



PSD SRO CAC – Meeting Notes 01/28 5:30pm – 7:00pm Zoom





SROs (mental health, discipline, etc) within the timeline, desire to let the record show the group has not been given sufficient time, inquiries about whether meetings could be added, and a desire to get an extension for anything from a few weeks to a year.

- Questions related to timeline arose for the PSD Board specifically, with a couple quick reactions from the two BOE members present: Could the BOE offer them a 6 month SRO contract instead of 1 year? (BOE members: Possibly, but it would require a re-negotiation, and the transition happening in the middle of the school year, especially recruiting and hiring replacement staff like mental health workers, would be quite challenging and unorthodox.)
- The group acknowledged that this IS the timeline we have, and even though many have reservations about it, we are willing to really put forth the effort to try to work within it

Group go-round about hopes for meeting outcome

- At this point, the <u>initial timeframes for tonight's agenda</u> was being stretched, but it felt important to still allow every member to put their voice into the "room" briefly despite the time crunch.
- Facilitators asked everyone to share, in light of the previous conversations, their own answer to the question: "what would success feel like for this meeting?"
- Reactions were widely varied from "better understanding of what the community engagement aspect of our work will look like" to "trust and relationship building" to "what's best for students" to "the ability to talk frankly and hear what others really think about SROs" to "to know that we are working toward a common goal" to "giving ourselves more credit." Several people were honest that they just weren't sure what success would look like, and many echoed a sentiment that success for tonight would look like more clarity on the group's goals, timeline, scope of focus, and plan for doing community engagement

Group Discussion on Increasing Clarity

- Given the widely felt need for clarity, the facilitation team decided to dispense with the planned agenda for the meeting, and instead to support a discussion that would hopefully get folks more clarity. (The original agenda would have had the group using an online tool to offer input on what "safety" means to us all in the context of our work and seeking to come to a shared understanding. The Trello board can still be <u>found here</u>)
 - The discussion was robust and wide-ranging. Highlights include:
 Discussion on the group's purpose / focus. One member

Next steps: NA





abarred tout from a alideabaur airren by DCD staff early in the	
shared text from a slideshow given by PSD staff early in the CAC's life that included language about the school to prison pipeline, not just SROs - others expressed agreement that they thought this broader focus still applies. PSD staff shared their understanding that the commitment had been to the group learning about the school to prison pipeline (which apparently did happen some in 2020), but that this direct question about SROs was now what's on the table. Remarks and growing agreement that a big part of "the problem" with SROs in PSD right now is that no one can really speak definitively about what their role is because it has been poorly defined and is understood differently by different groups and that no matter what happens, the role of SROs needs to be much more explicit and clearly defined. This view seemed to be shared by most of the CAC, including PSD staff and Board members present. A discussion about "white supremacy culture" and its norms - some feel it is impacting this group's operation clearly and negatively, especially in terms of urgency, while others disagreed and still others challenged the premise of "white supremacy culture" An exercise of the oops/ouch norm between two CAC participants occurred - a request for participants to speak for themselves using "I statements" instead of in the group voice, and an objection to a member feeling insulted by feeling the "white supremacy culture" discussion was being applied to them as a person of color A desire for all CAC members to be able to speak with a level of candor about their objections to SROs presence in schools	
ity Engagement Check In e for the meeting neared an end, the facilitators returned to ed to speak briefly on the community engagement work the vas expected to do on this question of the future of SROs. ommunity engagement needs to happen, and given the lack e to plan here, a suggestion was made that CAC members eer to join a CAC subcommittee that would form to help plan d steer that effort in conjunction with the broader CAC. bers were offered the chance to volunteer in the feedback with a reminder about the importance of giving that feedback	Next steps: • PSD staff will convene a CAC subcommittee to plan community engagement work with the members who volunteer in the feedback survey
	pipeline, not just SROs - others expressed agreement that they thought this broader focus still applies. PSD staff shared their understanding that the commitment had been to the group learning about the school to prison pipeline (which apparently did happen some in 2020), but that this direct question about SROs was now what's on the table. Remarks and growing agreement that a big part of "the problem" with SROs in PSD right now is that no one can really speak definitively about what their role is because it has been poorly defined and is understood differently by different groups and that no matter what happens, the role of SROs needs to be much more explicit and clearly defined. This view seemed to be shared by most of the CAC, including PSD staff and Board members present. A discussion about "white supremacy culture" and its norms - some feel it is impacting this group's operation clearly and negatively, especially in terms of urgency, while others disagreed and still others challenged the premise of "white supremacy culture" An exercise of the oops/ouch norm between two CAC participants occurred - a request for participants to speak for themselves using "I statements" instead of in the group voice, and an objection to a member feeling insulted by feeling the "white supremacy culture" discussion was being applied to them as a person of color A desire for all CAC members to be able to speak with a level of candor about their objections to SROs presence in schools ty Engagement Check In e for the meeting neared an end, the facilitators returned to ed to speak briefly on the community engagement work the fas expected to do on this question of the future of SROs. mmunity engagement needs to happen, and given the lack to plan here, a suggestion was made that CAC members eer to join a CAC subcommittee that would form to help plan steer that effort in conjunction with the broader CAC. ers were offered the chance to volunteer in the feedback





began a discussion on the broad outlines of what community engagement could look like.

- A few members shared frustration that the CAC might "reinvent the wheel" because many groups have already done / are doing community engagement around SROs and other related issues in PSD, and those groups' work should be included in the engagement that the CAC uses to inform its eventual recommendations too, lest we invisibilize good work in the community. This sentiment was supported by several members, and many were very supportive of the CAC connecting with the groups doing engagement already and incorporating their findings, especially because such a strategy would help lessen the burden on the CAC to engage as many people as it feels we need to.
- The facilitation team acknowledged that the community engagement process was outside of the scope of its contract, but would work to set the CAC subcommittee up for success. PSD staff committed to scheduling the first meeting of the community engagement subcommittee before the following meeting.

Wrap up

• Participants were asked to complete an after meeting feedback survey. Many expressed appreciation for the candor and openness of tonight's conversation.