



**PSD SRO CAC – Meeting Notes**

03/25

5:30pm – 7:30pm

Zoom

Notes	Outcomes / Action Items
<p><b>Welcome and Process</b></p> <p>Everyone shared a general check in on where they are today, noting the heaviness of the past week given the events in Boulder.</p> <p>The facilitation team acknowledged a number of things that are setting the stage for tonight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciation of Juan’s service and him stepping down from the CAC.</li> <li>• The LC Sheriff’s posts on Facebook about the CAC’s survey, process, and charge, and the possibility it will affect the community engagement results</li> <li>• The community and student survey, which has gone out but has not been analyzed fully by the time of this meeting.</li> </ul> <p>The facilitators reminded CAC members that their charge is to come up with viable recommendations. They also offered a short reminder of the work the group has done along the way to offer a sense of where they have come from and where they are going in the final three meetings, noting especially that we are trying to continue to build on the work around their vision of safety from January. Then facilitators brought the group back to the Miro board tool where a new space has been added with the same specific roles of SROs previously identified, now color coded for areas of focus from the CAC’s vision of safety. Between meetings, the facilitators took each of the group’s Miro Boards and synthesized them into one that has 3 columns labeled “Law enforcement SHOULD be involved”, “Unclear / Depends on circumstance”, and “Law enforcement SHOULD NOT be involved”.</p> <p>Tonight, the objective is to hopefully reach agreement on each aspect of SRO roles and which of the three columns it should be assigned to, keeping in mind the established visions of safety and the managing polarities framework. The facilitators noted that some of this is going to come back to the same arguments that have been shared all along (upsides and downsides to each aspect), and a resource was provided in the Miro board to remind CAC members of those arguments and questions they need to weigh regarding them before making a decision about where to place each role.</p> <p>Questions were asked about the final report and how it is going to be done in the timeline provided. The facilitation team thinks it is possible, but much of that hangs on the agreements reached this evening. Another CAC member asked to be reminded of the voting procedures in case they are needed. These were established in a previous meeting and will be used according to the agreement if necessary.</p>	<p><b>Next Steps:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> N/A</p>



## The Role of Law Enforcement

*Purpose: See if we can find alignment on the role of law enforcement in PSD schools*

Facilitators framed today's goal: to come to agreement on what the role of law enforcement - which could be SROs, security officers, or street patrol - should be in PSD schools. They explained that the shift of frame from SROs to law enforcement was intended to help address remaining unclarity around the roles of SROs by allowing the team to think in terms of any type of law enforcement playing these roles in PSD.

The CAC was presented with a Miro board showing the facilitation team's initial analysis of what they heard them saying should be and should not be the role of law enforcement, with numerous roles without clarity that the groups will need to discuss. Additionally, instructions were given that groups should feel free to break apart the cards if greater clarity or specificity is needed for some given role/scenario. The CAC was then broken into three groups, centered around the established safety elements: 1) Supportive School Culture + Preparedness and Response (grouped together); 2) Direct Prevention; and 3) Recovery and Accountability.

The CAC moved into breakout rooms and the three small groups spent about 45 minutes discussing which roles/scenarios should and should not involve some kind of law enforcement. CAC members were allowed to self-select their breakout groups and move between groups during the time. Then the whole group was reconvened, and the following summarizes the small group share-outs:

**Recovery and Accountability:** This group moved through quickly as consensus was already pretty clear. They don't think law enforcement needs to be involved when there are "minor" drug violations like tobacco and marijuana possession. Conversely, it seemed clear that if the drug violation was "serious" and required an investigation into a major crime like distribution, law enforcement should be involved. It was also clear that law enforcement should not be involved in speaking with students in an enforcement situation without a parent present, unless the student has specifically asked for support with something that they don't want their parents involved in (caveats included for mandatory reporting). One member commented that they would also like to see a caveat for students who have intellectual development issues, as they believe a parent should always be present when such students are speaking to law enforcement because they may need help understanding what's happening.

**Supportive School Culture and Preparedness and Response:** This group was also able to come to consensus. The biggest take away was that while the group believes it is good for law enforcement to have relationships with PSD students and all community members, this should not be the primary reason for their presence or a defined role for law enforcement in schools. (Building positive relationships with young people was noted as being part of the SRO contract

**Next Steps:** N/A

**Decision:** N/A



and often highlighted as a leading reason for SROs.) The group feels that anyone who comes into a school building should form positive relationships with students, but do not believe this should be a reason law enforcement is invited into school buildings, especially since there are many other spaces and opportunities where LE can do that relationship building with young people.

Another agreement came around using law enforcement for emergency planning. The group agreed that law enforcement should be involved in helping make the emergency plans as they add a unique perspective and have proven helpful in this area. However, when it comes to preparing students and staff, but especially students, for an emergency situation (i.e. active shooter drills), school administration should lead this without law enforcement involvement. There was a strong feeling that these drills are often traumatic enough for students and law enforcement does not need to be involved in these practice runs during school days (inviting LE to practice their response in actual school buildings on weekends was expressed as a better alternative).

One member raised a concern about not wanting law enforcement to build relationships with students, and questioned this recommendation. Another member responded that law enforcement can, and should, reach out and build relationships with young people in their community as a way to build trust, but it should not be the responsibility of schools to serve this role, nor should students be forced to build relationships with law enforcement in their school setting. All members came to consensus on this point after this exchange.

**Risk and Threat Assessment** - This group came to consensus on many items, but not all, as there were many nuances to these conversations. Overall, there was a theme that law enforcement involvement should be the last resort in most situations, and thus, all other avenues should be tried before their involvement is requested. Some highlights included of this group's conversation included:

- Threats of suicide: Law enforcement is not the first go-to resource, but instead we should rely on trained school personnel who understand how to address suicidal ideation. If the student poses a threat to others, including the mental health professionals involved, it should be treated as a co-responder situation.
- Mental Health Holds: These are best handled by mental health professionals who can help de-escalate, rather than escalate, the circumstances. There are models such as co-location of licensed mental professionals or working agreements with mental health centers/mobile providers, and the district should explore these options. If the concern is actually the safety of the mental health professionals as well, then it should be handled as a co-responder situation.
- Investigations of Crimes with a Victim: There is a difference a nuance in this area depending on the type of crime (i.e. sexual assault versus punching someone in a fight or a shoving match versus pulling a knife). Some of these crimes may better be handled by the school as a discipline issue while others need law enforcement's involvement. There needs to be consistency in this area, with clarity on when and



<p>when not to involve law enforcement. Additionally, the group felt strongly that if a victim does not want to go through with a legal investigation or charges, they should have the right not to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no solution/consensus on missing/runaway students or co-responder checks. However, from what we understand, often co-responder visits could be carried out without law enforcement involved and handled by the co-responder. If law enforcement is involved, the current practice of remaining on backup only as a safety precaution should be followed. Given this backup role, it would not be necessary to have an SRO specifically involved.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Closing</b></p> <p>Facilitators congratulated CAC members on having established a broad framework that they seem to have achieved meaningful consensus on for what law enforcement should and should not be involved in when it comes to PSD schools. They informed them that next week, we'll be discussing the "if not law enforcement, then who?" questions for those scenarios/aspects identified as not being the role of law enforcement to deal with. On the other side, we will also be discussing "how/what kind of law enforcement should be involved?" for those areas identified as needing law enforcement involvement.</p> <p>Each CAC member gave a one word check out on how they were feeling. Many expressed gratitude, optimism, and hope. Others noted feeling connected, inspired, "heard", encouraged, and positive.</p> <p>CAC members were asked to fill out the feedback form.</p>	<p><b>Next Steps:</b> Review community survey results before the next meeting for discussion and inclusion in recommendations.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> N/A</p>