

School Committee Policy Review Subcommittee
Monday, June 7, 2021
5:00 PM – 6:30 PM
Remote via Zoom

Policy Review Subcommittee members present: David Pearlman (Chair), Dimitry Anselme, Andreas Liu, and Jennifer Monopoli.

Other School Committee members present: Susan Wolf Ditkoff, Steven Ehrenberg, and Suzanne Federspiel.

School Staff present: Mary Ellen Normen, Casey Ngo-Miller, Michelle Herman, and Robin Coyne.

Mr. Pearlman called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

1) Approval of Minutes

On a motion of Dr. Liu and seconded by Mr. Anselme, the Policy Review Subcommittee voted unanimously (by roll call) to approve the minutes of the May 17, 2021 Policy Review Subcommittee meeting.

2) Discussion of School Resource Officers (SROs) and Potential Recommendation for School Committee (Possible Vote)

Mr. Pearlman provided some background information including a recap of Senior Director of Data and Strategy Erin Cooley’s June 2, 2021 presentation on a voluntary, anonymous survey of Grade 6-12 students and staff on SROs. At the meeting, Ms. Cooley explained data limitations and reviewed the response rate and results. The first question on the survey asked whether respondents knew that an SRO is a police officer. 70% of students responded that they did not know SROs are police officers, compared to 17% of staff. 30% of students reported that they knew their school had an SRO, compared to 66% of staff. Among those who reported awareness of SROs in their school buildings, only 15% of students strongly agreed that SRO presence made them feel safer (54% disagreed or strongly disagreed). By more than double (31%), staff respondents strongly agreed that students feel safer with SROs in the buildings. This suggests that adult perceptions of student feelings on safety with SROs do not align with actual student perceptions. While a majority of students, irrespective of race, who knew about SROs in their school buildings disagreed or strongly disagreed that they feel safer with SROs, the percentage of African-American/Black and Latinx students who disagreed or strongly disagreed was even greater: 66%. Only 3% of African-American/Black and Latinx students strongly agreed that SROs make them feel safer. Looking at Asian and White students only, 55% disagreed or strongly disagreed that SROs make them feel safer.

These combined data points, though limited by sample size, at minimum suggested to the School Committee a need to deliberately rethink how the Town of Brookline, the Police Department, and the Public Schools of Brookline can best achieve the Police Department’s worthy stated objective to “work in collaboration with school administration to support students, ensure positive outcomes for youth, and connect the school, students, and families to services and resources in the community.” The fact that

70% of respondents did not know about the SRO program (or its affiliation with the Brookline Police Department) suggests limited efficacy based on numbers alone. A majority of high school students disagreeing that they feel safer around SROs, and disagreeing that they feel comfortable talking to SROs, concerned the School Committee. That these numbers are even more pronounced in our African-American/Black and Latinx student responses makes swift reform all the more important. The School Committee wants students to feel safe and comfortable. Safety and comfort are among the foundational components of the Public Schools of Brookline educational mission. After a lengthy discussion of the survey results (as well as consideration of previous input from stakeholders and community members, the history of SRO programs, and scholarly research), it was clear that School Committee members were not in favor of continuing the SRO Program.

Mr. Pearlman presented a draft SRO Position Statement (Attachment A) for the Subcommittee's consideration. The draft recommendation notes that the School Committee and nearly all of the adult stakeholders, regardless of demographic or stance, agree that the current SROs, as individuals, are good people, with positive intentions, whose commitment to students and impactful contributions to many of their lives deserve recognition. School Committee members thanked Mr. Pearlman for drafting this statement, and offered comments.

Member Comments:

- Requested more detail on next steps.
- Requested clarification regarding whether the district needs a waiver to end the SRO Program, and if so, what is required and what is the timeline.
- Requested clarification regarding the process to modify the Memorandum of Agreement with the Police Department.
- Consult with other districts (e.g., Somerville) that have already ended SRO Programs, as well as the Massachusetts Association of School Committees (MASC).
- Requested information on the effectiveness of the AWARE Program.
- Should be a parallel process: 1) take some immediate steps (e.g., uniformed, armed police officers no longer have a presence in the Schools) and ensure that students who had positive relationships with SROs are still supported and 2) develop a process (perhaps including a streamlined program review) to plan/fund/implement a model that replaces the SRO Program and better supports and addresses the needs of all students.
- The statement should clearly state that the School Committee is ending the SRO Program. The School Committee can vote to end the SRO Program prior to the Select Board's June 15, 2021 deliberation/possible vote.
- The statement should note that the School Committee was not part of the decision-making process that established SROs.
- Requested clarification of whether School Committees or Superintendents have authority over SROs.
- Suggested that the rationale for ending SROs be moved to the beginning of the document.

Members of the public commented on SROs.

- Ryan Black: spoke in support of ending SROs; shouldn't conflate SROs with the AWARE Program; as of last year, the State no longer requires SROs.
- Kristan Singleton: spoke in support of ending SROs; decisions should be made in the context of other policing initiatives in the town, including Walk and Talk; some residents feel stigmatized and over-policed; need better information on program outcomes; need to make sure any new approach doesn't have unintended consequences; districts are no longer required to have SROs.
- Bonnie Bastien: spoke in support of ending SROs; not hearing the same urgency expressed during the June 2, 2021 School Committee meeting; students need to feel safe.
- Savyon Cohen: stressed the importance of ensuring that decisions are evidence-based with outcome measures; studies show that the DARE Program had a negative effect on some groups of students.
- Kimberley Richardson spoke in support of ending SROs; the Select Board requested a recommendation from the Select Board; police officers should not be in the Schools.

Mr. Pearlman will attempt to get answers to questions raised during this meeting and will redraft the recommendation before the next Policy Review Subcommittee meeting on June 14, 2021. During that meeting, the Policy Review Subcommittee will continue to discuss the issue, with a possible vote. The full School Committee will take up this issue and possibly vote later that evening.

3) Discussion and Potential Recommendation for Rescission of Some or All COVID-19 Emergency Policies (Possible Vote)

Mr. Pearlman recommended that the School Committee vote to rescind elements of the PSB Policy on Face Coverings. This item will be added to the June 14, 2021 School Committee Meeting Docket.

4) Preliminary Consideration of Pursuing a School-Specific Policy on Surveillance Cameras

Mr. Pearlman reported that Select Board Member Bernard Greene who serves as Chair of the Surveillance Technology and Military-type Equipment Study Committee asked him to participate on the Committee. The Town currently has a policy on surveillance, but the Schools do not. MASC has a 2015 sample policy that is quite brief. Ms. Ditkoff and Ms. Normen provided some background information including past Town/School discussions of surveillance and school building security. Members noted parallels between the discussions of SROs and cameras in the schools. It was noted that Brookline High School has very few cameras (in areas that are not accessible to students and most staff) and that the K-8 Schools have cameras monitoring exterior doors, but not in the buildings. Members requested a copy of the Town Policy and the MASC sample policy.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE SELECT BOARD ON SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS (SROs)

SCHOOL COMMITTEE POSITION

On June 14, 2021, the School Committee voted _____ to recommend ending the School Resource Officer program as currently constituted.

In arriving at this recommendation, School Committee members convened multiple discussions with a myriad of stakeholders, including central office administrators, school principals, administrators, educators, guidance counselors, community leaders, elected officials, parents, students, law enforcement, and the School Resource Officers themselves. Stakeholders represented a diverse array of backgrounds, experiences, interests, and perspectives. We received input from individuals across the socioeconomic spectrum, many of whom identified as one or more of African-American/Black, Asian-American, Latinx, and/or White.

The format for community engagement included conversations, formal and informal, multiple rounds of public comment, as well as an anonymous survey taken by staff and more than 600 students. School Committee members reviewed the history of School Resource Officer programs (in Brookline, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and nationally), as well as scholarly research on the efficacy of SROs.

Nearly all of the adult stakeholders, regardless of demographic or stance, agreed that the current School Resource Officers, as individuals, are good people, with positive intentions, whose commitment to our students and impactful contributions to many of their lives deserve recognition. The School Committee concurs with this assessment. One student shared during a public meeting how he personally benefitted from the relationship formed with his School Resource Officer. By recommending the ending of the SRO program as currently constituted, we do not seek to dismiss or otherwise minimize these reported positive experiences with specific SROs. Rather, we seek to examine the School Resource Officer program at a macro level through a systemic, structural framework decoupled from the individuals within that structure. People move in and out of positions; systems, unless changed, remain the same.

In evaluating the efficacy of any system, one must first inquire as to its purpose, and then examine whether the structures within it are optimal for achieving that purpose. Although the Brookline Police Department and Public Schools of Brookline share a long history of partnership in very specific areas, such as the Legal Studies program of the 1980s, the DARE program of the 1990s, and the AWARE program of the 2000s, the School Resource Officer program itself only dates back to October of 2019. At that time, Interim Chief of the Brookline Police Department, Andrew Lipson, and Interim Superintendent of the Public Schools of Brookline, Ben Lummis, entered into a Memorandum of Agreement along with the Norfolk County District Attorney's Office "...to facilitate a safe and secure environment for students, faculty, staff and the entire school community in the Town of Brookline." The October 2019 MOA further establishes that

the three entities will “coordinate their efforts and share information in order to prevent violence involving the students of the Public Schools of Brookline...prevent the use, abuse, and distribution of alcohol and other controlled substances...and to promote a safe and nurturing environment in the school community.” The MOA explicitly reserves non-criminal disciplinary matters to school officials: “...it is the sole prerogative of school officials to impose discipline in accordance with the policies and procedures for infractions of school rules and policies not amounting to criminal or delinquent conduct.” School Resource Officers serve as police liaisons “in order to facilitate prompt and clear communications between the school and police personnel.” They “are considered a part of the Public Schools of Brookline District’s ‘Law Enforcement Unit’...” The Brookline Police Department, on its website, defines School Resource Officers as police officers who “work in collaboration with school administration to support students, ensure positive outcomes for youth, and connect the school, students, and families to services and resources in the community.”

The October 2019 MOA that implemented the SRO program in Brookline was a delayed response to state legislation enacted in 2014 motivated by a spate of school shootings across the country. The 2014 statute, the Gun Violence Reduction Act¹, mandated that SROs be placed in all municipalities in the state where a school is located. Under legislation passed and signed into law in 2018, the state updated its requirements on the information that school districts provide in their Memorandum of Agreement with their local Police Department(s) regarding the scope of SRO roles and responsibilities. In September of 2018, the Massachusetts Attorney General issued a sample Memorandum of Agreement to be used as a template.

Currently, the state does not require municipalities to retain SROs. Each city and town can decide for itself, subject to an accepted waiver application to the Commissioner of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.² The written application must include the reasons for the waiver request, evidence in support of the request, and a description of how the municipality’s proposed alternative will ensure safe schools.

Community conversation around the purposes of the SRO program primarily highlighted promotion of a safe, nurturing environment, social-emotional support for students, positive interactions with police officers, and diversion from criminal court. School Committee members received considerable anecdotal reports, in both directions, about the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of the SRO program in achieving these objectives. In an effort to better quantify the positions of the most directly affected stakeholders, we surveyed staff and students in multiple choice and narrative response formats. The goal of the survey was not merely to determine where a majority of respondents landed on any one particular question, but to discern any patterns in the responses based on subgroupings by grade level, race, and stakeholder group (i.e. student or staff). Nearly everyone involved at any stage of this SRO program review, both in favor of the program and against, recognized the importance of applying these social and racial lenses as an acknowledgement of the disparate experiences of minorities in our community and throughout the nation. To strictly adhere to majoritarian numbers, in either direction, would by

¹ <https://malegislature.gov/laws/sessionlaws/acts/2014/chapter284>

² <https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/PartI/TitleXII/Chapter71/Section37P>

definition override and effectively suppress the voices of those in the minority. The School Committee strives to hear all voices.

The SRO survey was conducted over a 3-day span during the last week of May. Students in Grades 6-12, along with staff, received an opportunity to respond to the survey. More than 600 students participated, as did over 250 staff members. A small number of school building leaders provided narrative feedback.

The first question asked whether respondents knew that an SRO is a police officer. 70% of students responded that they did not know SROs are police officers, compared to 17% of staff. 30% of students reported that they knew their school had an SRO, compared to 66% of staff. Among those who reported awareness of SROs in their school buildings, only 15% of students strongly agreed that SRO presence made them feel safer (54% disagreed or strongly disagreed). By more than double (31%), staff respondents strongly agreed that students feel safer with SROs in the buildings. This suggests that adult perceptions of student feelings on safety with SROs do not align with actual student perceptions.

While a majority of students, irrespective of race, who knew about SROs in their school buildings disagreed or strongly disagreed that they feel safer with SROs, the percentage of African-American/Black and Latinx students who disagreed or strongly disagreed was even greater: 66%. Only 3% of African-American/Black and Latinx students strongly agreed that SROs make them feel safer. Looking at Asian and White students only, 55% disagreed or strongly disagreed that SROs make them feel safer.

Middle schoolers responded quite differently than high schoolers. 72% of middle school students who knew about SROs in their school buildings (39 students) agreed or strongly agreed that SROs make them feel safer. Only 37% of high school students who knew about SROs in their school buildings (126 students) felt the same. This divide between middle school and high school also manifested itself in the results to a question about student comfort level with speaking to SROs. 58% of middle schoolers agreed or strongly agreed with feeling comfortable talking to SROs, compared to 43% of high schoolers. Only 8% of middle schoolers said they strongly disagreed with feeling comfortable talking to SROs, while 36% of high schoolers strongly disagreed.

By race, not even one African-American/Black or Latinx student strongly agreed with feeling comfortable talking to SROs, while 58% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Among Asian and White students, a narrow majority (51%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with feeling comfortable talking to SROs.

These combined data points, though limited by sample size, at minimum suggest a need to deliberately rethink how the Town of Brookline, the Police Department, and the Public Schools of Brookline can best achieve the Police Department's worthy stated objective to "work in collaboration with school administration to support students, ensure positive outcomes for youth, and connect the school, students, and families to services and resources in the community." The fact that 70% of respondents did not know about the SRO program (or its affiliation with the Brookline Police Department) suggests limited efficacy based on numbers

alone. A majority of high school students disagreeing that they feel safer around SROs, and disagreeing that they feel comfortable talking to SROs, concerns the School Committee. That these numbers are even more pronounced in our African-American/Black and Latinx student responses makes swift reform all the more important. We want our students to feel safe and comfortable. Safety and comfort are among the foundational components of the Public Schools of Brookline educational mission.

The School Committee's recommendation to end the SRO program as currently constituted should not be construed as a desire to sever all relationships between the Public Schools of Brookline and the Brookline Police Department. Nor should this recommendation be interpreted as an indictment against any particular individual or School Resource Officer. The School Committee routinely reviews programs in all categories, whether academic, administrative, athletic, operational, or wellness-related. In reviewing such programs, we remind ourselves that we are not critiquing or evaluating the individuals involved, but rather the positions, structures, and systems in place. Even when one program ends, the individuals who held positions within that program sometimes remain involved under a different capacity better-suited for the needs of the district.

The Brookline Police Department and Public Schools of Brookline share a decades-long relationship that survives any one particular program. Termination of the DARE program in 2008 clearly did not mark the end of the schools' relationship with the police. Nor would termination of the SRO program. As it always remains the objective of the School Committee to promote the best interests of our school community, we want to carefully evaluate how to optimize the delivery of support services for our students, a subject for which we have devoted significant time and consideration to during the last year and a half in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic. The School Committee believes that a combination of educators, guidance counselors, mental health professionals, and public health experts would better serve many of the objectives identified as purposes of the SRO program, albeit not necessarily to the exclusion of police officers and other professionals who could provide support as guest speakers and mentors upon student request.

Ending the SRO program as currently constituted requires additional process. Legally, an alternative proposal that meets the statutory goals of the SRO program must be submitted to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in order for the Commissioner to be in a position to exercise the waiver of the general requirement for SROs. The School Committee insists that any such proposal be comprehensive, well-articulated, and reflective of school leader input. Several school principals and other district leaders expressed support for the SRO program in testimony to the Select Board's Task Force, in public meetings convened by the School Committee, and in other communications with School Committee members and School Department staff. Any new program that substantially reforms or replaces the SRO program must identify a specific plan, timing, funding, and reallocation of resources to maintain and enhance student support. There must be a full understanding of the roles SROs play now, which of those roles remain necessary, and if so, who would be best to carry out those roles (e.g. guidance counselors, health educators, social workers, police officers, etc.) The School

Committee will collaborate with the School Department, town bodies, and other stakeholders to produce an alternative to the SRO program as currently constituted.

DRAFT