Notes	Outcomes / Action Items
# Welcome and Process Everyone shared a piece of good news (after having an April Fool's Day prank pulled on them by the facilitation team). The facilitation team noted that their role tonight will be to challenge the CAC's recommendations to ensure they are strong, sound, and well-reasoned.	**Next Steps**: N/A **Decision**: N/A
# Clarifying Recommendations The facilitators gave context that the group is starting from the previous work done on the Miro board. They described the loose ends that needed clarification regarding the role of law enforcement (i.e. traffic control, co-responder checks, etc.). There were also a few areas that needed greater clarifications, such as "non violent offenses" and then "emergency response in schools including weapons". The goal of this evening was to pick up where the CAC left off during the previous meeting - gaining increasing clarity on when law enforcement should or should not be involved. There was a conversation about the draft report language, including comments about law enforcement building "strong relationships with students" which some CAC members had discomfort with. The group agreed that they understood the principle, but would like to work on the exact wording. The CAC members also asked about who was going to present the recommendations to the School Board. The facilitation team is making the recommendation that CAC members present the findings as they are the CAC's recommendations, with the support of the facilitation team where needed. More information about this will be discussed at the final meeting. The CAC members also asked if they were allowed to adjust the wording of the principles that have been drafted. The facilitation team noted that yes, this was part of the process as these were only drafts based on the work done in previous meetings on the Trello boards regarding the CAC's vision of safety. The facilitator noted that it might help to think of the principles as things that would overlap any law enforcement engagement.	Next Steps: the facilitation team will work to refine and redefine the principles Decision: the CAC understands that the language currently being used in the principals isn't right, but the overall thinking and direction is. There might be a need to preface that these principles overlay every engagement, not how decisions are made.
# Reviewing Community Input *Purpose: Understand the feedback from community members across PSD who took part in the survey and focus group and reflect on implications of the data for the CAC's recommendations.*	Next Steps: Those who were interested in diving deeper into the data were invited to join both Dwayne and John McKay from the

The facilitation team reminded the group that this survey data will be used to understand the views of the community as it relates to their current understanding of SROs and school safety and to inform the discussion of recommendations.

Dwayne Schmitz of PSD presented a high level summary of the survey data with an eye toward implications and what from the data supports or conflicts with the current recommendations.

Highlights from the staff survey showed:
- Elementary, middle, and high school staff's feelings on the question of "how important do they feel it is to have SROs assigned to PSD schools?" was pretty clear - they thought it was important or critical at a high rate, though he noted that there was a shift away from seeing SROs as "critically important" to school safety as grade level decreased (that is, more high school staff saw SROs as "critically important" to safety than did middle school staff, and elementary school staff had the least number of "critically important" ratings)
- When asked about whether security guards would be sufficient, there was a 50-50 split at elementary schools, which started leaning more toward "No, they're not a good alternative" at middle schools, then even more at high schools
- On SROs' impact on school climate, there was a big trend about SROs positive impact, with very few "negatives" and some "need more info." Dwayne noted, however, that there was a meaningful shift in the levels of agreement about SROs' positive impact on climate than there was on their positive impact on safety.
- Regarding clarity of the role of SROs, there was a 50-50 split on whether survey respondents understood the role of SROs
- When it came to funding, the preponderance of survey respondents were supportive of funding for SROs
- Dwayne offered a breakdown of all of the results by ethnicity. He also noted that there were far more female respondents to the staff survey and a very good cross section of folks from most levels of PSD and across many different staff roles

Dwayne didn't have visualizations for any group ready for the CAC today except for the staff survey, given the tight turn around between the survey closing and tonight's meeting, but that he would have it ready by the Monday data deep dive meeting (see next steps). Dwayne acknowledged that while there were some clear trends from initial review, this was "a mountain of data" that will take time to really parse through.

The conversation then moved to question and answer. Key questions included:
- Q: Can we track the influence that the Sheriff's Facebook post or the Boulder shooting had on the data?

PSD on Monday evening via zoom. A follow up email will be sent with this information.

Decision: N/A

- ● A: Yes, partially. We can track the responses and the data by date with the visualization tool, which will show us what responses were like before and after those events and after. However, the Facebook post was early on in the survey's release and the general take away was that there was not a huge influx of answers after the post.
- ● Q: Can we see staff responses broken out by those who work with IEP students?
- ● A: Yes, but it couldn't be done fast enough right in front of the CAC this evening. Dwayne noted he hoped to have this completed by Monday.

There was a lengthy discussion about what was perceived as "pro-SRO" information linked in the survey. Some also mentioned that there appeared to be a discomfort on the part of PSD to link to school to prison pipeline information because such information might have led respondents to have an anti-SRO bias, which some CAC members were frustrated with. PSD responded that the link provided was the best information they have on the SRO program and the survey was about SROs. The district also offered that if the link projects such a positive image of what the SRO is or is supposed to be, is that the vision/north star for what SROs *should* be? And if so, then could the CAC see the gap between here and there as the ground that changes to the SRO program needs to cover? He stands by having the link in there and doesn't believe it tainted the results of the survey. A CAC member appreciated the response but wanted it noted that they believe if one side was presented, then the other should have been also, and thus questioned the survey results.

As the conversation came to a close, one CAC member noted they felt like the majority of survey respondents were going to be pro-SRO from early on. The people who are comfortable giving their opinions vs the people who don't might be slanted by current societal dynamics that break along familiar social / racial lines. Another member noted that it is important for the CAC to remain open to exercising principled leadership that can take these survey results for what they are and still make decisions it feels it needs to. Another member chimed in to reminder CAC members that the survey did not encourage respondents to think about alternative solutions or approaches that could replace some current SRO roles in the way that the CAC is, and that makes the CAC's take on things much more nuanced because they aren't working with an understanding that the choice is between "SROs or nothing".

Given time constraints, the facilitators transitioned at this point to the next section of the agenda.

Clarifying The What and How of Law Enforcement in Schools

Purpose: Determine how to best handle roles where law enforcement won't be involved and where it will be involved

CAC members self selected into one of two groups:

- Group 1: Law Enforcement Not Involved
- Group 2: Law Enforcement Involved--Who and How

Facilitators shared that they intended to challenge CAC members in discussion, not because they agree or disagree, but because it was their role to make sure the recommendations have sound reasoning and have been tested. Facilitators also made sure to ask for explanations for when the recommendations don't match survey results/feedback.

The remaining time was spent in small groups drafting and clarifying recommendations, taking into account the survey feedback. CAC members worked in small groups until just before the meeting ended, and any disagreements or continued conversation was left for the following meeting. Specific draft recommendations were captured in the report google doc that will be reviewed during the following meeting.

Closing	Next Steps: N/A
CAC members were asked to fill out the feedback form.	Decision: N/A