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INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND
The Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE) launched a study to understand the status of school policing in Santa Clara County. This study, which was conducted from 2015-2017, involved the following steps:

1. Surveying school and district administrators and School Resource Officers (SROs) on issues related to school policing;
2. Conducting focus groups with high school students to gather their perspective on school safety, interactions with SROs, and school disciplinary policies;
3. Facilitating stakeholder and planning meetings with Superintendents and Chiefs of Police;
4. Discussions with community members, parents, and interested stakeholders; and
5. Gathering research on best practices for ensuring quality school policing and promoting safe and healthy schools.

Policing on school grounds is typically conducted by SROs otherwise referred to as Education Facilities Officers (EFOs) or campus police. These officers are sworn law enforcement officials who are responsible for providing security and crime prevention services in schools. While there are instances in which SROs are employed directly by school districts, they are more commonly employed by a local police department or sheriff’s agency.

The responsibilities of SROs are similar to regular police officers in that they have the ability to make arrests, respond to calls for service, and document incidents that occur within their jurisdiction. Beyond law enforcement, and perhaps more importantly, SROs sometimes serve as educators, emergency managers, and informal counselors. Their primary responsibility is one of law enforcement, however, SROs are encouraged to engage in positive, non-punitive interactions with students. Arrests are used as a last resort and only under specified circumstances.\(^1\)

PURPOSE
The primary objective of this report is to present findings from the SCCOE’s multi-year study on the state of school policing in Santa Clara County and discuss the implications. The second objective is to continue the discussion on related issues such as severe disciplinary policies that disproportionately affect certain groups of students and have the potential to negatively impact their academic progress and/or successful transition into adulthood. One such concern has been coined the “school-to-prison” pipeline. A third objective is to provide information on best practices that can be utilized at the district and school levels to ensure safe learning environments for students.

In meeting these objectives, local, state, and national resources on school policing as well as information on additional approaches that can be employed by schools to improve school climate and student health and well-being are presented. Laws, regulations, and education code relevant to student rights and services are provided throughout. The information in this report is intended to spark meaningful

\(^1\) https://cops.usdoj.gov/supportingsafeschools
conversations between policy makers, law enforcement officials, school administrators, parents, students, and local community organizations that are centered on the implementation of school safety and policing strategies.

**COMPONENTS**

There are four main parts to this report. The first segment provides a brief history on SRO programs. School Resource Officer programs formally started in the 1950s, spread across the nation throughout the ‘60s, ‘70s, and ‘80s, and were redefined in the 1990s. Additional details are provided on key federal legislation regarding the rights and treatment of youth. The importance of organizations such as the National Association for School Resource Officers is highlighted.

The second segment summarizes school policing considerations. It includes a discussion on such factors as “zero-tolerance” school disciplinary policies and their ramifications which include trauma caused by stigmatization, significant out-of-school time, and student involvement in juvenile and adult justice systems. Many of these are resolved when educators make school climate a priority; the roles teachers, school administrators, and SROs play in disciplining students are spelled out and understood; and the proper mechanisms are in place for adequate SRO training.

Following the discussion on school policing considerations is a presentation of findings from the Santa Clara County Office of Education’s study on school policing. Facts and figures from survey data collected from district and school administrators in addition to SROs are provided. This includes information on participant demographics, perceptions of SRO program impact, knowledge gaps that pertain to working with students with special circumstances, and the adequacy of current school policing arrangements.

This report concludes with a final segment on best practices. This section is informed by material presented in previous sections and draws from additional research that included a review of the literature and qualitative data collected through the administration of focus groups and interviews with subject matter experts. Topics such as the importance of developing sound agreements, holistic approaches to ensuring school safety, SRO training, and the need for program monitoring and assessment are covered.
HISTORY OF SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER PROGRAMS

A brief history of formal school policing programs, more specifically those involving School Resource Officers (SROs), as well as notable laws and legislation addressing the rights of youth, is provided below. Formalized school policing was not instituted until the 1950s. Prior to that point in time, school-based interactions between law enforcement and students occurred on an as-needed basis, largely at the request of school administrators. Common infractions included minor issues such as bicycle and traffic safety to more troublesome incidents involving child abuse and molestation.

1950s/1960s

The first SRO program was implemented in Flint, Michigan in 1953 in an effort to improve the relationship between youth and police officers. The model in which officers visited schools part-time evolved into a model where SROs were assigned to schools on a full-time basis. Youth attitudes towards law enforcement were assessed and the program, still in place today, was determined to be a great success. Throughout the 1960s, Flint’s model of school policing was adopted by other cities in the state, such as Saginaw, Michigan in 1966, as well as in cities across the nation (Cincinnati, OH in 1967; Los Angeles and Tulare, CA in 1968; Miami, FL in 1969). In 1964, Congress passed Titles IV and VI of the Civil Rights Act to answer the call for the desegregation of public schools. Title IV protects students from discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin by public elementary and secondary schools and public institutions of higher learning. Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in all programs or activities receiving federal funding. Included are programs that receive funds through the United States Department of Education for admissions, recruitment, financial aid, academic, guidance, recreation, and student treatment services. The Act also guarantees technical assistance through the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights to assist recipient institutions in compliance and establishes a process for filing discrimination complaints.

1970s/1980s

In the 1970s and ‘80s, the Flint SRO model continued to spread to other cities. In 1972, the Orlando Police Department started a pilot program in which SROs were placed full-time in two junior high schools, a practice that was adopted by city police departments throughout Hillsborough County, Florida in 1975. The 1970s also bore witness to legislation permitting the creation of school district police departments where SROs are fully sworn, commissioned police yet school district employees. Dade County School Police and the Palm Beach School District Police in Florida are prime examples. In 1979, The Florida Association of School Resource Officers (FASRO) was founded, providing a networking platform for SROs operating in the state of Florida as well as a comprehensive training program. In 1974, a key piece of federal legislation addressing child abuse and neglect known as the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) was enacted. This legislation made possible the provision of federal funding to states in support of prevention, assessment, investigation, prosecution, and

---

3 http://www.fasro.net/
treatment activities. As a result, public agencies and nonprofit organizations with various stakes in treatment of youth could then apply for grants to fund demonstration programs and projects.\textsuperscript{4,5}

Focus on the wellbeing of children strengthened in 1984 when the United States Department of Justice began to encourage coordination of units of state and local government to combat child victimization, neglect, and abuse. Shortly thereafter, in 1988, Congress amended CAPTA to address the needs of adopted children and families. It was renamed the Child Abuse Prevention, Adoption and Family Services Act.\textsuperscript{6}

1990s-Present

Interest in SRO training increased in the early 1990s when FASRO initiated the founding of the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO).\textsuperscript{7} The focus of NASRO is to better prepare SROs for working with youth in schools through a variety of trainings and an annual National School Resource Officer Conference. Training topics include school-based law, profiling juvenile offenders, crime prevention, drug and alcohol use, classroom techniques, and how to maintain a successful school-based program. According to NASRO, SROs are most effective when they fulfill three roles (see Figure 1), those of teacher, counselor, and law enforcement officer.\textsuperscript{7}

\textbf{Figure 1. Triad Approach to School Policing}

4 https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/93/s1191
5 https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubPDFs/about.pdf
In the teacher role, SROs provide law related education to students, parents, and staff. In the counselor role, SROs provide informal counseling to students and parents, work closely with school counseling staff to ensure a safe school environment, and provide information on community services. Lastly, in the role of law enforcement officer, SROs serve as positive role models and as liaison between school and police communities while exercising more traditional law enforcement responsibilities such as investigating crimes and making arrests.

Over the past two decades, assignment of police officers to schools on a full-time basis has become a widespread practice. This period of time coincides with the addition of SROs as part of a comprehensive, community-oriented strategy to address the range of real and perceived challenges to campus safety. The school safety law model is designed to adapt to the unique variety of special needs on local campuses. An estimated one-third of all sheriffs’ offices and almost half of all municipal police departments have assigned nearly 17,000 sworn officers to serve in schools. Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) estimates that nearly half of all public schools have assigned officers.

According to NASRO, there are between 14,000 and 20,000 SROs in service nationwide serving approximately 30% of our nation’s public schools. The exact number of public schools with assigned SROs is difficult to quantify given that most SROs are split between multiple school sites. In Santa Clara County, 14 of 31 school districts reported use of some form of school policing on school campuses (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Results from SCCOE Inventory on Use of School Policing in Santa Clara County Schools

---

10 https://nasro.org/frequently-asked-questions/
SCHOOL POLICING CONSIDERATIONS

The development and proliferation of effective models for school policing, in addition to the implementation of laws and regulations protecting the rights of students, have contributed significantly to the safety of our nation’s school systems. Though considerable progress has been made since the 1950s, school policing practices as they relate to student discipline continue to garner concern from the public. The section below describes recent issues brought forth through news coverage and research on the topic. Related links to recent media articles are supplied in Appendix A.

SCHOOL-TO-PRISON PIPELINE

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) provides information about the “school-to-prison pipeline,” a disturbing national trend wherein children are funneled out of public schools and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems. Many children referred to the courts have learning disabilities or histories of poverty, abuse, or neglect, and would benefit from additional educational and counseling services. Instead, they are isolated, punished, and pushed out.\(^\text{11}\)

There are many negative effects of school system exclusionary discipline policies and practices. At a fundamental level, students lose important instructional time. Disciplinary sanctions such as in-school and out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, or referrals to law enforcement authorities can lead to student school avoidance, diminished educational engagement, decreased academic achievement, and contribute to an increased likelihood of dropping out of school. More severe, studies have found a correlation between use of exclusionary discipline and increased behavior problems, substance abuse, and involvement with juvenile justice and adult correctional systems.\(^\text{12}\)

Important to consider are the costs associated with this trend. According to a 2014 report by the U.S. News & World Report, the incarceration of one youth costs state taxpayers an estimated $149,000 a year per person.\(^\text{13}\) That equates to just over $400 per person per day. This does not take into account other monetary factors such as lost future earnings, cost due to recidivism, lost tax revenue, and the cost of extending Medicare and Medicaid to inmates.

DISPROPORTIONATE DISCIPLINARY RATES FOR STUDENTS OF COLOR, WITH DISABILITIES, AND LGBTQ STUDENTS

The Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) conducted by the Office for Civil Rights has demonstrated that students of certain racial or ethnic groups tend to be disciplined more than their peers. For example, African-American students without disabilities are more than three times as likely as their white peers without disabilities to be expelled or suspended. Although African-American students represent 15% of students in the CRDC, they make up 35% of students suspended once, 44% of those suspended more than once, and 36% of students expelled. Further, over 50% of students who were involved in school-related arrests or referred to law enforcement are Hispanic or African-American. Students with

\(^{11}\) https://www.aclu.org/issues/racial-justice/race-and-inequality-education/school-prison-pipeline
\(^{12}\) http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201401-title-vi.html
disabilities are more than twice as likely to receive an out-of-school suspension (13%) than students without disabilities (6%).

These disparities are evidenced at the local level. According to NBC Bay Area’s School Discipline Across the Country application, which uses U.S. Department of Education data from the 2013-14 school year, the suspension rate among African Americans with disabilities attending schools in San Jose Unified School District, the largest district in Santa Clara County in terms of student population, is 4.5 times greater than the suspension rate for African Americans without disabilities (64.09% vs. 11.53%). In addition, the suspension rate among African Americans without disabilities is 1.5 times greater than that of Caucasians (11.53% vs. 4.5%).

Research suggests that the substantial racial disparities of the kind reflected in the CRDC and U.S. Department of Education data are not explained by more frequent or more serious misbehavior by students of color. Although statistical and quantitative data would not end an inquiry under Title IV or Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (1964), significant and unexplained racial disparities in student discipline give rise to concerns that schools may be engaging in racial discrimination that violates the federal civil rights laws. Statistical evidence may indicate that groups of students have been subjected to different treatment or that a school policy or practice may have an adverse discriminatory impact. Indeed, the Departments’ investigations, which consider quantitative data as part of a wide array of evidence, have revealed racial discrimination in the administration of student discipline.

**Zero-Tolerance Discipline**

Since the late 1980s, schools around the country have been adopting “zero tolerance” policies, or strict enforcement of regulations and bans against undesirable student behaviors such as campus possession of alcohol, drugs or firearms, gang activity, theft, destruction of property, and threatening or aggressive actions including harassment and fighting. Zero tolerance policies include harsher penalties, however, a large body of research has found that these policies have no positive impact on students. There is little compelling evidence to suggest they increase school safety. In addition, as discussed above, data has shown that a disproportionate number of students of color and students with disabilities have the potential to be impacted by such practices resulting in students being left unsupervised and without constructive activities. To reiterate, out-of-school suspensions are strongly associated with entry into the juvenile justice system, particularly for those who are the most vulnerable and at-risk.

---

15 http://www.nbcbayarea.com/investigations/Policing-the-Schools-413203253.html
16 http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201401-title-vi.html
20 https://www.aclu.org/issues/juvenile-justice/school-prison-pipeline
SRO TRAINING DEFICIENCIES AND POORLY DELINEATED ROLES
There has been increased scrutiny in recent years on the presence and effectiveness of SROs on school campuses. Youth-rights activists contend that incidents of excessive force stem from SROs being ill-prepared to work effectively with children, especially racial minorities, Hispanics/Latinos, and those that are disabled.\(^{21,22}\) While some form of training is required, questions arise as to the quality and degree of training, especially as it relates to helping SROs fully understand how unconscious biases influence their behavior. Further, one of the biggest threats to the ideal balance between school safety and student rights is a poorly structured Memorandum of Understanding (MOU); one that fails to address the roles of school officials and SROs with respect to disciplining students. An optimal MOU, discussed in greater detail under Best Practices, is one in which the conditions necessitating the presence of SROs and SRO-intervention are spelled out.

TRAUMA AND STIGMATIZATION ASSOCIATED WITH CRIMINALIZING STUDENT CONDUCT
A growing body of research indicates that juvenile arrests lead to further offending and increase the probability of future arrests. In 2014, Dr. Akiva M. Liberman and colleagues of the Urban Institute’s Justice Policy Center published a report that documented the findings of a longitudinal case-control study of juvenile reoffending.\(^{23}\) After controlling for frequency of offending and offender characteristics, Liberman concluded that the increased likelihood of subsequent arrests for juvenile offenders was due to an increase in law enforcement responses to those youth, not to increases in or the severity of offenses being committed. In short, initial offenders are labeled as “problems” and their behavior is subject to increased scrutiny and less tolerance from law enforcement, educators, and other authority figures.

While Liberman’s findings highlight the importance of external factors that are linked to recidivism, it is important to note that the trauma caused by a single arrest can have a negative effect on youth functioning beyond recidivism. A recent study conducted by researchers at George Mason University found that offenders are more likely to experience stigma-induced shame responses such as substance abuse and dependence, mental health symptoms, and a perceived lack of connection with their communities following an arrest.\(^{24}\) Effects may be exacerbated for members of non-minority groups because they lack certain life experiences and exposures (e.g., racial profiling) brought on by having visible stigmas such as darker skin.\(^{25}\) These findings suggest that the burden of carrying a concealable stigma such as a criminal record is very distressing, especially for youth.

---

\(^{24}\) https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4788463/
\(^{25}\) https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4494783/
The issues presented in the previous section underscore the need for adequate SRO training, the establishment of clear MOUs or other contracts between law enforcement and school districts that clearly delineate the roles SROs, and administrators are to play in disciplining students, and the utilization of other methods to keep students safe and in school. In order to better understand the status of school policing in Santa Clara County, the Santa Clara County Office of Education administered a series of surveys, interviews, planning meetings, and focus groups with the following stakeholders:

- School Administrators;
- District Administrators and Superintendents;
- School Resource and Supervising Officers; and
- Chiefs of Police.

These lines of inquiry produced valuable information on SRO availability, training and school need; best practices for student discipline used by school administrators, SROs and counselors; and student and school administrator perceptions of SROs, their utility, training, and quality of engagement. Findings are provided in greater detail in this section.

**SURVEYS**

Surveys consisting of closed- and open-response items were sent to school administrators, district administrators, and SROs between October of 2015 and July of 2016. Closed-response items consisted of demographic questions and Likert-scale items with 5-point options from (1) *Strongly disagree* to (5) *Strongly agree*. Weighted averages (WAvg) were calculated for Likert-scale items. Averages closer to 1 are indicative of a negative response pattern, while averages closer to 5 are indicative of a positive response pattern.

**School Administrator Survey**

A total of 82 participants representing 26 of 31 school districts responded to the School Administrator Survey. Most of the respondents (82%) identified as principals, with half indicating that they work at schools with assigned SROs. The majority of administrators at SRO schools reported that they share their SRO with another school site. Also notable, 53% of administrators reported that they work at a school employing Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS).
Abbreviations: PBIS = Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports; SRO = School Resource Officer

Responses to questions on perceived SRO impact were generally positive. When asked about current practice, most (WAvg=3.9) agree that current practices using SROs are effective (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. Distribution of Administrator Ratings of Current SRO Practice Effectiveness

When asked about SROs facilitating a safe environment, most (WAvg=4.1) agree that having SROs has resulted in a safe environment for students, family, and staff (see Figure 5).
When asked about SROs decreasing the need for student discipline, most (WAvg=3.7) agree that having SROs helps deescalate incidents requiring students to be disciplined (see Figure 6).

In terms of knowledge on key components of school policing, school administrators, on average, think that SROs are more knowledgeable about trauma informed care than school administrators are, but that they are more knowledgeable than officers on laws/regulations regarding students with disabilities, needs of students in special education, and students’ mental health needs (see Figure 7). Respondents suggest that this be an area of training for SROs.
Figure 7. Administrator Percent Agreement on SRO- and Administrator-Knowledge-Base Items

Note: Rates represent the number of Administrator “Agree” and “Strongly Agree” responses relative to the number of total responses. Administrators answered the same question two times, once with an SRO stem and a second time with an Administrator stem.

While 41 of the 82 participants that responded to the School Administrator Survey indicated the presence of an SRO at their respective schools, only 18 responded to a follow-up question on common SRO activities. The two most common SRO activities observed by administrators are “Engage in casual conversations with students to build positive relationships” and “Develop an effective working relationship with school staff to identify resources that support student/family/staff member needs.” Tied for third place, 82% of administrators have observed SROs “Provide a safe environment for student/family/staff member to seek avenues for information to make informed decisions” and “Respond to/Investigate criminal offenses on school campus.” Of the 41 administrators at schools without SROs, two indicated that they will use SROs in the future. Another eight are interested in receiving information about how to contract SROs.

District Administrator Survey
A total of 26 participants representing 25 of 31 (81%) school districts in Santa Clara County completed the District Administrator Survey. Of the respondents, 25 supplied their job title with 20 identifying as Superintendents (N=14) or Directors of Student Services (N=6). Of the total respondents, 17 (56%) indicated that their districts use SROs, with 76% seeking to maintain or increase current SRO usage.
District administrators provided equally favorable responses to school administrators when asked about the impact of current SRO practices. Most agree that current practices using SROs are effective (WAvg=4.6), that having SROs has resulted in a safe environment for students, family, and staff (WAvg=4.6), and that having SROs helps deescalate incidents requiring students to be disciplined (WAvg=4.4). Of the districts not currently using SROs, one respondent said he/she hopes they will use SROs in the future.

District administrator responses to questions on administrator and SRO knowledge base further demonstrate the need to better prepare SROs for working with special education students, students with disabilities, and those with mental health needs. At the same time, educators must be brought up to speed on what it means to provide trauma informed care. Children are subject to many sources of traumatic stress, from experience of neglect and physical or sexual abuse to acts of terrorism. Whatever the source, all adults in a school community, whether administrators, teachers, staff, or SROs, should be prepared to recognize and respond to students that are in need. The systems described under System-Wide, Holistic Approaches to Ensuring Safe and Healthy Learning Environments will go a long way towards promoting the underlying cultures of respect and support that are needed to alleviate and guide students through stressful situations.

The District Administrator Survey concluded with questions on SRO roles and MOU delineation of those roles. Ten district administrators provided responses to these questions which are summarized in Figure 9.
Figure 9. District Administrators Responses to Questions on SRO Roles and MOU Usage

All unanimously agreed that school administrators, not SROs, should play the primary role in disciplining students.

Nine of ten district administrators believe that SROs build positive relationships with students through casual conversation.

Eight of ten district administrators indicated that their districts utilize MOUs or other contracts for school policing services to place SROs in schools.

Only two of eight administrators from districts that utilize an MOU or other contract to place SROs in schools feel that the agreement clearly defines the role SROs are to play in disciplining students.

These findings demonstrate that district administrators value SROs that engage in positive interactions with students and that SROs should only discipline students under special circumstances. Unfortunately, the number of district administrators that feel their MOU clearly defines an SRO’s role in disciplining students suggests a lack of familiarity with MOU language and/or the need for MOU enhancement in this area.

School Resource Officer Survey
A total of 15 participants responded to the School Resource Officer Survey. Ten indicated that they were an SRO or in an equivalent position at the time of the survey, four oversaw SROs, and one identified as a Police Supervisor; all employed by either a Police or Sheriff’s Department. Of the 10 SROs, the majority (60%) have held the position between two and five years. Nine offered up information on how they became an SRO, with eight indicating that they volunteered and/or tested for the position. The SROs served 14 of the 31 Santa Clara County school districts, with nine out of nine assigned to multiple school campuses.
In terms of knowledge on key components of school policing, SROs agree that they are more knowledgeable about trauma informed care than school administrators but that school administrators are more knowledgeable than they are on laws/regulations regarding students with disabilities, needs of students in special education, and student mental health needs. When asked, “How would you define a ‘successful’ SRO?,” the typified response was:

“A successful SRO is one who interacts with students in a positive way and develops trusting, healthy relationships with students.”

Figure 11 summarizes the key practices and behaviors that facilitate being a successful SRO.

**Figure 11. Practices and Behaviors that Facilitate SRO Success**

- Exercise good communication skills
- Understand and relate to students
- Maintain a non-disciplinary presence
When asked about barriers, SROs indicated the need for more staff, having to deal with negative perceptions of law enforcement, and a lack of opportunity/time to build meaningful relationships with students as the primary challenges. When asked about training needs, SROs acknowledged the potential benefits of trainings on mental illness and other issues facing youth. Respondents also felt that school administrators could benefit from trainings on basic laws and by participating in ride-alongs with police officers.

**STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS AND EXPERT INTERVIEWS**

Focus groups were conducted with students from three high schools spread throughout Santa Clara County: (1) Homestead High School located in Fremont Union High School District, (2) William C. Overfelt High School located in East Side Union High School District, and (3) Christopher High School located in Gilroy Unified School District. In the focus groups, students were asked to describe their experiences with and perceptions of law enforcement, focusing specifically on interactions with SROs. Interviews with subject matter experts focused more on current and best practices in school policing in Santa Clara and other counties, thoughts for improvement, and observed challenges. Individuals lending their expertise included Superintendents, Chiefs of Police, and researchers with relevant experience. The latter included Dr. Roxana Marachi, Associate Professor with the Connie L. Lurie College of Education at San Jose State University. Dr. Marachi has conducted studies on youth suicide and bullying prevention, efficacy of evidence-based violence prevention programs, and student victimization.

The information collected through student focus groups and expert interviews validated many of the survey findings while providing a personal perspective on the state of school policing in Santa Clara County. The success of SROs is contingent on a number of factors, adequate resources such as staffing and funding notwithstanding. Essential elements for SRO success are summarized in Figure 12.

**Figure 12. Conditions for SRO Success**

![Diagram showing conditions for SRO success]

- Assessment/Evaluation
- Required Training
- Holistic Approach
- Clearly Defined Roles
The need for clearly defined roles and SRO training has been a reoccurring theme. Largely not addressed at this juncture is the need for system-wide, holistic approaches to ensuring safe and healthy learning environments for students and the need for school policing program assessment and evaluation. These topics, in addition to best practices, are discussed in greater detail in the following section, starting with clear delineation of SRO and school administrator roles in student discipline. Findings from our inventory of district MOUs are presented in conjunction with a discussion of recommended MOU components.

PARENT/COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES

Parents and community members provided their perspectives directly and via other stakeholders for this report. There are a range of opinions about school policing from those who highly value school policing to those who believe strongly that police officers should not be on school campuses unless called for a specific purpose or incident. Conversations with the community about campus safety, school discipline, and the roles of school police officers should be integrated into the stakeholder engagement processes of local school districts. These topics have a direct impact on school culture, student engagement, and thus student achievement.

It is recommended that policies and procedures about school policing including those delineated in a Memorandum of Understanding be communicated to students, parents, and community members through various means of publication at the local district and school campuses. Further, local school leaders are encouraged to offer regular opportunities for parents and community members to engage in dialogue about what is and isn’t working well with regards to campus safety.
BEST PRACTICES

School policing services and information on matters related to school policing are provided by a number of state and federal government offices and organizations. The Florida Association for School Resource Officers (FASRO) and the National Association for School Resource Officers (NASRO) were introduced earlier under History of School Resource Officer Programs. Both are recognized authorities on SRO training.

The California Department of Education has hosted forums and workshops to make districts, administrators, and teachers aware of successful alternatives to suspensions and expulsions, including "restorative justice" programs that help students understand the nature and consequences of their actions, and strategies that teach students life skills and emotional control. Similarly, the United States Department of Education has shown strong support for school-based programs that reduce student disruption and misconduct, reinforce positive behavior and character development, and help students succeed. The California and U.S. Departments of Education recommend the following tools to aid in this effort:

- Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDS) - supported technical assistance centers available to help schools, districts, communities, and states improve school climate and safety while reducing exclusionary discipline;
- School-based Enforcement through Collaboration, Understanding, and Respect (SECURe) Implementation Rubrics - help school districts, schools, and law enforcement agencies determine the type of school-police partnership that will be most effective in their community and, where appropriate, to incorporate school-based law enforcement officers into the school learning environment; and
- Guiding Principles - a guide for improving school climate and discipline through the creation of positive climates that focus on prevention, development of clear, appropriate, and consistent expectations and consequences to address disruptive student behaviors, and ensuring fairness, equity, and continuous improvement.

The Council of State Governments Justice Center released a report in 2014 titled, “The School Discipline Report: Strategies from the Field to Keep Students Engaged in School and Out of the Juvenile Justice System” that covers such topics as conditions for learning, targeted behavioral interventions, school-police partnerships, and courts and the juvenile justice system. The United States Department of Justice’s Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) seconds the Justice Center’s recommendations for the development of partnerships between schools and police, asserting that such partnerships more effectively address underlying issues facing students in schools, change negative behavioral patterns, and allow for the leveraging of community resources. Materials such as “The State of School

26 http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/ne/yr16/yr16rel5.asp
27 http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/se/behaviorialintervention.asp
28 http://ocrdata.ed.gov/
29 http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/support.html#tools

Locally, NBC Bay Area’s The Investigative Unit has conducted extensive research into school policing. A report published in 2015 revealed that one of Santa Clara County’s high school districts ranked 14th in the nation in the number of referrals to law enforcement.36 Following that report, the district in question, revised its student disciplinary policies and worked with the local police department to develop an MOU that addressed these policies and clearly defined student disciplinary roles. The importance of these actions are covered in greater detail in the following section.

The work completed by NBC Bay Area’s The Investigative Unit has also shed light on the disproportionate rates of suspensions, expulsions, and arrests among African American students and those with disabilities.37 These disparities were discussed in greater detail in the section on School Policing Considerations. In short, children with disabilities make up 23% of arrests across larger Bay Area schools, but only 10% of the student population. Similarly, African American students account for 24% of arrests yet only 9% of the student population.

The Investigative Unit’s website38 hosts a number of valuable information tools and resources related to their work on school policing in addition to links to stories beyond those provided in Appendix A. One application is a dashboard that allows users to draw California Department of Education data on the use of disciplinary practices nationwide as well as at the state and school district levels. Another application, embedded in their report39 on increased rates of referrals among African American and disabled students, allows users to run a countywide search of school districts that utilize school policing services and that have agreements that adequately define officer duties. Findings specific to Santa Clara County indicate that there are 10 of 31 school districts patrolled by law enforcement officers and that 2 of those districts have agreements in place that define officer duties. That same report contains an embedded 6-part video series on the topic.

The San Jose Office of the Independent Police Auditor (IPA), established in 1993, provides independent oversight of San Jose police and their compliance with city policy, procedures, rules, regulations, and the law through the objective review of police misconduct investigations.40 The IPA strives to promote accountability and stronger relationships between the police department and the community by way of outreach efforts and policy recommendations. In 2016 the IPA hosted a series of events to improve the visibility of the IPA among San Jose residents, particularly among those from minority communities, starting with a “Community Trust in Policing Forum” held at the Mexican Heritage Plaza.

37 http://www.nbcbayarea.com/investigations/Thousands-of-Bay-Area-Students-Sent-to-Police-329858661.html
38 http://www.nbcbayarea.com/investigations/Policing-the-Schools-413203253.html
40 http://www.sanjoseca.gov/ipa/
In 2017 the IPA published the Fifth Edition of “A Student’s Guide to Police Practices,” a 42-page publication directed at youth that provides an overview of:

- Tips for filing and need-to-know information regarding the review process for police complaints;
- A description of police practices that includes but is not limited to police officers in the school setting, consensual encounters and detentions, Miranda rights and their implications, and bias-based policing procedures such as “profile stops;”
- Common laws and policies that commonly pertain to youth such as curfew violation, truancy, bullying, and disrupting or interfering with classes; and
- Descriptions of and warning signs for issues and crimes that impact youth such as dating violence, abuse, sexting, and self-harm as well as tips for staying safe.

The guide concludes with a listing of related resources and services that are available to youth in Santa Clara County. Organizations are listed by name, descriptions and contact information are supplied. As a courtesy to readers, this information has been provided in Appendix B.

The practices described in this section are courtesy of information collected from the sources listed above, in addition to research conducted by the United Kingdom’s Safer Schools Partnership[^41] and SCCOE’s study on the state of school policing in Santa Clara County. The practices are aligned with the U.S. Department of Education’s SECURE implementation rubric, which includes five action steps that districts and schools can take to facilitate successful integration of SROs into school learning environments. These action steps include:

- Create sustainable partnerships and formalize MOUs among stakeholders, primarily between school districts and law enforcement agencies;
- Ensure that MOUs meet statutory civil rights and constitutional requirements;
- Recruit and hire effective school personnel as well as work with law enforcement agencies to recruit and hire effective SROs;
- Work with law enforcement agencies to ensure that SROs and school personnel are well trained; and
- Establish a process for continual evaluation and performance monitoring of SROs and school personnel.^[42]

CLEAR DELINEATION OF ROLES

“An agreement clearly delineating roles and responsibilities serves the dual goals of maintaining safe campuses while treating students with respect and prioritizing their individual educational needs.”

Administering formal school discipline should be the responsibility of educators, not SROs or other school law enforcement. While SROs are valuable assets in creating safe school environments, they should only step into a disciplinary role under well-defined circumstances. Findings from SCCOE surveys provide that school administrators, district administrators, and SROs all agree with that policy. Further, the data indicate that school administrators are better suited for dealing with students with disabilities, those with special and mental health needs, and those dealing with other issues such as homelessness.

School administrator and SRO roles should be clearly spelled out in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), a document that details operational agreements between school and law enforcement personnel, philosophies towards student discipline, and guidelines for implementing services. School or district administrators should also develop contractual agreements with law enforcement personnel to define fiscal arrangements. Whenever possible, both parties should be involved in the development of these forms. Without exception, all parties should be fully aware and knowledgeable about their content.

Through SCCOE’s inventory, it was determined that at least 14 of 31 districts (41%) in Santa Clara County use SROs or other campus law enforcement for school policing services. The number may be higher as four districts did not respond to our requests for information. Of those that responded “yes,” 10 (71%) utilize a contract (N=7) or MOU (N=3) but not both. This breakdown is provided in Figure 13. Results of this inventory are similar to those collected through the SCCOE’s District Administrator Survey. Recall, eight of ten (80%) District Administrators that responded to follow-up questions reported use of a formal agreement defining services. Alarming was the fact that only two of eight (25%) District Administrators felt their agreements were adequate in defining disciplinary roles.

Figure 13. Results from Inventory of Santa Clara County School District SRO and MOU Usage

Use SROs or Other Law Enforcement Officer for School Policing

- UNK = 4
- No = 13
- Yes = 14

SRO = 10

Use MOU or Other Contractual Agreement to Define Responsibilities

- No = 4
- Yes = 10

MOU = 3

Other = 4

Other = 7

In addition to clarifying roles law enforcement and educators are to play in disciplining students, Community Oriented Policing Strategies (COPS) recommends MOUs be used to define the difference between routine and non-routine discipline, document the SRO chain-of-command, list educator and SRO relevant and required training, define data to be used for SRO performance monitoring, set the terms of information sharing between schools and law enforcement, establish SRO scheduling terms, include a statement of student rights and responsibilities, and describe the roles and activities of relevant partner organizations. These essential MOU components are summarized in Figure 14.

**Figure 14. Recommended MOU Components**

![Diagram of MOU components](image)

Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) guidelines for recommended MOU components are as follows:

- **Definitions of routine vs. non-routine discipline**
  - This description should include the roles and responsibilities of the school, school district, and the law enforcement agency, and each partner should be specifically listed within the document.
  - It should clearly indicate that SROs will not respond to or be responsible for requests to resolve routine discipline problems involving students. The administration of student discipline, including student code of conduct violations and student misbehavior, is the responsibility of school administrators, unless the violation or misbehavior involves criminal conduct.

- **Description of partner roles and activities**
  - These roles may include providing a secure work space for the SRO to conduct interviews and maintain confidential records, establishing standing meetings, and/or working with school administrators in identifying problems and evaluating progress under the MOU.
  - The school administrator should ensure that staff cooperates with police investigations and any subsequent actions related to crime or criminal activity on campus.

---

• **Terms of scheduling**
  - The law enforcement partner is responsible for the selection of personnel assigned to the school, and these officers should adhere to the principles of community policing.
  - This section of the MOU should define the hours of SRO duty including arrival and departure times and specify if after-hour duties may be performed and if time spent in court, attending interagency meetings, and investigating school-related crimes are within the scope of SRO duties.

• **Terms of information sharing**
  - This section should address the type and the extent to which information will be shared between the law enforcement agency and school or school district partners. For example, define the type of information that the school is permitted/willing to share with law enforcement, as well as information flow from law enforcement to school partner(s).
  - When entering into an MOU, agencies should consider all federal or state laws that govern the collection, use, and dissemination of student records such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA).

• **Supervision responsibility and chain of command**
  - This section should clearly establish a definitive chain of command for the SRO, including the individual(s) with the responsibility for the supervision of the SRO.
  - With rare exception, the responsibility of establishing a chain of command lies with the law enforcement executive or his/her law enforcement designee.

• **Training description**
  - This section should describe what the local training requirements are prior to placing SROs in educational settings, as well as what the specific local in-service training requirements throughout their deployment in the schools will be and who is responsible for providing that training.

• **Data collection and performance monitoring**
  - Establish a local process to closely monitor the activities of the SRO program, including comprehensive disaggregated data collection on school-based arrests, citations, searches, and referrals to court or juvenile justice programs consistent with applicable federal, state, and local privacy laws.
  - This section can also include a process for raising and reviewing issues and complaints regarding elements outlined in the MOU or partnership activities.

• **Statement of student rights and responsibilities**
  - This section explicitly outlines or references legal precedents regarding the rights of minors and the suppression of those rights, especially those of children attending school.
  - The school’s policy towards *loco parentis*, a Latin phrase that means that while a student is in the custody of a school, the school acts as a parent, should be defined.
  - Language on student rights and violations may include but are not limited to free speech, free press, and search and seizure protections.
SYSTEM-WIDE, HOLISTIC APPROACHES TO ENSURING SAFE AND HEALTHY LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

“School safety requires a broad-based effort by the entire community, including educators, students, parents, and law enforcement agencies. A comprehensive approach to addressing school safety is one that focuses on prevention, intervention, and response.”

All too often, given mandates to improve student performance and adhere to educational standards for teaching and testing such as the Common Core, issues such as ensuring school safety and improving school climate are of low priority to educators. This is an unfortunate reality; unfortunate because the strongest predictors of school safety are the quality of teacher-parent and teacher-student interactions. Further, where school climate is not made a priority, commonplace are disciplinary approaches that contribute to many of the concerns discussed earlier in School Policing Considerations. A prime example is the use of zero-tolerance discipline by school administrators.

Effective systems for ensuring student safety in schools and promoting school climate should involve a multifaceted approach, one that addresses the distinct yet interlocking environmental systems that provide the foundation children require to develop into healthy, mature adults. According to the Life Course Framework, supports provided early in life contribute to the development of the social-emotional skills, school engagement and connectivity, and positive behavior patterns adolescents need to succeed in life (see Figure 15).

---

49 http://www.kidsincommon.org/storage/3283/TCA-Data-Book-2016_NEW.pdf
Results from programs designed to strengthen school communities such as the Center for the Collaborative Classroom’s Child Development Project (CDP) and Charleston County School District’s Positive Action through Holistic Education (PATHE) program provide that children are more likely to acquire developmental assets and experience academic success when schools:

- Nurture a caring school climate;
- Involve parents in their child’s education;
- Set clear rules and consequences and promote consistency in the home; and
- Hold high expectations for student behavior and academic performance.

These conditions are facilitated through a number of programs that operate at the prevention and intervention levels. One approach, known as Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS), emphasizes a school-wide, behavioral-based system that teaches students positive social behaviors. Additional details on PBIS are provided in the following section along with other notable programs or initiatives employed in Santa Clara or neighboring county schools.

**Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports**

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a decision-making framework that offers a continuum of positive behavior support for all students across all settings. The framework offers a three-tiered, data-driven, prevention-oriented way for school personnel to organize evidence-based practices, continuously improve their implementation, and maximize academic and social behavior outcomes for students.

---

50 https://www.collaborativeclassroom.org/cdp
51 https://www.nationalgangcenter.gov/SPT/Programs/136
53 https://www.pbis.org/
Tier 1 PBIS strategies provide a system of support that is universal for all students and focuses on reducing new cases of problem behavior. Tier 2 provides targeted support to select groups of students and focuses on reducing current cases of problem behavior. Tier 3 consists of individual support for extreme cases and focuses on reducing complications, intensity, and severity of problem behavior exhibited by single individuals. The key elements of PBIS are summarized in Figure 16.

**Figure 16. PBIS Elements and Decision-Making Framework**

Outcomes are academic and behavior targets that are determined to be important by students, families, and educators. The data are information used to determine the need for change and intervention effects. Practices refer to the interventions that are implemented. Lastly, systems are the supports needed to effectively implement the practices.

As of 2014, seven districts in Santa Clara County along with its Alternative Education Program were supported by PBIS. By 2017 that number has more than doubled to 15 districts, a 114% increase. In addition, 47 school sites are in a current PBIS training sequence. These findings demonstrate the commitment of Santa Clara County educators and the Santa Clara County Office of Education to improving school climate through the implementation of an evidence-based practice.

**Parent Engagement Initiative**

Evidence provides that children perform better in schools when parents are involved in their education. Involvement can take on many forms. Dr. Joyce Epstein of John Hopkins University’s Center on School, Family and Community Partnerships has developed a six-category classification of school promoted parent involvement roles:

---

54 http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/parental-involvement-and-student-achievement-a-meta-analysis
1. Parenting – Schools help parents develop parenting skills, provide information on their child’s development stages, and offer advice on establishing stage appropriate home learning environments;
2. Communicating – Schools work to keep parents abreast of their child’s progress and available school services while providing opportunities for parent-teacher communication;
3. Volunteering – Schools actively recruit parents, offering them opportunities to work with their children in the school or classroom setting;
4. Learning at home – Schools and educators provide parents with ideas for at-home learning, set expectations, and inform them of ways to monitor and help with homework;
5. Decision-making – Schools include parents in their decision-making process by making them partners in school organizations and through advisory panels and committees; and
6. Community collaboration – Schools seek out ways for community organizations and business groups to get involved in education while encouraging parents to participate in the community.55

The Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE) recognizes that these roles are critical. In 2010, SCCOE launched the Region V Parent Engagement Initiative in an effort to provide parents with the tools they need to support their child’s academic achievement by addressing academic, discipline, and school safety needs. The Initiative also calls for parents to mentor other parents to do the same. Like PBIS, this approach is tiered. In the learning stage, parents participate in a robust offering of trainings and workshops to learn various strategies to support students. In the implementation stage, parents are provided with opportunities to practice their newly acquired skills through collaboration with other parents. The training program is available to parents of K-12 grade students. Currently there are two interactive, six-week workshops:

- Parent Project Junior – workshop for parents of K-5 grade students that combines parenting strategies with Common Core activities; and
- Active Parenting – workshop for parents of grade 6-12 students in which parents learn about the developmental needs of adolescents and communication strategies.56

Parents that complete the trainings receive a Certificate of Completion and are eligible for follow-up coaching sessions.

Also part of the Region V Parent Engagement Initiative are opportunities for families to learn together through parent-led workshops. These free events are made possible through partnerships between parent leaders, school districts, and the SCCOE’s Curriculum and Instruction Coordinators. An example of one such event is the Families Learn Together STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics) Focus workshop hosted by Alum Rock School District. As of 2017, the Parent Engagement Initiative has expanded to 18 districts and charter schools in Santa Clara County, hosted conferences and workshops attended by nearly 15,000 participants, and trained over 200 parent leaders.

The understanding that parent engagement is an important factor in student success is shared at the state level. In 2014, California Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Torlakson, established guidelines to assist districts in the planning and implementation of programs to increase parent participation in their child’s education and meet the family engagement requirements of the Local

55 http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Public-education/Parent-Involvement
56 http://www.sccoe.org/depts/esb/parent/Pages/default.aspx
Control Funding Formula.\textsuperscript{57} In line with Epstein’s classification, the guide, known as the “Family Engagement Framework: A Tool for California School Districts,” provides schools with 18 principles that can be used to encourage parent participation through helping with homework, engaging in conversations about the importance of post-secondary education, attending school events, volunteering, and serving on school advisory committees.\textsuperscript{58}

**Coordinated School Health Program**

Since 1987, the United States Center for Disease Control (CDC) has recommended that schools take a coordinated approach when addressing the health and wellbeing of students. More recently, the CDC, in collaboration with the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and leaders in the fields of public health and education, developed the Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child (WSCC) model. This 10-component model recognizes the important role that student psychosocial and physical environments, families, and community agencies play in improving student learning and health in our nation’s schools (see Figure 17).\textsuperscript{59,60} The model also calls for the need to engage students as active participants in their own learning and health.

![Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child Model](image)

**Figure 17. Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child Model**

\textsuperscript{57} [http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/ne/yr14/yr14rel107.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/ne/yr14/yr14rel107.asp)

\textsuperscript{58} [https://www.wested.org/wp-content/files_mf/1414600912familyengagementframework2.pdf](https://www.wested.org/wp-content/files_mf/1414600912familyengagementframework2.pdf)

\textsuperscript{59} [https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/wscc/approach.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/wscc/approach.htm)

\textsuperscript{60} [https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/wscc/index.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/wscc/index.htm)
There is considerable overlap between the components incorporated in the CDC’s WSCC model and major tenants of PBIS and SCCOE’s Parent Engagement Initiative which are discussed in greater detail above. Outside of those programs, SCCOE has worked diligently to promote student health and wellness through the provision of leadership and technical support. The Coordinated School Health Program, led by SCCOE’s Safe and Healthy School Department, supports the following:

- California Healthy Kids Survey – a statewide survey of resiliency, protective factors, risk behaviors, and school climate that serves as a critical component for school improvement;\(^{61}\)
- Oral Health Assessment Reporting – a California Education Code (Section 4945.8) that mandates all school districts submit an annual report detailing the status of oral health assessments among students;\(^{62}\)
- Comprehensive Sexual Health and HIV/AIDS Prevention Education – a positive prevention effort made possible through the American Red Cross that contains six state-of-the-art lessons with materials for teachers, parents, students, and special adaptations for youth at high-risk;\(^{63}\) and
- Tobacco-Use Prevention Education (TUPE) – a state funded program available to schools interested in reducing youth tobacco use among students in grades 6-12 through research-validated instruction techniques and activities that build student knowledge, social skills, and developmental assets.\(^{64}\)

The Coordinated School Health Program serves all districts in the county. As of June 30, 2016, 25 school districts and the Santa Clara County Office of Education have been certified as tobacco-free local education agencies.\(^{65}\)

**Restorative Justice**

Restorative Justice, also known as restorative practice, refers to a set of justice principles that have been applied to the school context and serve as an adaptive alternative to harsh disciplinary action by school administrators. Unlike zero-tolerance policies which mandate suspension or expulsion for certain student misbehavior, restorative justice focuses on repairing the harm caused by student problem behavior and preventing its reoccurrence. In practice, students learn respect, develop stronger relationships with instructors, fellow students and other school staff, and learn to take responsibility for their actions.\(^{66}\) Successful implementation in school settings requires a paradigm shift in the way all school members think about and approach student discipline. This concept is depicted in Figure 18.

\(^{61}\) http://chks.wested.org/

\(^{62}\) http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/oralhealth.asp

\(^{63}\) http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/se/curriculum.asp

\(^{64}\) http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/tupeoverview.asp

\(^{65}\) http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/at/documents/final1617certifiedcounty.pdf

In Santa Clara County, there are a number of programs that have foundations in restorative justice principles that are available to children and families. A full description of these programs can be found on the County of Santa Clara Superior Court website. Among them are the Prevention and Early Intervention Diversion Program that identifies at-risk youth and provides them with opportunities to learn from their mistakes as well as receive support from community-based organizations. Similarly, the District Attorney Truancy Abatement Program trains school administrators on how to help truant children, seek out parent involvement, and make referrals to community resources. All are intended to keep low-level juvenile offenders out of the Juvenile Court System.

In neighboring Alameda County, Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) is leading the way with their school-based Restorative Justice Program. Their strategy involves a three-tiered approach to addressing student misbehavior (see Figure 19). Tier 1 involves the use of social-emotional learning directed at the entire student population to promote community building.

Tier 2 involves the use of non-punitive measures to address instances of harm and conflict. Common practices include the facilitation of harm circles, mediation, and family group conferencing. Student...
offenders and victims are provided with staff-mediated opportunities to collectively address issues resulting in harm. In this way, all parties are involved in the judicial process while giving voice to the person(s) harmed. Offenders are provided with the opportunity to take responsibility for their actions, make amends, and express remorse.

The focus of Tier 3 supports is on re-entry. Support is tailored to the needs of individual students following out-of-school time due to suspension, truancy, expulsion, or incarceration. Students re-entering are welcomed back into their respective school communities. They receive wraparound support from other students, teachers, and school administrators, and are encouraged to develop a greater sense of accountability and achievement. The goal of this support is to reduce reoccurrence while fortifying the foundation for student success.

Figure 19. Oakland Unified School District’s Three-Tier Restorative Justice Model

Source: http://www.ousd.org/restorativejustice

Oakland Unified School District’s Restorative Justice Program has demonstrated positive results. Since 2011, the district has observed a 50% reduction in the number of suspensions. Further, suspensions among African American students for minor issues such as disruption or willful defiance have substantially decreased, from 7.4 to 4.7 percent. Lastly, the majority of staff surveyed believe that the program has improved the way students resolve conflicts, has resulted in students building development assets and learning life skills, and has improved the overall school climate.
TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

“We have to make sure that school resource officers understand that the way a schoolhouse is policed is far different from the strategies that are used on the street.”\(^71\)

At the most basic level, SROs should receive training on how to interact with children. As of 2017, only 12 states in the U.S. have laws requiring said training. California is one of those states. According to California Education Code Section 38000:

“Every school police reserve officer shall complete a course of training approved by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training relating directly to the role of school police reserve officers. The school police reserve officer training course shall address guidelines and procedures for reporting offenses to other law enforcement agencies that deal with violence on campus and other school related matters, as determined by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.”\(^72\)

Unfortunately, while training is mandated at the state level, several issues exist. One problem is that there is no one standard for training. Another is that there exists a large degree of variability in the emphasis of training programs.

Survey data collected from SROs provided additional insight into these issues. When asked about training completed, most but not all listed the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards Training (POST) SRO Core Course as their training mechanism. This course requires a minimum of 40 hours to complete and covers topics such as:

- Fundamental statutes and case laws relating to policing in a school environment;
- School disciplinary systems;
- Roles, responsibilities, and philosophies of SRO programs;
- Common adolescent behavior and emotional issues;
- Fundamental counseling, interviewing, mediation, and problem-solving techniques; and,
- Special education classifications and appropriate actions with children with special needs.\(^73\)

The fact that portions of the POST SRO Core Course are dedicated to training SROs on working with children with special needs and understanding youth behavior and emotional issues is a step in the right direction; however, data collected from SROs suggests this coverage is inadequate. Further, responses from school and district administrators were indicative of a low level of trust in SRO knowledge as it relates to working with children with special needs and those with disabilities. Responses from all parties provided that SROs may also lack the skills needed to determine if children have mental health needs.

\(^71\) https://nasro.org/news/in-the-media/school-policing-different-street-policing-nasco-president-nbc-4-washington/

\(^72\) http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN&sectionNum=832.2.

\(^73\) http://lib.post.ca.gov/Publications/60700295.pdf
Ensuring that SROs are well-versed in all matters that apply to working with youth in schools must be a priority of school districts and law enforcement agencies. The issue is not that there is a lack of training options but of associated costs and time. Available training options are expensive and require days to weeks to complete. With that stated, SROs, in order to be truly effective in their work, need to be provided with planned training time, preferably on a re-occurring, annual basis, as well as financial support. The following listing of training courses provided by the National Association for School Resource Officers (NASRO) summarizes the types of training that are available to SROs (as opposed to non-sworn law enforcement personnel or SRO supervisors), their time commitment, and associated costs as of 2017:

**Basic SRO Course**
The Basic SRO Course is a five-day, forty-hour (40) block of instruction designed for law enforcement officers and school safety professionals working in an educational environment and with school administrators. The course provides tools for officers to build positive relationships with both students and staff. Emphasis is placed on:

- Law Enforcement Function – explains the difference between law enforcement on the street and law enforcement in a school with subcomponents on understanding teen brains and de-escalation techniques;
- Mentoring students – tools on how to be a positive role model and conduct informal counseling techniques; and
- Guest speaking – classroom management strategies that SROs can use to better educate students in a classroom setting.

The cost for this training is $495 for non-NASRO members. Members receive a $50 savings.

**Advanced SRO Course**
The Advanced SRO Course offers a three-day, 24-hour extension to the Basic SRO Course that follows the SRO triad model for school policing which involves law enforcement, educator, and counselor roles. The cost for this training is $395 for non-NASRO members, $345 for members.

**School Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)**
The School CPTED is a three-day, 24-hour course that teaches design, management, and activity strategies to improve school safety and reduce opportunities for crime to occur and fear of crime. The CPTED concept is designed to help SROs understand the connections between the physical environment and the behavior of people. Those that complete the course are required to complete a written test. If passed, SROs are provided with a Certificate of Completion. The cost for this training is $395 for non-NASRO members, $345 for members.

**Effective Internet Safety Presentations**
Effective Internet Safety Presentations is a three-day, 24-hour course with two objectives. First, SROs acquire tools that can be used to deal with internet-based crimes affecting students such as cyber-bullying and harassment. Second, SROs learn to design and implement internet safety presentations for a variety of audiences that include students, parents, and school staff. The cost for training is $395 for non-NASRO members, $345 for members.
School Law Update

Unlike the courses listed above, School Law Update is a one-day, 8-hour course. It is taught by Dr. Bernard James, Professor of Constitutional Law at Pepperdine University. The course is designed to bring SROs up-to-date on laws relevant to working with students in schools. Subjects include search and seizure, conducting student interviews, and sexual harassment. The cost of this training is $199 for non-NASRO members, $149 for members.

The National Association for School Resource Officers (NASRO) is not the only source of training for police officers working with youth in California schools. Strategies for Youth (SFY), a policy and training organization based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, has eight training centers in California that are dedicated to improving relationships between police and youth through community engagement, police training, relationship building, and youth outreach programs. Strategies for Youth also provides resources to students and their families. Pictured below is a SFY reference card that teaches students how to properly interact with officers (see Figure 20).

Figure 20. Strategies for Youth “Dos and Don’ts” Cards

![Dos and Don'ts Cards](http://strategiesforyouth.org/for-communities/dos-and-donts/)

While there are no SFY centers in Santa Clara County, there are three centers located within a 60-mile radius in neighboring San Francisco, Monterey, and Contra Costa County. The trainings provided through SFY require a two- to four-day commitment. A description of the training targeted to SROs is provided below. Unlike NASRO trainings, SFY training course materials explicitly prepare officers for working with specific groups of children, such as those that have experienced traumatic life experiences and female youth.

---

[^74]: [http://strategiesforyouth.org/about/](http://strategiesforyouth.org/about/)
Policing the Teen Brain in School
Policing the Teen Brain in School is a 21-hour course that teaches SROs methods for positive intervention and how to work with youth in special education classes. The training involves interactive lectures, use of scenario-based examples, and discussions with child and adolescent learning disability experts. Participants learn how to identify children with disabilities and applicable intervention techniques. Officers that participate in this training develop core competencies in child and adolescent development, mental health, and trauma, as well as key issues in special education.

Program Evaluation and Assessment

“While conducting an evaluation may seem complicated, expensive, or even overwhelming, it is important to remember that program evaluations serve as tools to improve programs. Simply put, program evaluations are conducted to make programs better.”

Program evaluation is conducted to answer basic questions about a program’s effectiveness. As displayed in Figure 21, it involves a cyclical process of planning, implementation, data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Questions such as, “Is a specific program achieving what it is intended to achieve?” and “Through what mechanisms is the program achieving intended goals?” are paramount.

Districts or schools with SROs should employ program evaluation to determine the impact of school policing efforts and to gather information that can be used at a formative level by school administrators and SROs to improve delivery of services. When the focus of the evaluation is on program impact, also known as summative evaluation, those involved with implementation of services should work closely with evaluators to identify outcomes of interest and associated targets that can be used to benchmark progress in the short- and long-term. To do the latter, baselines must be established for selected outcomes.

Figure 21. The Evaluation Process

---

When selecting outcomes, it is important to consider both objective and subjective measures. Objective measures defy interpretation. Either an outcome was achieved or it was not, there is no in-between. The key benefit of using objective measures is that they are quantitative. It is often the case that objective data are more readily available. Examples of objective measures that may be relevant to the study of SRO program impact include student truancy, disciplinary referral, suspension, and expulsion rates. Program success can also be determined by reductions in the number of student citations and arrests. Sources of these data include school and police records.

Subjective measures, while they require more effort to collect than objective data and are subject to issues such as individual biases and differences in interpretation, are important in that they offer insight into personal perception. In the case of SRO program evaluation, perceptions (and change in perceptions) of school climate, support systems, non-punitive and disciplinary interactions between students, SROs and educators, and SRO attributes may serve as valuable pieces of information in determining program success. These same measures can also be used to assess risk and to determine the focus of program efforts. For example, some schools may determine that addressing issues affecting school safety are of lower priority to addressing authoritarian SRO practices. Others may find that threats from outside sources or gang activity are the biggest issues facing student safety.

Subjective data are often collected directly from individuals. Much of the information previously described can be acquired through the administration of student, parent, educator, and SRO surveys similar to those used to inform this body of work, however, other validated measures do exist. The California School Climate, Health, and Learning Survey (CAL-SCHLS) System is one example. It is comprised of three interrelated surveys that were developed by the CDE. One of the surveys, the California Healthy Kids Survey, was introduced in the section on System-Wide, Holistic Approaches to Ensuring Safe and Healthy Learning Environment. The two remaining surveys are:

- The California School Staff Survey (CSSS) – an online, web-based survey that allows for the confidential collection of staff perceptions on teaching and learning conditions to (a) inform decisions about professional development, instruction, learning supports and school reform (b) address the problem of teacher recruitment and retention, (c) link instruction with the assessment of non-cognitive barriers (i.e., substance abuse, violence and victimization, poor student mental health) to learning, and (d) address issues of equity, bias and cultural competence and understand their relations with achievement gap;

- The California School Parent Survey (CSPS) – a brief, 34-item, anonymous survey that allows parents to provide feedback on issues related to parent involvement, the health, well-being and progress of their children, and school climate.

Beyond determining if a program is working, objective and subjective measures can serve as sources of formative feedback that may be used for quality improvement purposes. In the most general sense, school administrators and law enforcement personnel overseeing SRO efforts should be interested in surveying students, parents, teachers and other school staff on satisfaction with SRO services. As discussed in the section on Clear Delineation of Roles, MOUs should dictate that this level of information be used to monitor SRO performance and allow for performance improvement. Supervisors should also take special interest in summative evaluation findings.

---

76 http://cal-schls.wested.org/
77 http://csss.wested.org/
CONCLUSION

The Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE), in collaboration with school and district superintendents, educators, city police departments, and school law enforcement personnel, are working together to ensure that all children attending schools in Santa Clara County are provided with safe and healthy school environments in which they can learn and develop the skills needed to succeed in life. This report provides information on resources and best practices that are intended to facilitate that goal and that were made possible through research by the SCCOE and other agencies/organizations with stake in the state of school policing in Santa Clara County.

School policing, or SRO programs, play a vital role in keeping kids safe from internal and external school threats. Feedback from district and school administrators that use SROs indicates that SROs are instrumental in deescalating events and that their presence facilitates a safe environment. Beyond these benefits, SRO programs have the potential to build stronger, more positive relationships between youth and law enforcement and decrease youth involvement in the juvenile justice system. All are effects that may only be realized when certain conditions are met. Four of those conditions were emphasized in this report and include:

- Clear delineation of school administrator and SRO roles and responsibilities, especially as they pertain to disciplining students;
- Completion of training by SROs that prepares them for working with youth from different backgrounds;
- Regular monitoring and evaluation of SRO program effects for quality assurance and improvement purposes; and
- Utilization of system-wide, holistic approaches to keeping kids safe, healthy, and in school.

The latter may be particularly effective in establishing a foundation for student success. Students benefit from systems that provide multiple supports, from SRO programs that are designed to keep them safe, to strategies that are focused on improving school climate, engaging parents, and changing the way school administrators and educators approach student discipline.

PROGRESS TO-DATE

According to data collected through the administration of surveys to school and district administrators, results from a district inventory on SRO usage, and research on implementation of system-wide approaches:

- Approximately 50% of the districts in Santa Clara County utilize some form of school policing;
- The number of districts receiving Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) technical assistance has more than doubled (from 7 to 15 districts) since 2014 and there are 47 school sites in a current PBIS training sequence;
- As of 2017 there are 18 districts participating in the Parent Engagement Initiative with workshops attended by nearly 15,000 participants and over 200 parent leaders trained; and
- All districts are supported by the Coordinated School Health Program with 25 districts certified as tobacco-free local education agencies as of 2016.
These efforts, combined with California Department of Education and Santa Clara County support for the development and implementation of restorative justice programs, the passage of a statewide policy (Assembly Bill 420) requiring that schools limit suspensions and expulsions due to disruptive behavior (i.e., willful defiance), and school district implementation of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs)\(^78,79\) intent on keeping youth in school and on-track, are paying off. As displayed in Figure 22, suspension rates have steadily decreased since 2011. In Santa Clara County, the suspension rate has decreased by 33% from 2011/12 to 2014/15.

**Figure 22. Suspension Rates (2011/12 – 2014/15)**

Positive effects of statewide, county, and local school district initiatives are also evidenced by decreasing enrollment in the SCCOE’s Alternative Education Program which provides educational services to students who are unable to succeed in traditional education settings.\(^80\) The Alternative Education Program provides educational services to at-risk youth in juvenile probation department facilities (i.e., institutional schools) as well as in community schools. Between 2011/12 and 2016/17 the total enrollment in these schools dropped from 268 to 158 students (see Figure 23); that is a 41% reduction in enrollment over six years.

---

\(^78\) http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/lcfffaq.asp

\(^79\) http://downloads.capta.org/edu/e-school-finance/LCAP.pdf

\(^80\) http://www.sccoe.org/depts/students/alternative-education/Pages/default.aspx
Data on the incidence of felonies, misdemeanors, and status offenses among youth in Santa Clara County provide further proof of impact. According to information collected as part of the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation’s National Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program, the number of juvenile offenses reported by the San Jose Police Department (SJPD) have decreased categorically since 2011 (see Figure 24).

**Figure 24. San Jose Police Department Reports for UCR Juvenile Offenses (2011 - 2015)**

In the most extreme category, the number of SJPD-reported felonies perpetrated by juveniles fell from 1,302 in 2011 to 511 in 2015 (down 61%). The number of reported misdemeanors and status offenses (i.e., age-related offenses that include truancy and curfew violations) were reduced by 62% and 90%, respectively.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Reductions in student suspensions, in enrollment in educational programs that serve youth outside of traditional school settings, and in offenses committed by youth in Santa Clara County, in addition to increases in the availability and implementation of school-based and/or community programs that support students, all serve as indicators of progress. It can be inferred that programs that keep students safe, improve school climate, teach developmental assets and life-skills, and involve parents and members of the community in student initiatives, will continue to spread across Santa Clara County school districts.

In support of that proliferation, the Santa Clara County Office of Education and its Safe and Healthy Schools Department will continue its mission to establish interagency collaborations to cultivate positive and safe school environments that promote student success. This includes ensuring that schools that are utilizing PBIS receive the technical support that they need and that students continue to benefit from the Coordinated School Health Program. Given its critical role in student success, parent engagement will remain a focus, and the SCCOE, through its Parent Engagement Department, will continue to support districts in the development of programs that make parents active participants in their child’s academic, social, and personal development.

Recognizing that implementation of school policing programs is localized to school districts, it is recommended that district and school leaders develop partnerships with stakeholders, from students and their parents to educators and other, external community members and local businesses, with the goal of establishing a strong foundation for school safety, student health, and wellbeing. Regular data collection and reporting, stakeholder engagement, and adding the topic of school discipline and school policing to the agendas of existing forums is encouraged. A periodic review of the challenges and successes related to strategies designed to address school climate should occur. Localized surveys of students, parents, and others can yield important information that would not be available through a countywide data collection. Considerations of the local data may suggest the use of resources to develop or expand preventative and supportive services for youth and families such as mental health providers, counselors, social workers, and others.

According to Ron Stephens, Director of the National School Safety Center, the placement of school safety on the educational agenda by district and school administrators provides the impetus for effective school safety programs. Beyond utilizing the best practices discussed in this report, Stephens recommends that school administrators:
• Establish responsible supervision plans for students during and outside of school hours;
• Minimize and exert control over school entrance and exit points to both pedestrian and vehicular traffic; and
• Utilize technology to create additional avenues for information sharing and facilitate support networks for students.81

Administrators should establish policies and processes for gathering and distributing the data needed to monitor and improve their school safety and related programs, which includes disaggregating data to develop a better understanding of how practices impact students of different races, ethnicities, sexes, and learning and disability statuses. Whenever possible, administrators should strive to make this information available to community members, to raise public awareness and interest in issues pertaining to school climate, student safety, and the state of school policing services in local schools.

81 http://www.schoolsafety.us/about-us/directors-message
APPENDIX A: IN THE MEDIA

NEGATIVE IMPACT OF SCHOOL POLICING AND DISCIPLINARY POLICIES

Police Chief Says Over-Policing Contributes to High Dropout Rate
Source: The Huffington Post
Author: Alexandra Svokos
Link: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/02/25/school-police-officers-prison-pipeline_n_6738174.html

The School-to-Prison Pipeline: Time to Shut it Down
Source: neaToday
Author: Mary Allen Flannery
Link: http://neatoday.org/2015/01/05/school-prison-pipeline-time-shut/

This is Where Students Get Suspended from School the Most
Source: The Huffington Post
Author: Rebecca Klein
Link: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/student-suspension-maps_us_55afb813e4b0a9b948532e18

Police Chief Says Over-Policing Contributes to High Dropout Rate
Source: The Huffington Post
Author: Alexandra Svokos
Link: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/02/25/school-police-officers-prison-pipeline_n_6738174.html

Largest School Districts Vary Widely in Use of ‘Willful Defiance” to Suspend Students
Source: EdSource
Author: Susan Frey
Link: https://edsource.org/2013/largest-school-districts-vary-widely-in-use-of-willful-defiance-to-suspend-students/54381

Disproportionate Number of Disabled, African American Students Arrested in School
Source: The Investigative Unit
Author: Bigad Shaban and Michael Bott
USE OF EXCESSIVE FORCE BY SCHOOL POLICE

Talking to Students About Police Violence, Protests
Source: U.S. News
Author: Lauren Camera

Rough Student Arrest Puts Spotlight on School Police
Source: The New York Times
Author: Richard Perez-Pena, Christine Hauser and Sheryl Gay Stolberg

Federal Judge Rules Alabama High Schools Violated Students’ Rights by Pepper-Spraying Them
Source: Mother Jones
Author: Allie Gross
Link: http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/02/birmingham-school-police-trial-splic

Chokeholds, Brain Injuries, Beatings: When School Cops Go Bad
Source: Mother Jones
Author: Jaeah Lee
Link: http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/05/police-school-resource-officers-k-12-misconduct-violence

The Criminalization of Being a Kid: Officer Allegedly Shackles Elementary Student for Minor Infraction
Source: Think Progress
Author: Sam P.K. Collings
Link: https://thinkprogress.org/the-criminalization-of-being-a-kid-officer-allegedly-shackles-elementary-student-for-minor-infractio-18e38a44527d

POOR TRAINING AND INAPPROPRIATE UTILIZATION OF SROs

Police in Schools: Arresting Developments. Too Many American Schools Use Police Officers to Enforce Classroom Discipline
Source: The Economist
Author: Not Listed
Short-Staffed San Jose Police Department Unable to Fill Needs for School Resource Officers

Source: NBC Bay Area News
Author: Damian Trujillo

Why So Few School Cops are Trained to Work With Kids

Source: The Atlantic
Author: Mark Keierleber

Nearly 250,000 Bay Area Students Attend Schools With No Guidelines in Place for Campus Police Officers

Source: NBC Bay Area News
Author: Bigad Shaban, Michael Bott and Michael Horn
APPENDIX B: RESOURCES AND SERVICES FOR YOUTH

CITY OF SAN JOSE

After School Programs
(408) 793-5565 • www.sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?NID=3057
A partnership with the City of San José, school districts, community-based organizations, teachers and parents to provide safe, fun and enriching after-school activities for youth.

Anti-Graffiti Program
1 (866) 249-0543 24-hour hotline • 408-975-7233 • www.sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?NID=606
Call the hotline to report graffiti in your neighborhood. Their mobile app is “San José Clean.”

City of San José Call Center
(408) 535-3500 • www.sanjoseca.gov
Directory assistance for finding City of San José departments. Main City webpage.

Clean Slate Tattoo Removal Program
(408) 794-1660 • www.sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?NID=565
Serves former gang-involved and at-risk youth of San José between the ages of 14-25 who find tattoos to be a barrier to education and employment.

Independent Police Auditor (IPA)
• https://www.facebook.com/SanJoseIPA/ • (408) 794-6226 • www.sanjoseca.gov/ipa
A non-police office where you can file a complaint against a San José police officer. A Student’s Guide to Police Practices can be downloaded from the website in English, Spanish or Vietnamese. Presentations about the topics in this guide and IPA services are available to the public.

Mayor’s Gang Prevention Task Force (MGPTF)
(408) 794.1630 • www.sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?nid=642
A work group made up of City, county and state entities, community-based organizations, SJPD, faith community, schools, and other stakeholders that offer community resources to fight negative influences that youth receive from gangs. Please call for more information on available resource.

Safe School Campus Initiative
(408) 277-2741 • www.sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?NID=565
A mobile outreach unit that provides citywide mediation for street gangs and intervention in volatile situations. Works to reduce gang violence and refers gang involved individuals to intervention programs.

San José Fire Department
(408) 794-7000 (non-emergency) • Emergency #911 • www.sjfd.org
Public education staff are available to meet with schools, community organizations or other groups to do presentations on fire and life safety, community awareness, fire station tours, and others.
San José Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services Department
(408) 535-3570 • www.sanjoseca.gov/prns
Offers a variety of programs throughout San José for residents, families and youth. See their website for the Citywide Activity Guide, recreational activities, parks, youth programs and neighborhood services.

San José Police Department
(408) 277-8900 (non-emergency) • Emergency #911 • www.sjpd.org

San José Police Department - Crime Prevention Unit
(408) 277-4133 (non-emergency) • Emergency #911 • https://www.sjpd.org/bfo/community
Specialists provide safety information, referrals, and training on various safety topics for neighborhoods, community groups and businesses.

San José Public Library
(408) 808-2000 • www.sjlibrary.org • youth service department, call (408) 808-2183 • youth.sjpl@sjlibrary.org
San José Public Library enriches lives by fostering lifelong learning and by ensuring that every member of the community has access to a vast array of ideas and information. Offers homework resources, job and vocational guidance resources.

Work2future Youth Training Center
(408) 794-1234 • www.work2futureyouth.org
Assists with youth employment, career counseling, job search services, and job training. Some services require eligibility.

Youth Commission
(408) 793-5559 • www.sanjoseca.gov/clerk/CommissionBoard/Youth.asp
Provides youth with the opportunity to be involved in the City of San José’s decision making process. The Commission is the official youth advisory group to the City Council and serves to educate the community about youth issues.

OTHER RESOURCES

Al-Anon/Alateen
(408) 379-1051 • www.ncwsa.org
Al-Anon groups meet regularly to help families and friends of alcoholics recover from the effects of living with the problem drinking of a relative or friend. Alateen is part of Al-Anon and focuses on helping young people.

Alcoholics Anonymous (AA)
(408) 374-8511 • www.aasanjose.org
AA groups meet regularly to help people recover from alcoholism. The only requirement for membership is a desire to stop drinking.
Alum Rock Counseling Center (ARCC)
(408) 294-0500 • www.alumrockcc.org • (408) 294-0579 24/7
Youth Crisis Hotline Offers a range of crisis intervention, case management, counseling, mentoring, prevention, education, and early intervention services including programs designed for at-risk youth and families at schools and community sites throughout east and central San José.

Asian Americans for Community Involvement (AACI)
(408) 975-2730 • www.aaci.org
Provides youth support groups and mentoring on school campuses; afterschool programming; mental health, substance abuse, problem gambling, HIV testing, domestic violence, and medical services.

Asian American Recovery Services, Inc. (AARS)
(408) 271-3900 • www.aars.org
Works to decrease substance abuse in the Bay Area within the Asian and Pacific Islander communities. AARS develops and provides innovative outreach treatment, prevention, and research services for its target populations.

Big Brothers Big Sisters of the Bay Area
(408) 586-0150 • www.bbbsba.org
Builds responsible, independent children and youth by matching each with a supportive and caring adult role model. Offers mentoring programs for children who are at-risk for substance abuse, juvenile crime, academic failure, low self-esteem, teen pregnancy, and gang activity.

Bill Wilson Center
(408) 243-0222 • (408) 850-6125 Crisis Line • www.billwilsoncenter.org
Supports and strengthens the community by serving youth and families through counseling, housing, education, and advocacy.

The Billy DeFrank Lesbian, Gay, & Transgender Community Center
(408) 293-3040 • www.defrankcenter.org
Provides a safe space for youth and young adults to develop their sexual and gender identities, and to realize their potential as valuable members of the community. Several groups meet on a weekly basis and drop-ins are always welcome.

California Youth Crisis Line
(800) 843-5200 24-hour hotline • www.youthcrisisline.org
Offers support, encouragement, and referrals to youth in crisis who need help with issues such as family problems, sexual assault, eating disorders, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, suicide and more. Call for a referral or just to talk.

California Youth Outreach
(408) 979-3043 • www.cyoutreach.org
Serves gang-impacted youth, families and their communities with education services, intervention programs and resource opportunities that support a healthy and positive lifestyle.
Catholic Charities
(408) 468-0100 • http://www.catholiccharitiesscc.org/
Offers recreational activities, gang prevention and intervention, youth and parent support groups, community resources, street outreach for run-aways, mentoring, and truancy outreach.

Catholic Charities
• Immigration and Citizenship Services (408)-944-0691• http://www.catholiccharitiesscc.org/immigration-and-citizenshipservices
Offers eligible immigrants navigate the process of becoming a U.S. citizen services include assessments of eligibility, application assistance, interview preparation, and referral to English and citizen classes. Resettlement and retraining services for refugees and asylees who have fled war, persecution, and violence in the home countries.

Child Abuse Reporting Hotline (Child Protective Services Agency)
(408) 299-2071 24-hour hotline • (800) 422-4453 • www.childhelp.org
A 24-hour hotline where individuals can report child abuse and/or neglect. Children and youth can request help for themselves and/or their families.

ConXion to Community
(408) 213-0961 • www.conxion.org
Offers education, career development, and job training programs with a focus on services for youth ages 16-24. GED is offered in collaboration with East Side Union High School District.

Community Solutions Center, Inc.
(408) 225-9163 • www.communitysolutions.org
Provides group & family counseling, alcohol & drug assessment and treatment, home-based support for teen parents, foster care housing & support for teen parents, transitional housing for homeless youth & young parents, youth activity center, and teen assault awareness programs.

Crime Stoppers of Silicon Valley (Anonymous Tip Hotline)
(408) 947-STOP • (408) 947-7867 • www.svcrimestoppers.org
An independent organization where you can report information about a crime without having to give your name or appear in court. You may also submit information on-line.

Department of Social Services Application Center
(408) 758-3800 • www.mybenefitscalwin.org
Assists with the application process for food stamps, cash aid and MediCal.

Uplift Family Services
(408) 379-3790 • (877) 412-7474 Crisis Line • www.uplifts.org
Crisis line for teens and children dealing with trauma and severe depression. Other programs include family-centered (in-home) wraparound care and truancy case management services. For more information, call (408) 379-3796.
Home First (408) 539-2100 • www.homefirstscc.org
Provides shelter, housing opportunities, and supportive services for homeless individuals, families, and youth.

Family and Children Services
(408) 292-9353 • www.fcservices.org
Provides counseling, deaf and hard of hearing services, gay/lesbian services, HIV/ AIDS counseling, program for youth emancipating from foster care and juvenile probation, psychiatric services, school-based services, seriously mentally ill services, and youth leadership development.

Firehouse Community Development Corporation
(408) 327-9622 • www.the-firehouse.org
Empowers youth and their families to break the cycles of poverty and become productive members of the community. Offers gang mediation, intervention response, services for adjudicated youth, and parent/family support services.

Foothill Community Health Center
(408) 729-9700 • www.sjffcc.org
Provides high quality comprehensive affordable healthcare to community. Services are available to anyone, regardless of age ethnicity, social status, or ability to pay.

Fresh Lifelines for Youth, Inc. (FLY)
(408) 263-2630 • www.freshlifelinesforyouth.com
Provides mentoring, leadership training, and legal education for youth to reduce juvenile crime and incarceration.

Girl Scouts of Santa Clara County
408-287-4170 • 800-447-4475 • www.girlscoutsofsccc.org
Provides girls and young women, ages 5-17, with life skills that will empower them to reach their full potential, make life-enhancing decisions, develop self-esteem, and be active.

La Raza Roundtable
(408)- 529-1900 • www.facebook.com/LaRazaRoundtable
Holds a monthly forum to discuss issues affecting the community. Brings together community organizations, community leaders, elected officials, private and public sector representatives. Advocates for juvenile justice and works to develop youth leaders.

Legal Advocates for Children and Youth (LACY)
(408) 293-4790 • www.lawfoundation.org/lacy.asp
Free legal information and services in the areas of education/school, youth emancipation, and legal guardianships. Special programs for homeless youth and pregnant/parenting teenagers.
School of Arts and Culture
(408) 794-6250 • http://schoolofartsandculture.org/ • info@schoolofartsandculture.org
Offers a variety of programs, music classes, cultural enrichment programs, folkloric dance, and community engagement activities.

Mexican Consulate
(408) 294-3414 • www.consulmexsj.com
Consular protection and assistance on immigration, civil, labor and criminal matters. Services provided only to Mexican nationals.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
(408) 295-3394 • www.sanjosenaacp.org
The NAACP works to ensure equality of rights, and eliminate hatred and discrimination. The local chapter offers youth scholarships and events.

Narcotics Anonymous (NA)
(408) 998-4200 (24-hour hotline) • www.sjna.org
NA groups meet regularly to help each other stop using drugs and find a new way to live. Membership is open regardless of the type or amount of drugs used.

National Runaway Switchboard
1-800-RUNAWAY (1-800-786-2929) 24-hour hotline • www.1800runaway.org
Help for young people who are thinking of running away, have friends who have run away, or have run and want to go home. Also provides educational materials for teachers.

National Dating Abuse Hotline (NTDAH)
(866) 331-9474 (24-hour hotline) • www.loveisrespect.org
A 24-hour hotline that provides immediate and confidential help to teens (ages 13-18) experiencing dating abuse. There is no charge for the phone call.

Next Door, Solutions to Domestic Violence
(408) 279-2962 (24-hour hotline) • (408) 501-7550 • www.nextdoor.org
Crisis counseling for victims of domestic violence. For administration, legal services, shelter, support groups and counseling, please call (408) 501-7550.

Office of the District Attorney, Santa Clara County
(408) 299-7400 • (408) 501-7550 • www.santaclara-da.org
This office is responsible for prosecuting crimes in Santa Clara County. They also offer information on the criminal process and a resource guide for crime victims.

Office of Human Relations, Santa Clara County
(408) 792-2300 • www.sccgov.org/portal/site/ohr
Reduces discrimination and helps the community through a Youth Task Force, Domestic Violence Council, Immigrant Relations & Integration Services, Dispute Resolutions Program, Network for a Hate-Free, Institute for Non-Violence and Human Relations Commission.
Office of the Public Defender, Santa Clara County
(408) 299-7700 • www.sccgov.org/portal/site/opd/
This office provides legal representation if a person is charged with a crime in Santa Clara County but cannot afford a private lawyer. They also provide information on various types of cases and special programs.

Pathway Society, Inc.
(408) 244-1834 • www.pathwayinc.com
Provides counseling for families, individuals, and groups regarding drug addiction, substance abuse, and other issues.

Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG)
(408) 270-8182 • www.pflagsanjose.org
Offers support, education and advocacy to lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgender persons and their friends and family members.

San José Police Activities League (PAL)
(408) 272-9725 • www.sjpdpal.com
A youth crime prevention program that uses education, athletics and recreation to cement a bond between officers and youth. Offers cheerleading, football, softball, baseball and soccer.

Silicon Valley Career Technical Education Center
(408) 723-6400 • http://www.metroed.net/SVCTE/
The Silicon Valley Career Technical Education offers courses within 12 industry sectors where junior and senior high school students can explore and develop technical skills that will lead them to higher education or into the workplace.

Silicon Valley De-Bug (De-Bug)
(408) 971-4965 • www.siliconvalleydebug.com
A collective of writers, artists, organizers, and workers that publishes De-Bug Magazine and produces Block 2 Block Radio and Open-World TV, has media workshops for schools and community organizations, and fights for justice through Community campaigns.

Suicide Crisis Hotline, County of Santa Clara
(855) 278-4204 (24-hours/day) www.sccgov.org/sites/mhd/Resources/SP/Pages/default.aspx
Immediate and confidential emotional support and crisis intervention for people in lifethreatening situations.

Ujima Adult & Family Services, Inc.
(408) 928-1700
Offers various services targeting African families and youth at risk. Provides 24-hour home-based case management services to those who are involved in the juvenile justice system and African life skills groups for youth and families.
Planned Parenthood Mar Monte
(408) 287-7526 • (408) 971-6963 • www.ppmMarmonte.org
Planned Parenthood is a national leader in providing and advocating for sexual and reproductive health care services.

YWCA Silicon Valley
(408) -749-0793 • http://ywca-sv.org/
Counseling for victims of domestic violence. Presentations on healthy relationships, and training for peer education on domestic violence. Provides rape crisis services.
# GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractual Agreement</strong></td>
<td>A voluntary arrangement between two or more parties that is enforceable by law as a binding legal agreement and in which there is a promise to do something (deliverables) for a valuable benefit (payment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Assets</strong></td>
<td>Positive experiences and qualities that influence young people’s development, helping them become caring, responsible, and productive adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>A type of evaluation that typically occurs during a program cycle that involves an on-going process for the collection of feedback and assessment to improve a program’s quality during its implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Control Accountability Plan</strong></td>
<td>LCFF requires that school districts work with parents, educators, employees and the community to establish Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs) that describe a school district’s overall vision for students, establish annual goals that are aligned with state priorities which include engagement parents and improving school climate, and the specific actions the district will take to achieve those goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Control Funding Formula</strong></td>
<td>Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) is a local education agency (LEA) state funding system first implemented in 2013/14 that eliminated revenue limits and cut most state categorical programs. The formula creates funding targets based on student characteristics and grants districts greater flexibility in using funds to improve student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memorandum of Understanding</strong></td>
<td>A formal agreement between two or more parties outlining the terms and details of an understanding, including each parties’ requirements, roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports</strong></td>
<td>A proactive approach to establishing the behavioral supports and social culture needed for all students in a school to achieve social, emotional and academic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism</strong></td>
<td>Repeated or habitual relapse, as in the tendency of a convicted criminal to reoffend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Justice</td>
<td>A system of criminal justice that focuses on the rehabilitation of offenders through reconciliation with victims and the community at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policing</td>
<td>Activities (e.g., education, counseling, mentoring, law enforcement) conducted by law enforcement on school grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Resource Officer</td>
<td>Sworn law enforcement officers who are responsible for providing security and crime prevention services in the school environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-to-Prison Pipeline</td>
<td>A metaphor used to describe the increasing patterns of contact students have with the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems as a result of the recent practices implemented by educational institutions, zero-tolerance policies and the use of police in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Evaluation</td>
<td>A type of evaluation that typically occurs at the end of a program cycle and involves an examination of outcomes to determine program effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Informed Care</td>
<td>An organizational structure and treatment framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma. Trauma informed care emphasizes physical, psychological and emotional safety and helps survivors rebuild a sense of control and empowerment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>An average resulting from the multiplication of each component by a factor reflecting its importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willful Defiance</td>
<td>Term used to describe minor student misbehavior such as disrupting school activities or otherwise disregarding the valid authority of school staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Tolerance Discipline</td>
<td>A strict enforcement of regulations and bans against undesirable behaviors or possession of items by school staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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