



**West Linn-Wilsonville School District
October 26, 2020 @ 5:00 p.m.
Board Work Session Minutes**

A Work Session of the Board of Directors of the West Linn-Wilsonville School District was held on Monday, October 26, 2020 @ 5:00 p.m. at the District Office 22210 Stafford Rd, Tualatin, OR 97062.

(Please access the online video of this meeting for full verbiage in its entirety.)

**1. October 26, 2020 BOARD WORK SESSION @ 5:00 P.M.
5:00 p.m. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Molatore called the meeting to order at 5:08 p.m.

2. 5:00 p.m. ROLL CALL

Board Members Present:

Chair Regan Molatore
Vice Chair Chelsea King
Director Dylan Hydes
Director Ginger Fitch
Director Christy Thompson

3. 5:05 p.m. COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE

Chair Molatore acknowledged public comments submitted and stated that due to the coronavirus state-wide restrictions and in keeping with the efforts of social distancing to reduce the spread of the coronavirus, public comment will not be taken verbally during the meeting, but will be accepted via email. The Board must acknowledge they have had the opportunity to read all emails as part of this process.

The question has been raised as to who is allowed to give public comment. Public comment is just that, comments made by any member of the public. The ability to give comment does not discriminate as to who is allowed to provide comment as it is open to anyone. However, we do ask for names and address to be submitted with comments as we use this information to weigh the comments being provided.

This Board has acknowledged that it will give greater weight to comments and input from citizens within our district, yet we hear and review all input provided.

Public Comments submitted in support of the School Resource Officer Program in the District:

Jade Priest-Maoz
Michael Maoz
Joanne Masters
Matthew Greyerbiehl
Josh Juenger
Adam Simshauser
Jolene Vandenhaak
Mikal Lorio

Kyle Bunch
Darcy Hansen
Yarisa Jaroch Gonzalez
Michiko Walton
Lawrence Nelson
Tracy Normoyle
Diane DeHaaven Leebrick
Sandi Williams
James & Kari Kleinke
Allegra Parreira
Sean Sullivan
Lisa Hedberg
David Thomas
Jennifer Koenig
Nate Seymour
Tricia Britton
Bryan Flannery
Amy Porter
Mary Tornblom
Dana Crocker
Cheryl Landazuri
Karin Grano

Public Comment submitted not in support of the School Resource Officer Program:

Jacqueline Fuller
Debbie Meador
Richard Ponting

Public Comments submitted not in support of Comprehensive Distance Learning and requesting in-person education to resume:

Clay Masters
Joanne Masters
Fred Jackson
Jeff Dean
Tracy Normoyle
Bobbie Poppleton
Monica Wacek
Barbara Hass

Public Comments submitted not in support of gender neutral bathrooms:

Allegra Parreira

4. **5:15 p.m. BOARD BUSINESS - GENERAL ADMINISTRATION**

- A. **Review and Evaluation of School Resource Officer Program - Superintendent Dr. Kathy Ludwig, Assistant Superintendent Dr. Aaron Downs - BOARD ACTION** (*Expected Outcome: Board reviews program takes action*)

Chair Regan Molatore stated this meeting is scheduled for a two-hour discussion on the School Resource Officer Program Review and shared how and why we got here this evening; The Board has been engaged in reviewing the School Resource Officer (SRO) Program for a few months now. Staff had begun this work in the spring and in August at the School Board Retreat, the Board of Directors adopted 3

Commitments and No. 2 is: ***The Board will examine the District's School Resource Officer Program (SRO) to better understand if and how the program supports the District's Goals. Depending on the outcome of this examination, the Board will conclude this process with an evidence-based decision to maintain, change, or end the SRO Program.***

Before the Board of Directors created this Commitment, staff had already begun an internal review in the spring which continued into the summer. Due to national events that focused on police and protests across the nation, the Board received comments from community members inquiring about the functioning of the District's SRO Program. The Board became involved in the SRO Program review rather than leaving it just for staff alone to do the work.

The SRO Review was conducted by District Administration and School Board Liaisons Director Christy Thompson and Vice Chair Chelsea King who provided diverse sources of information. The recommendation from Superintendent Dr. Kathy Ludwig and supporting documents were provided a little over a week in advance of this meeting for the Board to review. District Policy BBF states the Board will take action after the Superintendent has provided a recommendation. As a result of these policies and practices, the Board specifically requested Superintendent Ludwig to conduct a review with Board Member involvement and provide a recommendation. Director Thompson and Vice Chair King offered to serve as Board Liaisons to help craft the survey and collect resources on how SRO Programs are ran elsewhere.

Chair Molatore stated that as the discussion begins, she reminds fellow Board Members to focus the discussion on the SRO Program and not on individual officers. This process is to ensure if we have an SRO Program in place, it supports any officer appointed to the position to work alongside us to support District Goals.

Superintendent Dr. Kathy Ludwig thanked Chair Molatore, the Board of Directors and the District Office Team that made it possible to meet in person with all the safety protocols in place. For community members watching at home, everyone in the room is socially distanced, plexi-glass is between each member at the table and the camera system is in the middle of the table. The only people in the room are the five Board Members, herself, Dr. Aaron Downs Assistant Superintendent, Mr. Andrew Kilstrom Director of Communications and Dr. Mayra Gomez Director of College and Career Readiness.

This review was multi-faceted, the binders the Board Members were given include the Superintendent's Recommendation, a report from both the Wilsonville Police Department and the West Linn Police Department with an overview of their Programs and the extensive survey results with over 2400 respondents. Patinkin Research is present to provide the survey results directly to the Board of Directors.

We held Focus Groups early in the summer and fall with Dr. Downs and Dr. Gomez reaching out to a diverse group of high school students and are represented in the survey. Articles were submitted by Board Members and staff in an attempt to look at multiple angles and tonight is a worthy discussion of what we have been learning.

Superintendent Ludwig introduced Ms. Maggie Simich, Vice President of Patinkin Research Strategies to provide the analysis of the 2400 plus survey responses.

Ms. Simich thanked Superintendent Ludwig and the Board of Directors and presented the survey results which were collected from September 28th to October 6th.

Survey Questions:

- How frequently have you interacted with a School Resource Officer in West Linn-Wilsonville Schools? This can include a simple greeting all the way to a formal meeting.
- How would you rate your interactions with SRO's (Limited to those who reported interactions with SROs.)
- Would you like to share an experience you or your student had with an SRO or the SRO Program that contributed to your opinion about their role in schools?
- What do you think is the purpose and function of SROs in WLWV Schools?
- What elements of the SRO Program should the District improve or remove?
- What is your role/relationship with the school District?
- How would you describe your race/ethnicity?
- Would you describe yourself or your student into fitting into one or more of these categories: (list of demographic categories)

The Board engaged in a discussion including:

Director Fitch stated 2/3rd of the responses are coming from one half of the District, is there any difference or can the data be broken out? She understands they could select all that applied on one of the questions, was there a significant response difference for people associated with High School vs. Primary School?

Director Hydes stated that it looks like the survey was taken by 306 students which is 3% of the student body. What efforts were taken to give the survey to all students and who opted to take the survey vs. who did not.

Dr. Aaron Downs, Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Schools stated that the survey was given at all three high schools with different classes and age groups. Many of these students also participated in Focus Groups and were invited by their teachers, counselors and or Administration for a wide range of representation. Students also took the survey on their own without us specifically inviting them as part of a class or Focus Group.

Director Hydes stated it sounds like a few 9th grade language arts classes were selected for the survey.

Dr. Downs stated we wanted to make sure we heard from our students so there was a targeted reach out and it was met with great acceptance.

Director Hydes asked Ms. Simich if this methodology and the 3% sample survey size was accurate to provide results?

Ms. Simich stated the survey is not necessarily the best representation of student opinion. If student voice is what you are basing your program review on, this survey is not the best tool with which to do this.

Director Hydes asked Ms. Simich if she knew what share of students took the survey in class vs. students that opted to take it on their own? Ms. Simich stated this is a District question.

Director Fitch asked if the amount of survey responses is consistent with others we put out?

Mr. Andrew Kilstrom, Director of Communication stated this is by far the largest survey response we have ever received. The next most comparable was the Student Information Act (SIA) Survey and that was 1800 responses.

Vice Chair King confirmed with Mr. Kilstrom that the SIA Survey was mostly feedback from parents if any students at all.

Superintendent Ludwig stated in addition to the survey, we had 51 students participate in Focus Groups.

Superintendent Ludwig and Chair Molatore thanked Ms. Simich for presenting to the Board of Directors.

Superintendent Ludwig stated a large part of the review was hearing from our community, our students and our parents who are all invested in the program. In addition to the survey, we reviewed articles, held Focus Groups and engaged in conversations with both Police Chiefs and School Resource Officers as they reviewed the data too. We held a follow up meeting with them after we received the results of the survey along with 8 students, high school principals, both Police Chiefs and both SRO's. They spent the first hour with the students and then thanked them and let them go back to class. The second hour was spent debriefing with the Police Chiefs and SRO's. A few days later, we debriefed with all three high school principals to ask them what did they hear and what do they wish to let us know.

Superintendent Ludwig and District Administration identified key findings and presented them to the Board of Directors in her memo and is entered into the record:

To: School Board Members

From: Dr. Kathy Ludwig, Superintendent

Re: WLWV School Resource Officer Program Review

Date: October 26, 2020

Overview of SRO Program Review

The West Linn-Wilsonville School District and School Board committed this year to conducting a review of the School Resource Officer (SRO) Program using an equity lens. This review will guide the work towards continually improving support to our students.

District staff met during the summer of 2020 with both West Linn Police Department and Wilsonville Police Department leaders to include them in our review process. We value our partnership with our local officers, agency and especially the currently assigned SROs. Our partnership is critical to our commitment of keeping students and families safe at school and district-sponsored events. Our partnership is critical during emergencies or crises interventions (e.g. lockdown, lock out, evacuation). And our partnership is critical to disrupting systems of racism in our community and in our schools.

The current SRO Program in our schools is multi-faceted and highly collaborative with our district leaders and staff. Currently, the program includes:

- Contributing to a Safe and Welcoming School Culture
- Providing law enforcement-related education, counseling, and prevention
- Investigating and Responding to Criminal Behavior
- Engaging in Restorative Practices and Group Circles for Problem-Solving
- Promoting Student Health and Wellness
- Engaging in Quarterly WLWV-First Responder Safety Meetings
- Providing Assistance During School Safety Events, Crises or Emergency Response
- Engaging in WLWV-Joint City Equity Events
- Serving as Liaisons between the District and Wilsonville, West Linn Police Departments

This review of the SRO Program is typical of other district program reviews. When we review a district program we do not review the individuals. We are careful to look at the purpose, investment, effectiveness and outcomes of the program itself.

This review included several aspects, including an opportunity for our community to provide their input and suggestions regarding the SRO Program through a survey. To ensure an inclusion of all voices, intentional efforts were made to reach out and hear the experiences of our students, parents and staff of color in our community.

The SRO Program Review, which spanned summer 2020 through October 2020, included:

- Review of the SRO Program (History, Overview, Costs, Training, Job Description, Referral Data) – this information came from our police departments.
- Feedback from students, staff, parents, community (focus groups, phone calls, survey) – this information came from our community.
- Research of other SRO Programs or School Security Models – this information came from District administrators and Board Members.
- Analysis and Summary of the Survey Feedback – this analysis was conducted by Patinkin Research Strategies, a third-party agency.
- Key Findings and Recommendations by School District Leaders in collaboration with West Linn and Wilsonville Police Departments, High School Principals and student representatives.
- Presentation and Recommendation Regarding the SRO Program by the Superintendent to the School Board at the October 26, 2020 Board Work Session.

Key Findings and Recommendations

The West Linn-Wilsonville School District currently partners with both the city of West Linn and the City of Wilsonville Police Departments to contract two (2) School Resource Officers, one from each city. The City of Wilsonville contracts with the Clackamas County Sheriff's Office for law enforcement services which includes the officer assigned to the district.

The Cost of the SRO Program to the City of Wilsonville Police Department is \$199,911 of which approximately \$91,000 is charged to the school district. The Cost of the SRO Program charged to the school district by the City of West Linn is approximately \$55,000. Both police departments, in agreement with the district, also charge for extended after-duty hours for events. These costs are reflected in the district's annual budget.

The SRO in West Linn currently works with the staff and students of 5 primary schools, 1 middle school and West Linn High School. The SRO in Wilsonville currently works with the staff and students of 4 primary schools, 3 middle schools, Wilsonville High School and Arts & Technology High School.

Upon review of the Police Department SRO Program reports, City-School District Memoranda of Understandings (MOUs), community survey outcomes (over 2,400 respondents), student focus group comments and review of the literature and research on SRO programs, several key findings emerged.

Finding 1: The WLWV SRO Program Needs Additional Definition and Clarity

Currently, much of the description of the SRO program is set by past practice and reviewed through annual meetings with verbal agreements regarding specific roles and responsibility, scope of the work and communication pipeline. The current MOUs are very brief descriptions of the program with cost agreements.

- a. *Job Description* – Currently the job description is written by each police department with general understanding of the school district's expectations.
- b. *Clarity of Roles and Responsibilities* – Currently the School District and cities do not have a joint description in the MOU of specific roles and responsibilities of SROs when working in the schools.
- c. *Scope of Involvement* – Currently the School District and cities do not delineate in the MOU the scope of involvement of an SRO when a conflict or wrongdoing arises (e.g. disorderly conduct versus low-level offenses versus serious offenses).

- d. *Range of Trainings* – Currently the SROs attend the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) Basic SRO Course. Other trainings, meetings and conferences are at the discretion of each police department or individual SRO. There are no specific training expectations written in the MOUs.
- e. *Annual Review of Data* – Currently the School District staff and SROs meet at the beginning of the school year to set the expectations, then meet weekly for leadership meetings, and then as needed to review individual cases or situations that arise. There is no formal annual review/analysis of the referral data or review of the program itself.
- f. *Communication to Stakeholders* – Currently the School District does not provide a description about the SRO Program to stakeholders where it can be publicly accessed (e.g. district website).

Finding 2: Majority of WLWV Community Reports Positive Interactions with SROs/Program

- a. *More positive interactions with SROs* – An analysis of the community survey regarding the SRO Program found that nearly eight-in-ten respondents who had interacted with an SRO (n=1,171) reported positive interactions: 79% Very positive, 9% Somewhat positive, 10% Neutral, 1% Somewhat negative, 1% Very negative. Students reported 59% Very positive, 17% Somewhat positive, 22% Neutral, 1% Somewhat negative or 1% Very negative interactions. Students of color reported 55% Very positive, 15% Somewhat positive, 31% Neutral, and 0% Negative/Very Negative interactions.
- b. *Prioritized Safe Learning Environment and Building Positive Relationships* - The community survey indicated that a high majority of respondents believe the purpose of the SRO Program is to provide assistance during crisis/emergency response (84%) and build positive relationships with students and staff (83%). These two priorities were also ranked the highest by respondents of color (68%, 74% respectively).
- c. *Smaller Percentage Called for Removal of the Program* – In response to an open-ended question, only 4% (n = 108) of respondents as a whole (n = 2,447) indicated a desire to eliminate the program. A majority who responded to this question (53%) either felt there are no improvements needed or wanted to reiterate that they do not want the SRO program to be eliminated. 7% of respondents suggested better relationships with students. 6% of respondents suggested expanding the program.
- d. *Larger Percentage Called for Retaining Program and Improving* – When asked for additional comments, of those who responded (n = 710) nearly two-in-three think positively about the SRO program and want to keep it in schools. Positive (keep the SRO Program) = 63%. Mixed/Needs Reforms = 10%. Negative (get rid of SRO Program) = 11%. None/Don't Know/NA = 15%.
- e. *Student Focus Groups Lean Positive and Provide Recommendations* – A total of 51 students participated in 1:1 survey or small focus groups regarding the SRO Program. When asked, “What is the job description of an SRO?”, a majority of students provided comments relating to safety, building relationships, informal counseling/support and providing resources. 3-of-34 comments stated a belief that SROs should not be in schools. When asked “What Changes Would You Desire?” to the SRO Program, 2-of-33 comments suggested elimination of the program. All others suggested either to keep as it is or improve certain parts of the program.
- f. *Board Safety Advisory Committee (Summer 2018 Report)* – This committee, comprised of parents, teachers and students, met several times over the 2018 summer to provide the School Board with a report outlining their perceptions of school safety. The committee identified areas of strength including many strong processes already in place; solid training for the processes we follow; active and effective relationship with our first responders. The Areas of Concern identified by the committee did not include SROs or mention of the program. Appendix A of the report identified the current status of the SRO program (two SROs) and that any “possibility for additional SRO staff would need to be discussed during the Budget Process.” To date, neither the School Board nor the District Administration have brought forward a request for adding additional SRO staff during the Budget Process.

Finding 3: Some SRO Programs May Contribute to “School-to-Prison Pipeline”

The literature and research selected for this SRO Program review was considered alongside the survey results and comments from focus groups. Several risk factors/themes emerged that contribute to law enforcement

involvement in schools resulting in students having a negative interaction/experience or obtaining an early criminal record that follows them through life (“school-to-prison pipeline”). These are some of the risk factors:

- a. *When Philosophy of the SRO Program is Only Law Enforcement* – Several studies and survey/focus group comments indicated more negative interactions or experiences when the SRO program or officer only responded through a law enforcement role. NASRO recommends the TRIAD model (Law enforcement, Teacher, and Informal Counselor) be established to promote a successful SRO program and relationship between law enforcement and youth and avoid unnecessary involvement for minor offenses or disproportionate referrals, arrests and confinement of youth, particularly minority youth.
- b. *When School Districts and Law Enforcement Operate as Silos* – In studies where school district leaders did not collaborate with their SROs, abdicated all discipline to SROs, or did not collaborate on the selection of the officer, an increase in minor issues as referrals occurred. Additionally, in these settings there tended to be no shared accountability for disproportionate data or referral outcomes.
- c. *When Roles Are Not Clearly Defined* - In studies where SROs were more involved in discipline and/or minor offenses that should have been handled by staff, an increase was found in referrals and arrests of students in schools *with* SROs compared to schools *without* SROs.
- d. *When Trainings Are Not Adequate* – Based on studies and survey/focus group comments, when trainings are not adequate (e.g. no implicit bias training, no cultural competence training) students experience more negative interactions, lack of relationship and a sense of being “monitored or tracked” even after a small incident.
- e. *When Involvement is Reactive* – Based on studies and survey/focus group comments, when there is a lack of proactive involvement (teaching, informal conversations, relationship building), students tend to view SROs as only law enforcement “waiting to catch wrongdoing”.

Finding 4: Some Model SRO Programs May Contribute to Student Success in School and Life

The literature and research selected for this SRO Program review was considered alongside the survey results and comments from focus groups. Several themes emerged that contribute to an effective SRO program which supports all students’ success in school and long-term for life. These are some of the factors:

- a. *When the Shared Philosophy is Restorative Justice* – Several studies, including NASRO standards, and survey/focus group comments emphasize the SRO’s critical partnership in creating teachable moments, empathy, reinforcement of citizenship and restorative acts. One particular study noted that the philosophy of discipline (prevention-oriented vs. punishment-oriented) in response to a wrongdoing was a key factor for program success and long-term student success. The President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015) encourages the culture of community policing to be “Guardians versus warriors: protecting the dignity and human rights of all.”
- b. *When School Districts and SROs Collaborate On and Review the Program Regularly* – Several studies recommend that Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) should be created through a collaborative process that establishes a common vision that meets the needs of the community and reflects the shared philosophy. Both parties should annually examine practices, case studies and referral data to correct any systems of bias, prevent inappropriate referrals, and identify areas for improvement.
- c. *When Roles and Responsibilities are Clearly Defined* – A national assessment of SROs discovered that when specific roles and responsibilities were not defined, problems were often rampant and lead to role confusion and conflict (NASRO; Finn and McDevitt, 2005). The NASRO provides role descriptions to support the TRIAD model. A recent “Model Memorandum” by the California ACLU (2016) written for school districts and police departments outlines sample role definitions that provide guidance, protect students, and strive to eliminate harmful long-term negative consequences for young people.
- d. *When Training is Multifaceted* - Several studies and survey/focus group comments indicate that in settings where SROs are well-chosen and well-trained, they can focus on building authentic relationships based in cultural competence, prevention and early intervention.
- e. *When Involvement is Proactive* – Several studies and survey/focus group comments indicated that proactive school-based law enforcement relies on positive relationships between officers and students.

These relationships build trust and reduce school or student safety issues by gaining knowledge of issues occurring and developing effective prevention strategies. Several survey/focus group comments shared instances where students approached SROs with safety and welfare concern rather than calling 911 or informing parents, because there was a relationship and sense of trust.

Staff Recommendation Regarding WLWV SRO Program

Recommendation to Retain and Improve WLWV SRO Program

The West Linn-Wilsonville School District Superintendent, upon:

- review of the West Linn and Wilsonville SRO program descriptions;
- review of input from stakeholders including students, parents, staff and community;
- review of the research and literature submitted; and
- in consultation with District Office Leaders, High School Principals, Students, West Linn and Wilsonville Police Departments, and District Legal Counsel

makes the recommendation to the School Board to retain the SRO Program and implement improvements identified in Finding 1 (The WLWV SRO Program Needs Additional Definition and Clarity) and Finding 4 (Some Model SRO Programs May Contribute to Student Success in School and Life).

Recommended Improvements

- I. Draft new Memoranda of Understanding using the *ACLU of California Model Memorandum (2016)* and other equity-based SRO Program exemplars as guides for the City-District SRO Program that includes the following areas to ensure student safety and support the positive development of our young people.
 - a. Shared Philosophy of Restorative Justice (“Guardians versus Warriors”)
 - b. Collaborative Approach to the Program’s Goals and Action Plan (Using NASRO Triad Model)
 - c. Collaborative Identification of Qualifications for Job Description and Officer Selection
 - d. Clarity of Roles and Responsibilities (Using *Model Memorandum* as guide)
 - e. Description of Information Exchange (process for gathering and sharing information)
 - f. Scope of Involvement (Using *Model Memorandum* as guide)
 - g. Student Rights (related to safe and positive school environment)
 - h. Range of Multifaceted Trainings (e.g. implicit bias, cultural competence, restorative practices, mental health)
 - i. Annual Review of Referral Data; 3-Year Review of Program Effectiveness (including students’ input)
 - j. Communication to Stakeholders (students/parents/staff; district and school websites)
- II. Hire an additional social worker in the district to expand hours of support at our three high schools. The 1.0 FTE would be funded by the Student Investment Account (SIA) Grant in 2021-2022 and onwards. The district already employs 3.0 FTE Social Workers. This additional staff member would allow for .8 FTE Social Worker at each high school with the remaining time to support the other schools or district-wide programs. Cost = Approximately \$125,000.

Each High School-assigned Social Worker would work with the school leadership team, school counselors and site-assigned psychologist to provide support to students, particularly when it involves social, emotional and mental health situations. The Social Workers and SROs would be provided time to jointly establish systems for collaboratively supporting students and distinguishing carefully between each other’s roles (per MOU).

- III. To further the district’s Goal #1 of “disrupting systems of racism”:
 - a. Continue inclusion of both cities’ Police Department involvement in any or all West Linn- Wilsonville equity summits, equity trainings and cultural events.
 - b. Expand and support SRO’s relationship-building opportunities, particularly with historically marginalized groups of students and families, by invitation to be guest teacher; participating in

- classroom Circles; engaging in a variety of school and district events (e.g. Day of the Dead Event; school equity team meetings; student affinity group meetings; Unity Day).
- c. Continue inclusion of both cities' Police Department (and SRO) involvement in the quarterly WLWV-First Responder Safety Meetings and monthly District Safety Committee Meetings which support the district mission and goals, emphasize a student-first approach to safety and wellness, and integrate an equity lens with decision-making and actions.

A Model SRO Program in West Linn-Wilsonville

It is our belief as District Leaders that West Linn-Wilsonville School District can provide a model SRO Program which contributes to student safety *and* student success in life. We are mindful of the heightened concern surrounding law enforcement involvement in schools, particularly the concern regarding the "school-to-prison pipeline". We are committed to a program that supports the positive development of all students and a shared philosophy of restorative practices and restorative justice.

Our review of the best practices (standards) and practices that mitigate disproportionate referrals and harmful effects on students, provide us with an equity-based philosophy, framework, structure, strategies, and confidence to implement a model SRO Program for our students and school community.

We already have a strong SRO program with many positive experiences reported by our students, staff and families. We already have a strong collaborative partnership with our city police departments, including a shared philosophy of restorative justice and a commitment to equity and anti-racism. There is a commitment by both the district staff and the cities' police chiefs and SROs to strengthen our program; and there is a commitment to make improvements based on the key findings of this review including the comments and recommendations provided by our students, staff, parents and community members.

"If students and educators are to achieve their full potential, schools must *be* safe and *feel* safe."

J. Rosiak, 2015

Chair Molatore stated that as a process point, the Board Meeting is an hour in.

Vice Chair King stated she believes going through the binder organically and asking questions sounds good.

Dr. Downs stated that he appreciated our students' willingness to engage with District Administrators, teachers, counselors, himself and Dr. Gomez. We wrapped up the SRO Review in October after having conversations with both communities. Students felt we created a safe place for them to share and several students felt more comfortable with a one-on-one or one-on-two conversation rather than a Focus Group environment. Some students also preferred to provide written data to their counselor.

Dr. Gomez stated we heard from our students they want a clear definition of what the role of the SRO is. Are they there to protect from outsiders, prevent school shooters or to form relationships. They like when they are in presentation workshops, they want to talk to them about current events and hear first-hand from a Police Officer. They do feel intimidated by the uniform with weapons, they feel scared.

Dr. Downs stated students also described stories and personal connections they made with the SRO by sharing something that happened to them or something they heard about from someone else. They shared tough situations and a few bad experiences with us and as they were processing the conversation, one thing we took away is the honest feedback students gave us. They said they knew they make mistakes and they trusted the SRO would be right alongside them to help them get back on a winning streak. They shared honest feedback and vulnerability with us.

Dr. Downs stated we debriefed the survey results and Focus Group results with the 8 students and asked if it sounded consistent with what they hear and they agreed.

Superintendent Ludwig stated we currently have two SRO's for close to 10,000 students. Our SRO's would love to have more of a presence to build relationships at all levels in the District. One SRO is contracted through the City of Wilsonville and works with Arts and Technology High School, Wilsonville High School and the Wilsonville primary and middle schools that feed into the high school. Stafford Primary and Athey Creek Middle School are also assigned to the Wilsonville SRO as part of Clackamas County Sheriff's Office. The second SRO is assigned the schools in West Linn.

Dr. Downs stated since the SRO's spend the majority of their time at the West Linn and Wilsonville High Schools, they have offices there.

Director Thompson stated that as she is looking at the recommendation, going forward can we redefine how much time the SRO's spend at the middle and elementary schools for the positive benefit of starting relationships at a younger age?

Superintendent Ludwig stated this is something for us to take a look at within the triad model and where does it begin with intention. She had conversations with our Police Chiefs on how to move forward with intention and clarity to the roles and responsibilities to free up time to build more relationships. Students in all of the Focus Groups commented on wanting to see them more, to know them more as a person rather than just a cop. Students said that if they have a good relationship with the SRO's, then when a critical time comes, they know they are there to help them.

Vice Chair King stated she continues to hear relationships are such a big part of the discussion and if we can start in elementary school, by the time a student is in high school, it has been established. She appreciates the recognition that the phrase "preschool to prison pipeline" is not made up as she has been hearing about it for many years at Oregon School Board Association (OSBA) Conferences. She is also aware it exists outside of our community and she is not blind to it. Students are saying micro aggressions do occur and may come from a variety of people and it is our responsibility to educate ourselves. She feels SRO's can be intimidating, she is a law abiding citizen and can still be intimidated by the uniform. She recognizes these are real things and we are not turning a blind eye to this.

After reading the data, reading the public comments, doing her own research, reading research fellow Board Members submitted and having conversations with the Chair of the North Marion School Board who is also the Chair of the OSBA Color Caucus on how they handled their review, she feels confident in the recommendation made by Superintendent Ludwig in her memo. Everything she just articulated is in alignment in her research and in our own District. There is a dramatic need for clarity in SRO roles and responsibility of Administration to ensure the SRO training is in alignment with District philosophy and goals. One thing she is still wondering about is how the selection of the SRO happens.

Dr. Downs stated that currently we work with both cities and Police Chiefs and invite the High School Principal to represent student voice. When the Police Department knows there will be an SRO vacancy, they try to post the position early. They may have interest in the position internally based on the level of knowledge about the position and if someone has had a good experience with the current SRO, there is a higher percentage of people interested in the position

Superintendent Ludwig stated going forward, how do we encourage a cadre of people that may come with the SRO to teach a class so if the SRO is absent for a week or two, there is a natural progression of that person filling in. Building this capacity is also our interest with the Police Chiefs.

Director Thompson stated some of the comments were about the uniform, is there a certain requirement that SRO's could come dressed in a way that is less intimidating but they still have their equipment, or is there no flexibility in this?

Dr. Downs stated that this question has been around for a while, asking if an SRO could be in a "soft uniform" and unfortunately they cannot. Right now, the way the SRO contract is set up, the SRO can be called to an active situation within the city which is why they need to be in full uniform.

Director Fitch confirmed that if an SRO is coming to talk to any level of a classroom, they are always in full uniform.

Superintendent Ludwig stated the barrier of the uniform came up in consultation with the group of 8 students who engaged in conversations with us and with one another. They said yes, it is a deterrent, but bad people know the SRO has a gun on them and we have to think "do we want to be safe or feel safe?" The conversation was around how do we mitigate this and some of the suggestions were to lock the gun in their office, keep it concealed, lock the gun in their car or maybe not carry it all the time. After the students left the meeting and went back to class, and they debriefed with the Police Chiefs who understood their feelings around the gun and the uniform.

Director Thompson stated if students become used to the uniform in primary school, they can see the SRO as a protector, helper, friend, counselor and teacher instead of negatively.

Chair Molatore stated as a process point, it is now 6:30 p.m.

Director Fitch stated she hear a lot of positive information about one SRO and this raises a question; If we hired someone and they are exclusive to us, we can make it so they are not going out on calls and we know who we are getting. Is there is a reason why we do not? Is the benefit of having someone embedded in a city police force greater than hiring our own?

Chair Molatore stated we would not be working in conjunction with the Police Departments as this is an interagency partnership.

Superintendent Ludwig stated the benefit of having an SRO as part of the local police department is that they know all the ins and outs of their department and our schools. In quick response times, these conversations happen quickly and our SRO's know immediately where they need to be in terms of response time. If we hired our own, we would lose critical knowledge and connection.

Dr. downs stated we also rely on our SRO's in building valuable relationships between our neighborhoods and cities. As an example, one of our students had a small fender bender and within 30 seconds of receiving the report, our SRO was ready to immediately support and help the student and family who let us know how appreciative they were. We also rely on our SROs in non-school time, on weekends and during the summertime in that our connections and relationships that have been built don't go away.

Director Fitch stated she wanted to share her thinking and her final concern. She had a long conversation with Wilsonville's Chief Wurpes several weeks ago, it was her second conversation with him. We already know that the City of West Linn Police Department has issues with acting in racially inequitable and unlawful ways. She is concerned because they are the ones selecting our SRO, they are the ones collaborating and the ones we are trying to persuade. They provide the training criteria on equity and racial bias and this concerns her and she is wondering how are we going to address this? She appreciates the recommendations from Superintendent Ludwig and she likes the sample Memorandum of Understanding and believes it is heading in the right direction.

She talked to some of her colleagues who work with juvenile delinquents and they stated concern of when there is no SRO, the outcomes for students can be disparate and sometimes harsher and she agrees with the statements made by Superintendent Ludwig about when you have these structures in place, you do not get worrisome outcomes. We did receive positive feedback about one in particular and that is the outcome we hope for along with the responses from the Focus Groups and surveys. One thing she did not see and it concerns her, was any acknowledgement that there is implicit bias and how to train and look for it. She is glad we are starting this conversation, but she does not have faith that on their own, it is being done to the extent she wants it done. The SRO selection is huge for her, and she hopes that when we meet jointly with the city, we need to say this is a huge priority for us. Also, people falsely believe that police officers should be doing social and mental health work and she is glad we are looking at providing these services separately.

Superintendent Ludwig stated one thought came up for our group as we were working on the memorandum and that is; How do you create a Professional Learning Community (PLC) to practice what you have been trained in? For many years, our SRO's have been a part of our training and they also hold trainings and monthly meetings with other SRO's. Our wonder is in establishing a PLC with other school districts that are doing the same review with an equity lens such as North Clackamas, Beaverton, Lake Oswego and Tigard-Tualatin School Districts. Maybe they bring a high school principal with them or a district staff member to do a table top exercise or case study on how to check for implicit bias.

Director Hydes stated he has a few questions for Dr. Downs.

Chair Molatore stated for those watching at home, the Board of Directors had the opportunity to submit questions in advance of the meeting which Director Hydes is referencing.

Dr. Downs provided information on how the District is billed from West Linn Police Dept. and the Wilsonville Police Dept.

Director Hydes stated he submitted approximately 20 questions and he does not expect to go through each one. One of the questions he asked is what the typical day in the life of an SRO is like.

Dr. Downs stated he can speak to this as he has worn many different hats as a teacher, Administrator and Assistant Superintendent in our District. An example of a day or a week in the life of an SRO; They attend briefing at the Police Department before 7:00 a.m. daily, then they go off to schools connecting with students and staff members. The SRO may start at a High School by checking in with Administrators and engage and interact with students in the halls during passing times which builds relationships. The SRO may be called by a counselor to help with a family situation, they may attend a District Safety Leadership Team meeting, they may participate in a Lock Down Drill or run it and debrief with school Administration or they may be a guest speaker in class. They might attend a wheel-a-thon then head over to another school for a lunchtime karaoke lip sync and they also lead restorative circles. If there is a night event, they may be asked to provide supervision, we often ask our local police officers to be at larger events on our campuses. All day long they are engaged with our Principals with text messages and they continue to follow up with family situations and students at all levels to create mutually beneficial relationships.

Director Thompson inquired on how often during the week do they end up in a classroom?

Dr. Downs stated it may be just a few times in one week or if a teacher is doing a specific unit, or they may be invited in multiple times during that week for multiple classes such as period 1, 3 and 5.

Director Hydes stated that in addition to the SRO's three roles of educator, informal counselor and police officer, roughly speaking, how much percentage of time is spent on each with the understanding there is travel time between schools?

Dr. Downs stated in our experience it is not as proportional right now as we would like. There is a lot more law enforcement investigation or them being called out to do follow ups. From their own Department, they may get anywhere from 5-18 calls a day which means over half or more of their time is spent on the law enforcement side.

Superintendent Ludwig stated our belief is when you have one person that is with us for a long time, the more they build upon relationships. We are hopeful if a cadre is formed, there can be other police officers that go out on calls, rather than the SRO just because it involves a child. Maybe one week the SRO is consumed with an investigation, the following week, they are in schools reconnecting with students.

Director Hydes asked if there is any idea of the percentage of time between the three school levels.

Dr. Downs stated High Level 60%, Middle Level 30% and Primary Level 10% if he had to guess and it is dependent up on the year. Covering our District is a lot and they are doing a great job of being accessible. They have a desire to be more connected with the middle and primary levels in a proactive way. When they are asked to be a guest speaker, we hear from students that they like the ability to follow up with them which is a great way to create an ongoing relationship which we do not have with a one-time guest speaker.

Chair Molatore stated as a process point, it is 7:00 p.m.

Director King thanked Director Hydes for submitting his questions. With regard to Director Fitch's comment on implicit bias, Chair Molatore and Superintendent Ludwig and herself attended the training with OSBA on implicit bias. She took the implicit bias test on men and women and was surprised about what she learned about herself and she shares this to acknowledge that we all carry it.

- **Vice Chair King motioned to retain the SRO Program and implement the recommended improvements as stated in the Superintendent's Memo.**
- **Director Thompson seconded the motion.**

The Board engaged in a discussion including:

Director Hydes stated it is important to look at the Commitment: ***The Board will examine the District's School Resource Officer Program (SRO) to better understand if and how the program supports the District's Goals. Depending on the outcome of this examination, the Board will conclude this process with an evidence-based decision to maintain, change, or end the SRO Program.***

Director Hydes believes this is an important goal and he supports this Commitment. In 2020, we are asking: Are we asking too much of the police? Are we asking them to do something that can be accomplished by someone other than the police? That is why he thought we began this process. The largest school district in Oregon recently ended their entire SRO Program, that does not mean we should follow their lead. His expectations from the District is that there would be a thorough review at a macro and micro level with qualitative and quantitative cost analysis to make determinations about goals of the SRO Program or some combination thereof.

To help guide the process, he and Chair Molatore submitted questions on September 3rd, he does not feel the Board received what it needed from the District, what they got were glossy brochures from the Police Departments telling them how great their SRO Program is; Survey results from 3% of our students and 8% of our parents and the person from the polling company said this is not an accurate way to understand how students felt about the SRO Program and a smattering of seemingly random SRO articles with no theme to them.

Here is what they did not receive; No clear vision of what the SRO Program costs, virtually no evidence-based findings on the benefits or potential risks of the Program and no summary of what the latest research and findings are on the benefits of or possible detriments of an SRO Program. They received no options other than the one single recommendation from the District Office and no discussion of duties that could be done by someone other than an SRO.

Prior to this evening, he shared his concern with the District Office and this is the response he received: *“The District team reviewed the comments by students and staff and community in the survey and Focus Groups. This feedback indicated to us that our SRO Program is operating well. Staff was asked to present a recommendation for this Work Session and we have done that. Staff is satisfied with the review, findings and recommendation.”* He is not satisfied with the findings, recommendations or review. While parent feedback is important and hearing from students is important, that is not the end of our process.

The Board of Directors charged the District with a comprehensive review of the SRO Program to allow the Board to make an evidence based decision and now he feels they are being told if it is not a good enough job, they can do it themselves. This is how he read the District’s response. They were also told if they eliminate the SRO Program, it is up to them to design an alternative model. This is beyond his expertise and he wanted to describe how it feels from a Board Member’s perspective; It feels like the District does not want the Board involved in a meaningful way. He feels this is a pattern of this District that we have been making progress on and now we are regressing in 2020 and he thinks the District is a victim of its own excellence. What he means by this is the District is so confident in its own rightness that it becomes more interested in explaining why it is right rather than engaging in meaningful conversation.

As a Board Member, he wants to be educated, not persuaded. In this case, he does not feel the Board received a thoughtful analysis which the Board requested, instead they got was a rush job intended to get the Board where the District wants it rather than educating the Board on the pros and cons of the SRO Program and have a meaningful conversation about it. He cannot support the recommendation, does not want to vote no, because it very well may be the best recommendation possible, but he does not feel a meaningful analysis has happened yet and he requests his fellow Board Members is to not support the Resolution and have the District go back and do a thorough evidence-based analysis which they charged the District with in August.

Chair Molatore stated to Director Hydes that she felt he is scapegoating a little bit to the District. The Board of Directors has to accept some responsibility for their role in the SRO Program Review. The Board arbitrarily set the date of November 1st for the SRO Program Review to be conducted because we are on Comprehensive Distance Learning and they wanted it done before students return to school. The Board knew of the tight timeline because District Administration continually told them this is a big ask and the Board said they wanted to do this.

This could very well be a yearlong research project to get the degree and caliber of information that Director Hydes is asking for. That is doable, but it is not the timeline the Board set for this particular activity. To some degree, the Board needs to accept responsibility that they are not getting the in-depth review the District told them they were not going to be able to get on the short runway. The District

promised they would do the best they could in light of the consideration and during a Board meeting, they said they would accept it and now they are turning around and saying no, we do not accept it. The Board collectively has to take a degree of responsibility too.

Director Hydes stated he understands this and he thought they made a clear Commitment. On September 3rd he and Chair Molatore sent in very detailed questions to the District and until about 4:30 tonight, most of them still had not been answered. He feels the Board gave the District a very clear direction. If he were in the District's position, he would have (a) said we need more clarification or (b) said we thought about this further and cannot do it the timeframe you have given us and ask for a delay rather than force something through, which is what this feels like to him. He feels it is more important to get it right rather than quickly and he does not feel confident it is right tonight.

Director Fitch stated that her thinking was this is a good start and in a year if we have some kind of Memorandum of Understanding, they will get the data they need. Right now, they have no evidence of actually knowing how much time the SRO's are called out on non-school business, are they keeping track, do they have that data? Her sense is that it was hard enough to get any data from the Police Departments. She feels this is a start in order to make an evidence-based decision on how much law enforcement are they doing vs. counseling and relationship building. She was surprised they did not hear from Elert and Associates, the District's Safety Consultants to tell us it is better to have an SRO than to hire your own. She felt this is a start to get them data. She agrees, they do not have the data needed to make a decision that she thought was their charge and Commitment. On the other hand, she feels we are heading in the right direction and this will allow us to get the data from this agreement.

Vice Chair King stated she came in with skeptic's eye. She had a lot of discussion with neighboring districts and provided documents for review from North Marion School District and a variety of articles. The fact there were a smorgasbord of articles is because she submitted a few and other Board Members submitted a few. Is it perfect, no, is there enough data from our students, parents and this primarily this Commitment to improve? She does feel like the Commitment and Recommendation will strengthen the program and she sees imbedded in the memo, an annual and a three-year review which is a commitment to continue the conversations. Her inclination is to move it forward as she does not see anything that says we should not have this SRO Program. She is confident in the information provided and the research fellow Board Members provided for improvement and continuing the conversation.

Superintendent Ludwig stated that during this unique time while we are in Comprehensive Distance Learning, we can make decisions that do not impact a person on campus right away. One option could be to have an outside audit, where a group could come in with research based knowledge. They could follow a typical SRO throughout the day, look at our data and actions and provide an analysis to the Board. If the Board does not want staff to do it due to the limitation of our own time, or if the Board feels what we brought was not adequate, we can contract with an agency that does specialize in this. They could give the report to the Board with their perspective of what other SRO Programs are like nationally and have that depth of information.

Again, not knowing how far you wanted us to go, she does submit respectfully, that with regard to the questions, we felt most of them would be addressed in our review and a couple would be saved for this discussion as we didn't know how informal or formal you wanted the questions answered. Clearly we missed the mark on what you as a Board or as individuals expected from those questions and she apologizes for those shortcomings. If the Board wants to charge the District with more surveys and to gather more information from more students, we are happy to do whatever it is the Board needs us to do.

Director Thompson stated she agrees with Director Fitch and Vice Chair King. She has spent a lot of time looking over the research and talking with people. She feels comfortable that this is a good place to

start, even some of the stuff that came up tonight, wonderings she had about the uniform and trying to get our SROs more into our primary schools. She feels these are some things that will evolve and is a good place to start. She believes we can all agree that every program we have can be improved and what she sees here are good improvements and she sees concerns addressed that we can build on every year and make better.

Director Hydes stated he will be voting no, he does not want to kick the can down the road, but he wants to make sure the community knows his vote is not “no” on the SRO Program, but “no” to the meaningful process.

- **Chair Molatore called for a vote:**

- **Chair Molatore, Yes**
- **Vice Chair King, Yes**
- **Director Thompson, Yes**
- **Director Fitch, Yes**
- **Director Hydes, No.**

- **4-1 Motion passes.**

Chair Molatore thanked the Board of Directors for holding the meeting in person, stating there is still work to be done and it will be done.

The Board of Directors and Superintendent Ludwig thanked one another for a collegial conversation.

5. **IMPORTANT DATES FOR THE BOARD**

- A. 11-9-20 @ 6:00 p.m. Regular Board Meeting
- B. 11-16-20 @ 5:00 p.m. Board Work Session
- C. 12-7-20 @ 6:00 p.m. Regular Board Meeting

6. **7:00 p.m. ADJOURN**

Chair Molatore adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

A. **DISTRICT GOALS**

2020-2021 District Goals

1. Grow student achievement through the use of high leverage instructional and engagement strategies to raise rigor, disrupt systems of racism, and generate equitable outcomes for all students while eliminating opportunity and achievement gaps.
2. Effectively use systems of professional growth, assessment for learning, social-emotional learning and inclusive practices to build self-efficacy for every student
3. Operate in an accessible and transparent manner to encourage and generate community involvement as our parents, students and community partners are an integral and valued voice towards change in our district.
4. Be responsive to community growth and student learning needs of the future by conducting long-range capital improvements and financial planning through processes and practices

Regan Molatore, Board Chair

Date

Kelly Douglas, Board Secretary

Date