



## PSD SRO CAC – Meeting Notes 04/08 5:30pm – 7:30pm Zoom

Notes	Outcomes / Action Items
Welcome and Process  The facilitation team opened with an appeal to CAC members to work toward consensusnot loving everything, but working to get to a place where they did not feel the need to block anythingwhich will be a stronger statement to the Board and PSD community. They reminded the group that there is more common ground than was thought possible at the start and encouraged everyone to really listen and work toward agreement.  As an opener, CAC members shared their favorite dance moves.  The CAC members were sent a spreadsheet earlier in the week to rate their approval on each of the recommendations using a "fist to five" approach - where a "fist" (or zero) would indicate such deep disagreement that a participant felt the need to block a recommendation, and a five represented the most enthusiastic support possible The facilitation team gave appreciation to the group for all the time they spent prior to the meeting giving their feedback.	Next Steps: N/A  Decision: N/A
The focus of the meeting is on the issues that still have some folks who rated specific recommendations or sections at zeroes. The goal was to resolve enough issues that everyone can agree that, even if that recommendation is not their favorite, they could support it in public	
Advancing Recommendations in Small Groups Purpose: Ensure each CAC member provides input and insights in each key aspect of the report	Next Steps: Move discussion of changes/edits to full group for approval and hopeful consensus
The facilitation team explained the process and structure of tonight's meeting. Using a "World Cafe" approach, all council members had an opportunity to go into small group discussion for all 3 "sections" of the report (1) vision elements, principles, and "other" recommendations, 2) roles where law enforcement should not be involved in schools, and 3) roles where law enforcement should be involved in school). During the small group discussions, CAC members were asked to discuss the comments/feedback offered by fellow CAC members, offer clarifications, and approve or modify. The process was designed to move all "zeros" to higher numbers, if possible, and the feedback/suggested changes of members who ranked a given recommendation at zero were prioritized.	Decision: N/A





Small group changes/edits/notes were captured directly in the recommendations report.

## Advancing Recommendations in Full Group

Purpose: Large group works inclusively to finalize recommendations and any noted dissent or caveats.

As the discussion progressed the group was asked to update their spreadsheet in real time as changes to recommendations were being made. The facilitation team tracked if there was movement in the overall "score" of recommendations, indicating either for increasing or decreasing support.

The group first discussed changes to the Principles, Vision Statements, and "Other Recommendations" section. The group made a number of tweaks including:

- Language was changed to indicate that law enforcement should be trained to have strong relationships with "schools" instead of "students".
- The "other recommendations" section was moved to the appendix, and language was added that these were captured as part of the process but were not fully discussed or agreed upon

The group came to consensus on these elements of the recommendations report.

The group then moved to the "when law enforcement should be involved in schools" section. It was clear that there was not agreement on the current recommendation, which was to remove law enforcement from being embedded in schools and instead implement a "police liaison" model. Concerns about removing SROs included the physical safety benefits of SROs vs. emotional safety for all students, and some members did not feel they could make a recommendation that could decrease the physical safety of students. Another member noted that the SOPs for SROs were just recently created and not enough time has gone by and data collected to know if those changes help the program's identified issues.

The facilitators offered the group a choice to provide a "split opinion" on this specific aspect of the report and allow a dissent opinion. Many of those uncomfortable with the recommendation agreed with this approach. However, other members stressed how far the group has come and desired to submit a full consensus report to the Board. The facilitation team then offered that a compromise may be to study alternatives over the course of the following year. The CAC went back and forth on alternative options and the difficulty some felt in seeing colleagues elevate rare physical safety considerations over BIPOC student's regular emotional safety. Numerous additional options were

Next Steps: Finalize recommendations in final meeting

Decision: The CAC could add one more meeting to attempt to reach consensus





discussed, including giving the CAC more time or having another diverse advisory group explore alternatives to the SRO program after the CAC's term ended. In the end, the group was unable to come to consensus on any of the proposed recommendation language.

A vote was finally suggested, as the group did not appear to be moving any closer to consensus on this item. However, numerous CAC members expressed a desire to have an additional meeting to see if consensus could be reached with more time to process and discuss between meetings. Even though this meeting had been scheduled to be the final meeting of the CAC, members and the facilitation team agreed to add one more meeting the following week to seek a final resolution of their discussions.

The group ran out of time and was not able to discuss recommendations around the roles that law enforcement should no longer be involved in.

Closing

CAC members were asked to fill out the feedback form which included information on those interested in helping with the presentation to the Board on April 27th.

Next Steps: N/A

Decision: N/A