SCHOOL CLIMATE & SAFETY: School Resource Officers program

Board of Education  |  July 11, 2017
GOAL

• Inform BOE vote on Minneapolis Police Department (MPD) service contract recommendations
• Board action on August 8

AGENDA

• Discuss administration's recommendation to “Reduce and Support” SRO program
• Review MPD contract enhancements
• Present key findings of stakeholder engagement
• Review EDIA Committee recommendations
• Review academic supports and preview MPS School Climate and Safety Framework
SCHOOL CLIMATE & SAFETY: SRO Program

SROs in Minneapolis Public Schools:

- School Resource Officers in MPS since 1960s
- Formal contract with Minneapolis Police Department (MPD) since 1980
- Currently 16 SROs
- Current Assignments – 7 Traditional high schools, Transitions Plus, Harrison, and 7 rovers
- Current Demographics:
  - 15 males, 1 female
  - 9 White, 3 Asian American, 4 Black (3 African American, 1 East African)
1. **Maintain/Modify**: Maintain existing SRO program and modify agreement with MPD on how SROs work with students

2. **Reduce and Support**: Reduce number of SROs and enhance centralized supports to schools

3. **Eliminate**: Eliminate SRO program and support schools in site-based or centralized security management
Factors informing recommendation:

- Considered certain community concerns with law enforcement’s interactions with communities of color
- 2014 BOE plan to reduce SROs
- Best practices on equity
- Stakeholder survey and engagement session results
SRO PROGRAM: Reduce and Support

Minneapolis Police Department contract SY2017-18

- 3-year contract with “reopening clause” informed by either MPS or MPD for FY2017-18: $1.15M
- Reduce from 16 to 14 SROs
- Contract savings used for:
  - Software upgrades for training and incident communications and coordination
  - Increased training
  - 1 FTE to support schools

- Contract Enhancements
  - Clarifies SRO role in support of safe and welcoming environment
  - Examples of positive engagement
  - Strengthened language around data sharing
  - Active participation in new Climate & Safety Advisory Committee
  - Soft uniform
  - Selection made by MPD Chief in consultation with the Superintendent
  - Better define training
  - Added SRO evaluation to process
### SCOPE OF WORK

- Focused on general safety concerns, engagement
- Aligned with Department of Justice SECURe Rubric
- Clearer separation between safety and behavior
- Role modeling; more definition of positive engagement with students, families
- Participation on Climate & Safety Advisory Committee

### SRO SELECTION

- District and MPD interview
- Final decisions made by MPD Chief of Police
- District and MPD interview with MPS input
- Final decisions made by MPD Chief of Police in consultation with District Superintendent

### SRO TRAINING

- New SROs attend 3 days of training
- Returning SROs attend 1 day of training as defined by MPS
- Training better defined and aligned to student needs and positive school climate:
  - Child and adolescent development
  - Age-appropriate responses
  - Cultural competence
  - Restorative justice
  - Accommodations for students with disabilities
  - De-escalation techniques
- MPD trains in bias-free policing
## SRO Program: MPD Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SY2016-17</th>
<th>SY2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Performance</strong></td>
<td>SROs only evaluated by MPD supervisor</td>
<td>● Ongoing SRO performance feedback from schools formalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Schools can submit performance feedback to SRO supervisor as part of monthly review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SRO Reassignment</strong></td>
<td>● MPD and District have equal ability to request SRO reassignment</td>
<td>● MPD and District have equal ability to request SRO reassignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● MPD Chief of Police has final decision</td>
<td>● Final decision made by MPD Chief of Police in consultation with the District Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data &amp; Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>● Monthly detailed reports on officer activity</td>
<td>● Daily detailed reports on officer activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Monthly review of police contact discipline incidents</td>
<td>● Monthly review of police referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Quarterly joint review of law enforcement practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hennepin County
Law Enforcement Referral Data
Total School Crime Referrals to HCAO
2006/2007 to 2016/2017 School Years
Total Disorderly Conduct School Crime Referrals to HCAO
2006/2007 to 2016/2017 School Years
MPS School Crime Referrals
2006/2007 School Year

Offense Type

- Assault (289, 31.4%)
- Burglary (5, 0.5%)
- Crimes Against Sex (2, 0.2%)
- Disorderly Conduct (409, 44.5%)
- Drugs (4, 0.4%)
- Miscellaneous (9, 1.0%)
- Obstructing Justice (12, 1.3%)
- Property (96, 10.4%)
- Receiving (9, 1.0%)
- Theft (43, 4.7%)
- Weapons (38, 4.1%)

Total: 919 (100.0%)
MPS School Crime Referrals
8/1/2016 to 6/26/2017

Offense Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th># of Cases</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outcome of School Crime Referrals from MPS
8/1/2016 to 6/26/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior History of Student</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Diversion</th>
<th>Decline</th>
<th>Defer for Additional Investigation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Prior Referrals to HCAO</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Referrals to HCAO for Offenses at School(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Referrals to HCAO for Offenses in Community</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Referrals to HCAO for Offenses occurring in Community &amp; at School(s)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 5 cases that were charged after unsuccessful diversion referral
SRO Program:
Stakeholder Engagement Data
Stakeholder Engagement

May - June 2017:

• **REAA Surveys (Total: n=8,431):**
  – Students (n=7,117 students grades 5,7,9,11,12)
  – School staff (n=714)
  – Families (n=600)

• **Engagement sessions and feedback form (Total: n=300):**
  – Schools held sessions with:
    • Parents/School Site Councils (n=75)
    • Positive School Wide Engagement Teams (n=71)
  – 3 sessions with community members (n=66)
  – 2 sessions with students (n=36)
  – Feedback form online (n=52)
The mixed-methods evaluation considered both qualitative and quantitative data collected from three surveys conducted in June 2017

- Stakeholders surveyed include students, staff, and parents.

- All quantitative was summarized using descriptive statistics.

- All responses to the open-ended questions were read and coded into emergent themes across all three surveys. Each response was coded into a single theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Student Survey</th>
<th>Staff Survey</th>
<th>Parent Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>7,117 students</td>
<td>714 School Staff</td>
<td>600 Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,7,9,11,12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Representative sample)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Standardized paper forms</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>English (Additionally administered in Spanish &amp; Somali at Wellstone)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English, Spanish, Somali, and Hmong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA: REAA Evaluation Questions

1. Do stakeholders think SROs should work in MPS schools? Does stakeholder perception vary by any demographic categories? Does it vary by geographic location of school? Does it vary by whether or not stakeholders know and/or have interacted with SROs?

2. What drives stakeholder perception of the SRO program?

3. MPS is considering three scenarios regarding the continued use of SROs in schools; which do stakeholders recommend?

4. Who influences stakeholders’ perceptions of safety in schools? Do SROs make stakeholders feel more or less safe than teachers, principal/administrators, social workers, counselors, and other students?
I think that Minneapolis Police Department SROs should work in my school.

**Students (N=6583)**
- Strongly Disagree: 9%
- Disagree: 18%
- Agree: 56%
- Strongly Agree: 17%

**Staff (N=703)**
- Strongly Disagree: 6%
- Disagree: 12%
- Agree: 28%
- Strongly Agree: 54%

**Parents (N=547)**
- Strongly Disagree: 11%
- Disagree: 17%
- Agree: 42%
- Strongly Agree: 31%
I think that Minneapolis Police Department SROs should work in my school.

### Students

- **White (N=1996)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 8%
  - Disagree: 21%
  - Agree: 57%
  - Strongly Agree: 14%

- **African American (N=1534)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 12%
  - Disagree: 19%
  - Agree: 49%
  - Strongly Agree: 20%

- **Hispanic/Latinx (N=1014)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 6%
  - Disagree: 14%
  - Agree: 63%
  - Strongly Agree: 19%

- **Two or More Races Identified (N=732)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 11%
  - Disagree: 20%
  - Agree: 51%
  - Strongly Agree: 19%

- **Asian/Pacific Islander (N=473)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 9%
  - Disagree: 10%
  - Agree: 70%
  - Strongly Agree: 15%

- **Other (N=433)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 11%
  - Disagree: 17%
  - Agree: 54%
  - Strongly Agree: 18%

- **American Indian (N=124)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 12%
  - Disagree: 19%
  - Agree: 48%
  - Strongly Agree: 21%

### Parents

- **African American (N=152)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 14%
  - Disagree: 20%
  - Agree: 37%
  - Strongly Agree: 28%

- **White (N=150)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 4%
  - Disagree: 9%
  - Agree: 53%
  - Strongly Agree: 33%

- **Hispanic (N=77)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 10%
  - Disagree: 18%
  - Agree: 39%
  - Strongly Agree: 32%

- **African (N=64)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 16%
  - Disagree: 20%
  - Agree: 38%
  - Strongly Agree: 27%

- **Two or More Races (N=45)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 16%
  - Disagree: 18%
  - Agree: 36%
  - Strongly Agree: 31%

- **Asian (N=38)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 13%
  - Disagree: 5%
  - Agree: 47%
  - Strongly Agree: 34%

- **American Indian (N=21)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 10%
  - Disagree: 43%
  - Agree: 14%
  - Strongly Agree: 33%
I think that Minneapolis Police Department SROs should work in my school.

DATA: Survey Responses

- **Students in Grade 5 (N=1612)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 8%
  - Disagree: 16%
  - Agree: 51%
  - Strongly Agree: 25%

- **Students in Grades 6-8 (N=1470)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 9%
  - Disagree: 21%
  - Agree: 54%
  - Strongly Agree: 16%

- **Students in Grades 9-12 (N=3501)**
  - Strongly Disagree: 9%
  - Disagree: 18%
  - Agree: 59%
  - Strongly Agree: 14%
I think that Minneapolis Police Department SROs should work in my school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1 (N=1948)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2 (N=2174)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3 (N=2402)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=269) (N=110) (N=173) (N=149) (N=215) (N=149) (N=183)
I think that Minneapolis Police Department SROs should work in my school.
DATA: Survey Responses

*Have you ever had a direct interaction with the Minneapolis Police Department SRO at your school?*

Percent responding “Yes.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1 (N=2014)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2 (N=2209)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3 (N=2436)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=173)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=112)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=272)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=156)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=230)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=214)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think that Minneapolis Police Department SROs should work in my school.

**Students**
- Interaction (N=854): 9% Strongly Disagree, 12% Disagree, 49% Agree, 30% Strongly Agree
- No Interaction (N=3910): 10% Strongly Disagree, 19% Disagree, 56% Agree, 15% Strongly Agree

**Staff**
- (N=427): 5% Strongly Disagree, 7% Disagree, 22% Agree, 66% Strongly Agree

**Parents**
- (N=146): 26% Strongly Disagree, 16% Disagree, 22% Agree, 36% Strongly Agree
- (N=401): 6% Strongly Disagree, 17% Disagree, 49% Agree, 29% Strongly Agree
### Top 5 Qualitative Comment Themes – Negative Comments

#### Students (n=7,117)
- SROs are Unnecessary: 447
- SROs are Intimidating and/or Make Students Uncomfortable: 130
- SROs are Ineffective: 95
- SROs Treat Students Like Criminals, are Racist, and/or Perpetuate the School-to-Prison Pipeline: 76
- Negative Perception of MPD Generally: 69

#### Staff (n=714)
- SROs are Ineffective: 20
- SROs are Unnecessary: 16
- SROs Treat Students Like Criminals, are Racist, and/or Perpetuate the School-to-Prison Pipeline: 13
- SROs are Intimidating and/or Make Students Uncomfortable: 12
- Unclear Role of SROs in School: 11

#### Parents (n=600)
- SROs are Ineffective: 55
- SROs are Intimidating and/or Make Students Uncomfortable: 51
- SROs Treat Students Like Criminals, are Racist, and/or Perpetuate the School-to-Prison Pipeline: 20
- SROs are Unnecessary: 14
- SROs are a Waste of Money: 7
### Top 5 Qualitative Comment Themes – **Positive Comments**

#### Students (n=7,117)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Theme</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address General Issues of Safety in School</td>
<td>2,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support for SRO Program</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Issues of Fighting in School</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Potential External Threats</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationships with SROs</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Staff (n=714)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Theme</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationships with SROs</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address General Issues of Safety in School</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROs Build Rapport between MPD and Students/Community</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Potential External Threats</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support for SRO Program</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parents (n=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Theme</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address General Issues of Safety in School</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support for SRO Program</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Issues of Bullying in School</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Potential External Threats</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Issues of Drugs in School</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of respondents who **agreed or strongly agreed** with each scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep the Minneapolis Police Department SRO program at my school (N=6702)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>(N=700) 77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the amount of time Minneapolis Police Department SROs spend working at my school (N=6615)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>(N=644) 22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End the Minneapolis Police Department SRO program at my school (N=6593)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>(N=646) 11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=600)
Percent of respondents who **agreed or strongly agreed** that the following people make them feel safe at school.

### Students
- Teachers: 92%
- Principal or Administrators: 87%
- Social Workers: 89%
- Counselors: 89%
- Minneapolis Police Department School Resource Officers or SROs: 80%
- Other Students: 72%

### Staff
- Teachers: 96%
- Principal or Administrators: 86%
- Social Workers: 94%
- Counselors: 88%
- Minneapolis Police Department School Resource Officers or SROs: 79%
- Other Students: 79%

### Parents
- Teachers: 92%
- Principal or Administrators: 83%
- Social Workers: 85%
- Counselors: 84%
- Minneapolis Police Department School Resource Officers or SROs: 77%
- Other Students: 66%

*Note: N values vary for each category.*
### Session Votes

Respondents/Participants at each session were asked to select one of the three scenarios for the future of the SRO Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>SRO Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SRO Community Engagement Sessions       | Community      | 3 sessions with 66 total participants                      | 1. Maintain and Modify: 25 individuals  
2. Reduce and Support: 3 individuals  
3. Eliminate: 7 individuals^            |
| PSWE Sessions                           | Staff          | 13 sessions held at 10 schools** with 71 total participants | 1. Maintain and Modify: 12 sessions  
2. Reduce and Support: 1 session  
3. Eliminate: 1 session^^             |
| Parent/Site Council Sessions            | Parents        | 10 sessions held at 9 schools*** with 75 total participants | 1. Maintain and Modify: 9 sessions  
2. Reduce and Support: 2 sessions  
3. Eliminate: 0 sessions^^^           |
| Student Sessions                        | Students       | 36 participants in 2 sessions. One session voted individually, and one came to a group consensus | 1. Maintain and Modify: 0 individuals  
2. Reduce and Support: 6 individuals  
3. Eliminate: 7 individuals & 1 session |
| General SRO Feedback Form               | Community      | 52 participants                                             | 1. Maintain and Modify: 18 individuals  
2. Reduce and Support: 8 individuals  
3. Eliminate: 26 individuals           |

^Not all individuals voted  
**10 Schools included: Anderson, Anthony, Folwell, Green, Longfellow, Pratt, River Bend (2 sessions), Waite Park (2 sessions), Washburn, and Webster (2 sessions).  
^^1 session was split between two options, which is why the total number of sessions adds up to 13, instead of 12.  
^^^1 session was split between two options, which is why the total number of sessions adds up to 11, instead of 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Engagement Sessions</th>
<th>REAA Surveys 2017: Maintain &amp; Modify</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58% Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions:</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83% participants</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77% Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86% sessions</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71% Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions:</td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82% sessions</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71% participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions:</td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82% sessions</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS</td>
<td>Feedback Forms</td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain &amp; Modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% respondents</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Themes – Question 1

Of the three SRO program options, which do you consider to be the most favorable? Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SRO Community Engagement Sessions      | • More of the comments were **positive** than negative  
                                           • Prominent positive themes: students and families have positive relationships with SROs, and officers can address potential internal issues of safety and external threats (school shootings, neighborhood crime, etc.)  
                                           • Prominent negative themes: SROs are unnecessary, ineffective, intimidating and/or make students feel uncomfortable                                                                                                    |
| (N=66)                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| PSWE Sessions                          | • More of the comments were **positive** than negative  
                                           • Prominent positive themes: Students and staff have a positive relationship with the SROs, and that SROs can address potential external threats (school shootings, neighborhood crime, etc.)  
                                           • Prominent negative themes: SROs are unnecessary (especially at elementary schools), and that SROs are intimidating and/or make students and families feel uncomfortable                                                                                     |
| (N=71)                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Parent/Site Council Sessions           | • More of the comments were **positive** than negative  
                                           • Prominent positive themes: SROs address general issues of safety in school, that students and staff have a positive relationship with the SROs, and that SROs can address potential external threats (school shootings, neighborhood crime, etc.)  
                                           • Prominent negative themes: SROs are unnecessary, and are a waste of money (especially at elementary schools)                                                                                     |
| (N=75)                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Student Sessions                       | • Almost all comments were **negative**  
                                           • Prominent negative themes: SROs are ineffective, and they have an unclear role  
                                           • Specifically mentioned security as more effective and supportive than SROs                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| (N=36)                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| General SRO Feedback Form              | • More of the comments were **negative** than positive  
                                           • Prominent negative themes: The SRO program assumes students are criminals and perpetuate the school-to prison pipeline, and a negative perception of police among the community  
                                           • Prominent positive themes: SROs can build rapport between police and schools, and they provide general safety for schools/students                                                                                                                                 |
| (N=52)                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
If MPS does continue to have SROs, what should their role be in providing a positive school climate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SRO Community Engagement Sessions (N=66)| • Support positive school climate as a “peace officer” through consistent restorative discipline practices, including collaboration with security, participation in school climate teams, and bullying prevention efforts  
• Be on call for crisis situation  
• Build relationships with students and staff  
• Discuss the need for uniforms and weapons  
• Develop trust between police and community |
| PSWE Sessions (N=71)                    | • Build relationships with students and staff  
• Develop trust between police and community  
• Lead education opportunities about citizenship, criminal justice system, etc.  
• Help in crisis situations |
| Parent/Site Council Sessions (N=75)    | • Build relationships with students and staff  
• Develop trust between police and community  
• SROs should be trained in social emotional learning (SEL), restorative mindset, de-escalation, mental health, and cultural competency |
| Student Sessions (N=36)                | • Build relationships with students  
• Protecting school in case of emergency (i.e. school shootings) |
| General SRO Feedback Form (N=52)       | • Many individuals could not answer because they are opposed to any police presence in schools  
• Build relationships with students and staff (many respondents said this can only be done if they remove uniform and weapons)  
• Lead education opportunities about citizenship, safety, drug and alcohol use, gangs, criminal justice system, etc. |
# If MPS does not continue to have SROs, how should schools continue to provide welcoming and safe schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SRO Community Engagement Sessions**  
(N=66)                           | - Focus on building student-teacher relationships and relationships with volunteers  
- Review curriculum and provide more challenging, engaging, skill-building, and relevant activities for students, including opportunities for leadership and mentoring  
- Staff training and funding for prevention services including restorative practices, SEL, de-escalation techniques, mental health services, trauma-informed interventions, social workers, smaller class sizes |
| **PSWE Sessions**  
(N=71)                             | - Security management and planning, including requests to hire contract officers for certain sites and concern that the school will be less safe  
- Staff training and funding for services, including trauma-informed interventions, de-escalation techniques, mental health services, Positive School Wide Engagement (PSWE), and restorative practices |
| **Parent/Site Council Sessions**  
(N=75)                             | - Staff training and funding for services, including mental health services, behavior support staff, social workers, and counselors  
- Many sites could not discuss this question as parents said SROs must be present |
| **Student Sessions**  
(N=36)                              | - Trust all students, especially black males, to manage own behavior  
- Staff training and funding for services, including security officers, social workers, deans, and other caring adults |
| **General SRO Feedback Form**  
(N=52)                              | - Staff training and funding for services, including security officers, youth development specialists, restorative practices, SEL, de-escalation techniques, mental health services, trauma-informed interventions, social workers  
- Improve student-staff relationships  
- Hire more support staff and staff of color |
• Continue to recruit diverse officers for SRO Program
• Include de-escalation training
• Include community and youth voice in performance feedback for officers
• Deliberately train school communities about SRO Program
  – parents, students, staff
• Appreciated rigorous data collection process and opportunity for new learnings
• Data indicates we need to do a deeper analysis in Zone 2 with emphasis on American Indian community
• Committed to engaging to continue SRO program improvements
Academic Supports
Academic Supports

- **Professional development in August** on Non-violent crisis intervention, SRO roles and responsibilities with school admin and SROs together

- **Scaling School Positive School Wide Engagement (PSWE)** work to provide site-based supports:
  - PSWE Team members aligned with Associate Superintendents to coach, model and support schools sites
  - Continue to ensure implementation of the Voluntary Compliance Agreement

- **Incoming Student Support Services executive director** to guide and streamline enhanced student supports

- Identify opportunities for students and families to meet the SRO assigned to their school

- **Develop a cross-departmental team** to ensure that everyone understands their role in supporting implementation of the Climate and Safety Framework
Climate and Safety Framework

- Identify proven strategies and tools in proactive behavior management skills
  - Examples: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), ENVOY, Responsive classroom, Restorative Practices, Social Emotional Learning

- Cohesive and comprehensive framework aligning:
  - Schools’ Positive School Wide Engagement Plans, Classrooms Plans, School Improvement Plans
  - Tools and resources to increase impact and effectiveness

- Accountability: Monitor and measure impact of key strategies
THANK YOU!

Web: emss.mpls.k12.mn.us/sro
School Resource Officers: National Context and MPS History
What is an SRO?
A police officer authorized by a police department or agency to work in collaboration with a school(s) to provide safe learning environments.

Why does MPS have SROs?
1. Foster positive relationships between youth and police
2. Strengthen police-community connections
3. Support safe learning environments
   - Protect from internal threats, e.g., student brings weapon to school
   - Protect from external threats, e.g., intruder with weapon
NATIONAL DATA: U.S. Dpt. of Education survey - 2013-14 school year:

- **30%** of public schools in survey had at least 1 full-time or part-time SRO
  - 98,500 public schools that year, means about **29,550 schools had at least 1 SRO**
- **43%** of school had some type of security personnel present at school at least once a week
- Represents a **conservative estimate** of SROs due to small survey sample size
- **NOTE:** Survey was a nationally **representative sample** of schools:
  - 1,600 regular public schools in all 50 states and District of Columbia
  - Elementary, middle, and high schools
  - Variety of enrollment size (< 300, 300 to 499, 500 to 999, and 1,000+)
  - Variety of communities: city, suburban, town and rural

(Source: [2015 report by the National Center for Education Statistics](https://nces.ed.gov))
### Percent of MINNESOTA Public Schools with SROs, by School Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>MDE School Count</th>
<th>SRO Count</th>
<th>Percent of schools with SROs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>924 PK-6</td>
<td>189 PK-6</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Schools</td>
<td>193 5-8</td>
<td>113 PK-8</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Secondary Schools</td>
<td>761 7-12; K-12; ALCs</td>
<td>225 7-12; K-12; ALCs</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,878</strong>**</td>
<td><strong>527</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High Schools Only</td>
<td>218 9-12 only</td>
<td>132 9-12 only</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Schools classified by the highest grade served.

** Total public school count excludes 30 schools classified as state-approved Distance Learning Programs

+Percentages should be interpreted with caution due to different definitions in classifying schools

Source: Law Enforcement in Minnesota Schools: A Statewide Survey of School Resource Officers
SRO Training:

- All MPD: Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Certification
  - 2- or 4-year degree or military service, plus 2-9 months of training to start
- Annual use of force training and 16 hours a year continuing education to remain certified
- Any new MPD SRO receives additional 24 hours of training from the MN School Safety Center
- MPS has SROs spend 8-24 hours a year in school related issues, e.g., Special Education, Positive School Wide Engagement, Social Emotional Learning, Equity
- New SROs partnered with senior SRO their first year
Behavior Levels and Responses
Levels of Behaviors, Interventions and Responses

Continuum for responding to behavior

- Based on: MPS Policy 5200: Behavior Standards and Code of Conduct
- Outlines appropriate interventions: Levels 1-5
- Examples of behaviors, definitions
LEVELS: 0-3

Proactive, school-wide responses to behavior issues:

- Positive School Wide Engagement (PSWE)
- Social Emotional Learning (SEL)
- Mentoring
- Restorative Practices

LEVELS: 4-5

Identified school staff are trained in:

- “Nonviolent Crisis Intervention”
  - Focus on prevention
  - Skills in verbal de-escalation and physical intervention
  - Safely defuse anxious, hostile or violent behavior early

- How and when to bring in SROs into a situation
Climate & Safety Advisory Committee Workplan
(see document under separate cover)
PROJECT TITLE: Climate & Safety Advisory Committee (CSAC)
DATE: July, 2017

This project supports the following strategic plan goals and/or district strategic priority:
(List strategic plan goal(s) the project primarily supports)
❖ #5 Stewardship - Systems and structures will be utilized to prioritize the school district’s work (programmatically and financially), ensure alignment throughout the system, and successfully execute on our stated priorities.
  o Re-examine and update the School Resources Officer model to better support safe, positive and welcoming school environments.
❖ #2 Equity - Reduce the disparities in response to student behavior between white students and students of color.

OBJECTIVE:
The purpose of the Climate & Safety Advisory Committee is to invite a diverse group of stakeholders with knowledge and expertise into a collaborative partnership to advise the superintendent. The charge of this group is to help build a more comprehensive and transparent approach around school climate; including but not limited to improving the formal and informal relationship between the Minneapolis Public Schools and Law Enforcement Agencies, Behavior and Safety concerns within schools, and the types of supports needed in order to provide a safe and welcoming learning environment at each school. This will include a special emphasis on responsiveness to the impact of historical trauma in our communities and to ameliorate the institutionalized racism that exists in our organization.

SCOPE AND ASSUMPTIONS:
● CSAC will be representative of the various perspectives that exist amongst stakeholders on school climate and safety
● CSAC will give feedback and input to the district’s efforts to create a warm and welcoming climate for all students.
● CSAC will provide guidance and input on current and future school safety models
● CSAC will review annual data around climate and engagement and draft district level recommendations for improvement
● CSAC will advise on the Educational Assessment (EA) that will review security and other educationally quality factors to inform our revised Educational Indices for the district’s capital planning
● CSAC will address workplace safety issues and may serve functionally as the District Behavior Committee as outlined in the MFT Agreement
### MPS PROJECT WORK PLAN

#### PROJECT ORGANIZATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sponsors        | Karen DeVet, Chief Operations Officer  
                 Suzanne Kelly, Chief of Staff  
                 TBN, Deputy Chief of Academics, Leading and Learning |
| Project Manager | Jason Matlock                                                        |
| Project Team    | Jason Matlock, Director, Operational & Security Services  
                 Suzanne Kelly, Chief of Staff  
                 Executive Director of Student Support Services  
                 (3) Principals  
                 (3) Students  
                 (3) Teachers  
                 Member  
                 Team  
                 MPD representative  
                 (3) Parents |

#### Resource Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total budgeted amount</th>
<th>Total estimated cost</th>
<th>FTEs assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Varied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Subject matter experts

- Jason Matlock, OSS
- Julie Young Burns, SEL
- Roc
- Hell
# MPS Project Work Plan

## Project Milestones Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Draft charter for the CAC</td>
<td>7-31-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recruit and install CAC membership</td>
<td>8-11-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Finalize charter</td>
<td>8-18-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Convene first meeting</td>
<td>8-18-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Work Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Milestones(s) and Work Tasks</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Project End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Milestone Title: Draft charter for the CAC

**Milestone Due Date:** 7-31-17

- 1.1 Repurpose charter document from Summer Strong Initiative
  - Jason
  - 3-3-17
  - 3-3-17

- 1.2 Align charter to existing district priorities and initiatives
  - Jason
  - 3-3-17
  - 3-17-17

- 1.3 Request input/feedback from sponsor, project team, SME
  - Jason
  - 3-24-17
  - 7-10-17

- 1.4 Review charter and respond
  - Sponsors
  - 7-10-17
  - 7-17-17

- 1.5 Receive feedback and incorporate it into the charter
  - Jason
  - 7-18-17
  - 7-28-17

### Milestone Title: Recruit and install CSAC membership

**Milestone Due Date:** 8-11-17

- 1.1 Identify key stakeholders
  - Sponsors, Jason
  - 3-20-17
  - 7-17-17

- 1.2 Invite stakeholders
  - Sponsors, Jason
  - 7-17-17
  - 7-28-17

- 1.3 Provide project team with learning materials
  - Jason
  - 7-28-17
  - 7-31-17

- 1.4 Review of learning materials
  - Project Team
  - 7-31-17
  - 8-2-17

- 1.5 Convene initial meeting
  - Sponsors
  - 8-2-17
  - 8-11-17

### Milestone Title: Finalize charter

**Milestone Due Date:** 8-18-17

- 1.6

### Milestone Title: Convene first meeting

**Milestone Due Date:** 8-18-17

- 1.7

### Milestone Title: Review and install CSAC membership

**Milestone Due Date:** 8-18-17

- 1.8

### Milestone Title: Convene final meeting

**Milestone Due Date:** 8-18-17

- 1.9

### Milestone Title: Finalize charter

**Milestone Due Date:** 8-18-17

- 1.10

### MPS PROJECT WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Milestones(s) and Work Tasks</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Project End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Establish structure, meeting schedule and clarify scope</td>
<td>CSAC</td>
<td>8-7-17</td>
<td>8-11-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Adjust charter accordingly and publish changes</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>8-11-17</td>
<td>8-18-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MILESTONE TITLE:** Create meeting norms and structure, finalize charter and desired outcomes

**MILESTONE DUE DATE:** 8-18-17
### PROJECT RESOURCE SUMMARY:
(The resources reflected should account for ALL resource labor, time from other departments, hardware, software, facilities, etc. required to achieve the stated scope and objectives.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Categories</th>
<th>Amount Budgeted AND Approved</th>
<th>Additional Amount Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Guidance from General Counsel</td>
<td>existing FTE</td>
<td>6-8 hrs of support from Nan Miller on creating and refining bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Support from Communications</td>
<td>existing FTE</td>
<td>3-6 hrs of support crafting messaging/promotional materials for committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Project Management(scheduling)/clerical support from CALL</td>
<td>existing FTE</td>
<td>1-2 hr per week from Ellene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Meeting refreshments and logistics (child care, translation, transportation? )</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>No current budget available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (sum rows a-e)</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft 6.20.2017 MPS PROJECT WORK PLAN