal law lcps shall not request or collect information or

documentation concerning the immigration or citizenship status of a student the student's parent the student's legal guardian or another person associated with the student

[01:01:46] second thank you so motion made myself seconded by dr rasheed um and that's uh editing language at lines 107 to 110 of the red line version just for clarity of the record um school board members any discussion on this all right um no discussion uh all in favor of the amendment say aye aye may um so that myself dr asheed um the motion passes two to one with dr asheed and myself

[01:02:20] voting yes and uh mrs griffiths voting no we will now move to the next policy um with respect uh where this language occurs next would be 8125 at line 57 currently reads beginning at lines 56 for the paragraph for immigration or citizenship status in keeping with the action on the last two and in keeping with the recommendation you would extend on line 57 concerning a student's or the

[01:02:57] student's parents legal this gets very wordy i'm going to defer to legal counsel whether or not this is an appropriate extension here to have consistency of language and how we would best affect that would be the same phrase with the dick in keeping with the recommendations we receive from the community member yes so if I'm understanding correctly on line 57 it would be phrased concerning the

[01:03:31] immigration or citizen stat ship status of a student a student's parent or student's parent or legal guardian or any other associated and any other person associated with the student um yes i i think we can make it work i'll offer an amendment here um at line so this will be lines uh 56 through 58 of the red line version immigration or citizenship status so we'll have it read lcps shall not request or collect information or documentation concerning the immigration or citizenship status

[01:04:10] of a student, the student's parents, the student's legal guardian, or another person associated with the student except to the extent required by state or federal law. Oh, so yes, no, no, so I moved where the immigration or citizen status was.

[01:04:32] So it will now read, LCPS shall not request or collect information or documentation concerning the immigration or citizenship status of a student, the student's parent, the student's legal guardian, or another person associated with the student, except to the extent required by state or federal law. Second. Any discussion on this amendment? All right. All in favor say aye. Aye. Aye. The motion passes 3-0 with all school board members present voting yes.

[01:05:02] All right. We'll move to the next policy where we have similar language. Okay. this is 8115 and it occurs on the first page at lines 12 and again at lines 18 it currently reads at line 11 and 12 the actual or perceived immigration or citizen status of the student or the student's parent or guardian so you might entertain a motion to make that consistent with what you've done in the other policies and then down at line 17 and 18 the actual or perceived immigration or citizen status of the student or the student's parent or

[01:05:42] guardian I know it's in so that language already has a reference to guardian but just not not legal not what the word legal and then we would be adding in another person associated with the student okay for consistency I mean I defer to legal counsel if there's any concern with with adding that consistent

[01:06:06] language here if that makes sense to do so so for this particular policy given with respect to enrollment, it may not be as germane.

[01:06:33] However, to make it consistent, like you acknowledged, Chair Swenson, that language could be incorporated. - All right, well, let's do it for consistency.

[01:06:50] So the amendment will be to lines 11 and 13, which we'll now read without regard to the actual perceived immigration or citizenship status of the student, student's parent the student's legal guardian or another person associated with the student consistent with Virginia code section 22.1 - 2.2 and revising at lines 17 to 18 actual or perceived immigration or citizenship status of the student the student's parent the student's legal guardian or

[01:07:25] another person associated with the student second thank you is there any this uh yes mr allen i believe for consistency 25 to 26 also might require oh thank you um all right i am uh i'm revising the amendment so did we keep those two parts changing lines 11 to 13 and 17 to 18 and adding on a change to line lines 24 to 26 which will now read lcps shall not request or

[01:08:02] collect information or documentation concerning the immigration or citizenship status of a student the student's parent the student's legal guardian or another person associated with the student except to the extent required by state or federal law second thank you some of the motions the amendments have been made by myself seconded by dr asheed any discussion on this amendment no i see none all in favor uh say aye aye um the amendment passes two to one with myself and dr Dr. Rasheed voting yes, and Mrs. Griffiths voting no.

[01:08:38] Dr. Bergen, is that all the policies I have this language? To mine, well, I'll say yes, and then we'll find one. For now, it's those four. Those were the four that were flagged through the feedback process. Thank you. I appreciate that feedback from the public and the opportunity to make those changes.

[01:09:00] So we do have two more policies that were part of this packet, and there was feedback on those as well. The feedback is similar to both of these, but it's a different matter So these two policies are 8030 and 1040 and the feedback is at the section in each of these policies where we list out the the different Aspects that we do not discriminate against and the lists are different the wording is different and one includes Some that others don't so I would suggest we start with

[01:09:38] 80:30 Marie if you could put 80:30 on the screen, please so we're looking at lines 11 through 14 and as As on the screen here we say LCPS prohibits discrimination or harassment against any student or by any student on the basis of any actual or perceived race color national origin cast immigration or citizenship status religion sex pregnancy status childbirth or related medical conditions

[01:10:13] sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, marital status, disability, age, genetic information, and any other characteristic provided by law. Now, Marie, if you'll take that down and put up 1040, remove that from the screen, please, Marie, and project policy 1040.

[01:10:38] So 1040, we're looking at similar but different list at lines, this is in 12 to 16. I'll just call out, in 80-30, we say actual or perceived race.

[01:10:53] Here, we say perceived or actual race. It's, you know, slightly different. Here, in 10-40, we say citizenship or immigration status. In 80-30, we say immigration or citizenship status. In 10-40, we don't include caste or genetic information, which we do in 80-30.

[01:11:14] And in 1040, we don't end with any other characteristic provided by law as we do in 8030. So tracking with a suggestion from the community member, it might be cleanest, but I'll defer to legal

counsel on this.

[01:11:32] If we leave 8030 intact and borrow that language in whole and bring it into 1040 or vice versa, Just so the two lists match identically with verbiage and that all groups are included in both, unless there's some reason that they shouldn't be listed exactly the same in both of these policies.

[01:11:53] And what I notice also is that in 1040, 1040 includes socioeconomic level and military status. I don't believe either of those are in 8030. Good catch. Yeah, that's correct. socioeconomic level and military status uh are are not in uh 80 30. mr al yes by way of context um policy 80 30 um has not been revised since i believe uh march 2022 and policy 1040 was most

[01:12:32] recently updated uh this year in february and so there have been some code changes under the Virginia Human Rights Act that removed the word caste and genetic materials or genetic information yes thank you and so that explains for the distinction between the language so given the board's prior vote on 1040 of the language and this year on February 13th and it

[01:13:05] would conceivably be the board's will to conform the language in policy 8030 to policy 1040. And do you happen to know why caste and genetic information are no longer in the list?

[01:13:35] My understanding is that, so the code required the addition of the modifier of ethnic to origin, So it used to say national origin only. And in recent years, they added ethnic or national origin and took out cast at the same time, I believe.

[01:13:55] So that just might be a swap there. And then for genetic information, I believe that might be captured in childbirth or related medical conditions. And so that explains.

[01:14:13] Okay, and then is there a reason that we would not have the kind of that catch-all clause at the end and any other characteristic provided by law? That's an 80-30, but not in 10-40. Thank you for the clarifying question.

[01:14:30] No, I'm unaware as to the board's decision whether to include that or not when it last reviewed policy 10-40 in February of this year.

[01:14:51] All right, thank you very much. I think I'm trying to think of the cleanest way to do an amendment across two policies, but maybe I'll put forward an amendment to policy 1040 that edits line 16, the red line version,

[01:15:16] to say after the word status, comma, it would say disability, comma, and any other characteristic provided by law.

[01:15:34] Is there a second? Second. Thank you, Dr. Rasheed. So speaking to this amendment, I think that we have the most inclusive language now in 1040 if we adopt this amendment.

[01:15:55] And then we could take that language and put it in the name. Yes, Dr. Rasheed. I just wondered by Mr. Allen, is that comprehensive what Chair Svensson has proposed? Thank you, Dr. Rasheed.

[01:16:12] When you say more comprehensive, could you explain? I think he added at the end, if I'm not mistaken, Chair Spenson, please correct me, you had mentioned instead of any other, you did say any other characteristic provided by law, the change you made, if you can be distinct on that in those lines.

[01:16:36] Let me rephrase that. Chair Spenson, can you clarify what you proposed again? Yes. So basically, policy 8030 has this language at the end that says, and any other characteristic provided by law,

that wasn't in 1040. So the amendment adds that to 1040 just to cover our bases with 1040 and make sure that we're capturing all protected statuses under law.

[01:16:56] I withdraw my question. Thank you. Yes, Mr. Allen. So I do believe I have additional context based on listening to that. So under 1040, there are certain demographics that are beyond Virginia Human Rights Act.

[01:17:13] And so adding that language then puts attention or just creates a presumption that all of those characteristics are already protected by law. And so I think you could rephrase that, though, to address your concern without any other.

[01:17:35] I see. Okay. So a friendly amendment to my own amendment. I would say, I'll say the amendment will be to line 16. It will now say after the status, comma, disability, and I guess, would you say any characteristic provided by law?

[01:17:58] Otherwise protected by law or provided by law. and any characteristic otherwise provided by law. Second. Motion has been made and seconded by Dr. Rashid.

[01:18:15] Board members, any further discussion on Policy 1040? Yes, Mrs. Griffiths. I'm not sure we need to change it. I'm sitting here and I'm listening to all of this, and I don't really think we need to change what's there.

[01:18:31] So I'm sticking by that. Thank you. Thank you, Mrs. Griffiths. Yes, I agree. The paragraphs are quite similar. There are some differences, but I think that just to ensure some consistency, I would like to add that parenthetical, that final parenthetical here.

[01:18:55] All right, board members, any further discussion? All right, all in favor of the amendment, say aye. Aye. Aye. The amendment passes two to one with Dr. Rashid and myself voting yes, Mrs. Griffiths voting no.

[01:19:12] so now policy 1040 that reads the school board uh that lines 12 to 16 now read the school board affirms a commitment to this principle for all persons regardless of perceived or actual race color religion ethnic or national origin citizenship or immigration status sex pregnancy childbirth related medical conditions age marital status sexual orientation gender identity gender expression socioeconomic level military status disability or any characteristic otherwise provided by law I will now move to amend policy 8030 to replace the language at

[01:19:45] lines 10 through 14 with the language I just read which is lines 12 to 16 of policy 1040 is there a second thank you dr. she'd any further discussion on that all right all in favor of the amendment say aye aye the motion passes two to one with dr. she to myself voting yes mrs. Griffiths voting no all right and

[01:20:21] chair Spence and so that dispenses with 8030 but back to 1040 notwithstanding the amendment that you just made there is another minute posted by a committee member to 1040 thank you and was there any other public feedback no sir we're done with public feedback on those policies all right yes mrs. Griffiths do you have an amendment thank you chair sense and yes I have three and none of them have to do with I believe what you just put through you had mentioned line

[01:20:53] 16 I would like to make amendments revised lines one through nine so one through nine is the Loudoun County School Board is committed in to maintaining providing for an equitable safe and inclusive learning and working environments environment loudon county public schools believes all

students staff division and the community members deserve rigorous and respectful educational training and workplace experience working environments this policy affirms lcps demonstrates our well i have changes in there so i'm getting

[01:21:32] confused demonstrates our commitment to fostering serving the entire lcps community and to ensuring safe welcoming and responsive school and work environments and outlines um and per my amendment i did list it so uh in case i'm not reading it totally 100 you'll know what i'm getting at it clarifies the expectations for providing providing lcps to ensure equitable safe and and inclusive environments that provides access to services, spaces, opportunities, and accommodation that support the diverse needs of our LCPS community.

[01:22:11] Clean version, I would like it to read, the Loudoun County School Board, and this is just cleaning up language, let me just phrase that. The Loudoun County School Board is committed to maintaining equitable, safe, and inclusive learning and working environments.

[01:22:27] Loudoun County Public Schools, LCPS, believes all students, staff, and community members deserve rigorous and respectful educational and workplace experiences. This policy affirms LCPS's commitment to fostering welcoming and responsive environments and outlines expectations for providing equitable access to services, spaces, opportunities, and accommodations that support the diverse needs of the LCPS community.

[01:22:55] So basically, I took out providing for Ann, added an S to environments, added LCPS, took out the divisions, took out respect, not respectful, but learning, added workplace experiences, working environments, took out demonstrates hour, took out serve and let's see.

[01:23:24] And I took out Ensure and turned into Ensuring. It's basically just language clarification. It was too wordy before. So let's see. I took out other minor things.

[01:23:41] LCPS to Ensure and also took out Safe and Inclusive Environment that provides access. And also to Meet the Desperate was also taken out. So it was just clarification of the English language, and I can read it again, but it should have been provided to you through BoardDocs.

[01:24:02] This was on BoardDocs. So if you had any questions for me. Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. Board members, questions? You all see the clean version, right, of Amendment 1?

[01:24:18] Yes. Okay, good. So yes, and so this concerns, just for clarity, you're introducing all three amendments that you posted on BoardDocs? Yes, sir. Maybe we'll just, we'll take them, would you like to just vote on them all together or do it one at a time?

[01:24:41] Whatever's easier for you. If I do it all at one time, I'm hoping that we can do it quickly, but I don't know if you want to dive into each one individually. I'm happy, given the time, to do it all at once. I will let Dr. Shee weigh in.

[01:25:00] I personally am uncomfortable with the language as is in the policy and I do understand for the public feedback folks would have been focused on the the red line changes and incidental changes related to our incorporating this the new state law requirements they may not have been as focused on other aspects of the policy so I appreciate kind of this is a more discreet revision focused on the the updates based on virginia code and i i am fine with the language as is in the policy at the moment so um i i will not be supporting the amendments likely but i'll turn it over to dr

[01:25:40] rashid uh i'm just i just wanted to say i'm okay with voting with all three in one at once yeah thank you thank you dr rashid do you need me to reread while all of no no that's all right i um i have I have them here all right we are voting on the Griffiths amendments to policy 1040 amendments one through three as they were posted on board docs any further discussion board members all in favor say aye aye all opposed say no no

[01:26:18] the motion of amendments fail one to two with mr. Griffiths voting yes and dr. to myself voting no i think that i will unless there is any further amendment um entertain a motion to forward the to approve this suite of policies at the committee level um and forward them to the school full school board as an information item so moved thank you uh second

[01:26:49] um all right uh any discussion uh board members all in favor of approving the suite of policies at the committee level and porting to the full school board as an information item, say aye. Aye. The motion passes two to one with Dr. Rasheeda and myself voting yes and Mrs. Griffiths voting no.

[01:27:10] That concludes our action items on the agenda. We did have a discussion item 5.01, cameras during public comment scheduled for this meeting, but seeing as the time is 6.30, we will continue that discussion to the next legislative and policy committee meeting.

[01:27:29] I will note that there were some additional resources posted on board docs for the committee and public's consideration just to prepare for our discussion at the next meeting. We will not be having a meeting in December for legislative and policy, given that our action items have been now moved forward to the full board, and we'll be dealing with those in December.

[01:27:52] So with that, I will wish everyone a happy Veterans Day, And thank you to our veterans and service members who are serving our country. And I hope everyone has a good evening. The meeting is adjourned at 6.31.