

# Kirkland School Resource Officer Task Force

Report of Recommendations to  
Kirkland City Council and Lake Washington School District Board of Directors

Final – March 2020





Kirkland City Council  
123 5<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Kirkland, Washington 98033

Lake Washington School District Board of  
Directors  
16250 NE 74th Street  
Redmond, Washington 98052

Dear Kirkland City Council and Lake Washington School District Board of Directors,

The Kirkland School Resource Officer (SRO) Task Force is pleased to convey its recommendations in response to its charge in Resolution R-5339 to:

- become educated on the current SRO program,
- compare the current SRO program to national best practices, and
- make recommendations on improvements to the program to the City and the District.

The decision to bring SROs to middle schools in Kirkland was made prior to the convening of the task force.

The task force consisted of community members representing various organizations and perspectives, as well as leadership staff from the City and District. The City contracted with an external consultant to help plan and facilitate task force meetings, and the group met seven times between June 2019 and January 2020.

The task force was convened in response to concerns from the Kirkland Human Service Commission and other Kirkland residents about possible unintended consequences of a police presence on middle school campuses, specifically regarding potential disproportionate impacts on students of color and students with disabilities, as have been documented in other communities. Generally, the task force found that the Kirkland SRO program uses best practices for officer training, does not involve officers in school discipline, and employs experienced officers.

The task force was impressed at the experience and training that the current Kirkland SROs had received, their approach to interacting with students, and the openness of executive leadership of the City and District to hear and discuss our concerns.

The attached report reflects the task force's process of review and articulates additional recommendations and resources to further explore in order to improve Kirkland's SRO program. The task force's program review process was intended to be high level and did not include in-depth review of the effectiveness of various SRO program best practices.

Through the task force's conversations, research, and review, the group identified several recommendations to help address concerns in the community, including two immediate improvements. First, the process for data collection and reporting of student contacts should be more robust to ensure that the SRO program is using best practices and is not causing unintended negative consequences, particularly for students of color, LGBTQ+ students, and students with disabilities. Second, there needs to be continuous re-introduction of the SRO program to parents, students, and the school community in order to communicate the program's purpose, the role of the SROs, their responsibilities in the schools, and students' rights. Included as an attachment to the report is a list of additional references that the task force hopes the City and District will refer to as the SRO program continues to improve and evolve over time.

Additionally, the task force identified the need for a consistent statement of purpose for the SRO program to be used in the various authorizing documents that govern the program. The task force developed and recommends the following statement:

The Kirkland School Resource Officer program is a partnership between the City of Kirkland and the Lake Washington School District. The primary purposes of the School Resource Officer (SRO) Program are to:

- Help keep students physically, socially and emotionally safe at school.
- Provide for positive interactions between the SROs and students, families, and community members in order to make the Police Department more accessible and approachable.
- Connect students with supportive services.
- Help keep students out of the criminal justice system.

The task force was pleased that some of its recommendation for community introductions was immediately implemented, including an introduction of the SROs at the PTSA Council meeting on December 5, various in-person meet-and-greets at the schools during the week of December 16, and a video published on December 19 introducing the SROs to the community. We appreciate the responsiveness of City and District staff for this recommendation, and we look forward to the review and implementation of our other recommendations by the City Council, School Board, and City and District leadership.

Finally, it is worth noting that between the authorization of the task force in October 2018 and the first task force meeting in June 2019, State legislation codified RCW 28A.320.124, which was made available in October 2019. This new RCW has a required compliance date of September 2020 and includes several key requirements related to the SRO program, which the task force incorporated into its report.

Thank you for being open to community feedback about the SRO program and for the opportunity to serve on the task force. Task force members would be pleased to answer questions or provide further information as you consider our recommendations.

Respectfully,  
The Kirkland School Resource Officer Task Force

Bill Blake, Safety & Security Supervisor, LWSD  
Marjorie (MJ) Carlson, Indivisible Kirkland  
Derrick Dotson, LWSD Equity Team  
Scott Emry, Manager, Risk Health, and Safety Management, LWSD  
Nihal Fahim, LWSD Equity Team  
Amy Falcone, Kirkland Human Services Commission  
Matt Gillingham, Associate Superintendent, Student and Community Services, LWSD  
David Godfrey, Kirkland Human Services Commission  
Cherie Harris, Police Chief, City of Kirkland  
Gloria Henderson, Director, Opportunity, Equity, & Inclusion, LWSD  
Robert King, School Resource Officer, City of Kirkland  
Savannah Klein, Kirkland Youth Council  
Debbie Lacy, Executive Director, Eastside Refugee and Immigrant Coalition  
Diana LaFornara, LWSD Equity Team  
Mindy Lincicome, President, PTSA Council  
Jane Stavem, Superintendent, LWSD, co-chair  
Kurt Triplett, City Manager, City of Kirkland, co-chair  
Al Viellete, LWSD Equity Team

# CONTENTS

- METHODOLOGY ..... 1
  - Task Force Meetings - Overview ..... 1
  - Process Used for Review of Best Practices ..... 3
- RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 5
  - Recommendations related to the SRO program’s various authorizing documents..... 5
    - Recommendation 1.1: Define a clear statement of purpose for the SRO program that includes “help keep students out of the criminal justice system” as one key purpose of the SRO program. .... 5
    - Recommendation 1.2: Align authorization documents related to the SRO program to use a consistent purpose statement and roles and responsibilities. .... 6
    - Recommendation 1.3: Include future documents currently being developed by the State Superintendent’s Office to update relevant authorizing documents, such as the City-District contract, KPD policies, and SRO job description..... 6
  - Recommendations related to the SRO program in general ..... 7
    - Recommendation 2.1: Create proactive communication materials to better introduce the SRO program to the school community, including potentially-impacted community members. .... 7
    - Recommendation 2.2: SROs should meet with affinity groups, which are groups formed around a shared interest or common goal, to learn about the varied perspectives and experiences of students and families. .. 7
    - Recommendation 2.3: Formalize the community feedback requirement of RCW 28A.320.124, with a particular focus on proactive outreach to potentially-impacted community members. .... 8
    - Recommendation 2.4: Explore ways for SROs to be provided information on student behavior-intervention plans for use in emergency response situations, so SROs are best prepared to interact with students who may have specific needs. .... 8
    - Recommendation 2.5: Explore ways to regularly collect and report relevant data that indicates whether disparate negative impacts are occurring for particular groups of students, including students of color, LGBTQ+ students, and students with disabilities..... 9
    - Recommendation 2.6: Evaluate additional mechanisms for feedback, such as 360 or other similar evaluation tools, that includes students, staff, and families to help inform existing evaluation protocols. .... 9
  - Recommendations related to SRO experience and training..... 10
    - Recommendation 3.1: Update training requirements and offerings for SROs to meet or exceed expectations for RCW 28A.320.124. .... 10
    - Recommendation 3.2: Maintain the current expectation of NASRO training for all SROs. .... 10
    - Recommendation 3.3: Ensure SROs receive training on referring students to counseling or other services. . 10
    - Recommendation 3.4: Maintain the current hiring requirement of a minimum of two years of experience as a commissioned police officer. Additionally, in the SRO job description, pursuant to bargaining with the Police Guild, consider replacing “willingness and desire” with “demonstrated ability” with respect to interactions with youth..... 10
    - Recommendation 3.5: Continue emphasizing retention of SROs through the current five-year SRO assignment commitment. .... 11
- NEXT STEPS ..... 12

# METHODOLOGY

## Task Force Meetings - Overview

The task force first met on June 25, 2019. The purpose of the first meeting was to orient the task force members to the current School Resource Officer (SRO) program and to begin to identify interests and concerns about Kirkland's SRO program, as well as SRO programs in general. The meeting primarily consisted of short presentations by various subject matter experts, including SROs from Kirkland, Redmond, and Sammamish. The task force was also joined by the Chief of Police from the Sammamish Police Department and the Community Engagement Division Sergeant from the Redmond Police Department, as well as school principals from Kirkland Middle School, Lake Washington High School, and Redmond Middle School, who provided additional insight about the SRO program across the District.

At that meeting, task force members raised concerns about the lack of representation by students and parents of color on the task force. Additionally, there were questions related to how the District employs discipline and how the incidence of discipline impacted students of color and students with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Based on that feedback, the City Manager and Superintendent placed the task force on hold during the summer to determine how to best address those concerns.

When school began again in September, the District invited several community members from its District Equity Team to ensure greater representation of the community on the task force. With additional members identified, the task force next met on October 23. This meeting provided for the introduction of new members to the work of the group, additional presentations on District discipline data and SRO training, and further identification of concerns related to SRO programs generally.

Between the authorization of the task force in October 2018 and the first task force meeting in June 2019, State legislation codified [RCW 28A.320.124](#), which was made available in October 2019. This new legislation, with a required compliance date of September 2020, includes several key requirements related to SRO training, SRO program review involving the community, clear roles and responsibilities as it relates to school discipline, collection and reporting of data to guard against disparities in impact, and a clear process for collecting and investigating complaints against SROs.

Specifically, RCW 28A.320.124 states that SRO training must include:

- a) Constitutional and civil rights of children in schools, including state law governing search and interrogation of youth in schools;
- b) Child and adolescent development;
- c) Trauma-informed approaches to working with youth;
- d) Recognizing and responding to youth mental health issues;
- e) Educational rights of students with disabilities, the relationship of disability to behavior, and best practices for interacting with students with disabilities;
- f) Collateral consequences of arrest, referral for prosecution, and court involvement;
- g) Resources available in the community that serve as alternatives to arrest and prosecution and pathways for youth to access services without court or criminal justice involvement;

- h) Local and national disparities in the use of force and arrests of children;
- i) De-escalation techniques when working with youth or groups of youth;
- j) State law regarding restraint and isolation in schools, including RCW 28A.600.485;
- k) Bias free policing and cultural competency, including best practices for interacting with students from particular backgrounds, including English learners, LGBTQ, and immigrants; and
- l) The federal family educational rights and privacy act (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g) requirements including limits on access to and dissemination of student records for noneducational purposes.

Additionally, RCW 28A.320.124 defines needed elements of the contract between the City and the District. Such an agreement must be reviewed and adopted annually in a process that includes parents, students, and community members. Elements of the agreement must include, at a minimum:

- a) A clear statement regarding school resource officer duties and responsibilities related to student behavior and discipline that:
  - a) Prohibits a school resource officer from becoming involved in formal school discipline situations that are the responsibility of school administrators;
  - b) Acknowledges the role of a school resource officer as a teacher, informal counselor, and law enforcement officer; and
  - c) Recognizes that a trained school resource officer knows when to informally interact with students to reinforce school rules and when to enforce the law;
- b) School district policy and procedure for teachers that clarify the circumstances under which teachers and school administrators may ask an officer to intervene with a student;
- c) Annual collection and reporting of data regarding calls for law enforcement service and the outcome of each call, including student arrest and referral for prosecution, disaggregated by school, offense type, race, gender, age, and students who have an individualized education program or plan developed under section 504 of the federal rehabilitation act of 1973;
- d) A process for families to file complaints with the school and local law enforcement agency related to school resource officers and a process for investigating and responding to complaints; and
- e) Confirmation that the school resource officers have received the training required under subsection (1) of this section.

In its deliberations, the task force recognized that RCW 28A.320.124 will address many of the initial concerns explored by the task force that are not already incorporated in the SRO program.

Based on the concerns expressed at the meetings up to this point and the additional background materials including the new RCW section, City staff and task force members created three working documents that would help facilitate the work of the task force:

- Best practices for the SRO program in general;
- Best practices for SRO experience and training; and
- Comparing authorizing documents for the SRO program.



## Process Used for Review of Best Practices

To generate the first draft of the working documents, City staff referenced all materials provided by task force members and compiled a list of best practices that pertained to SRO programs. Some materials provided best practices that did not pertain directly to an SRO program, such as providing additional funding to counselor resources or not having SROs in the first place. Such best practices were not included in the first draft of the working documents, as those best practices involved policy decisions outside the scope of the task force's work. It should also be noted that the best practices identified and compiled in the working documents do not consist of all best practices possibly applicable to SRO programs. Although not a comprehensive list of all the resources used by individual task force members throughout the task force process, the task force as a group referred to several sources, including:

- American Civil Liberties Union;
- Dignity in Schools Campaign;
- International Association of Chiefs of Police;
- Kirkland Police Department Policy 302 – Handcuffing and Restraints;
- Kirkland Police Department Policy 435 – School Resource Officer Program;
- Kirkland Youth Council webpage on student rights;
- Lake Washington School District Administrative Policy: JFBG – Interviews and Interrogations of Students by Outside Agencies on School Premises;
- Lake Washington School District Administrative Policy: JFBG-R – Interviews and Interrogations of Students by Outside Agencies on School Premises;
- Lake Washington School District Administrative Policy: JFCB – Threats of Violence or Harm;
- Lake Washington School District Administrative Policy: JFCB-R – Threats of Violence or Harm;
- Letter to Kirkland City Council from the City of Kirkland Human Services Commission;
- National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO);
- RCW 28A.320.124 – School resource officer programs;
- RCW 28A.600.485 – Restraint of students;
- Resolution R-5339;
- School Resource Officer Program Contract;
- U.S. Department of Justice – Community Oriented Policing Services; and
- Washington Mass Shootings Work Group - Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs

The three working documents were structured to identify gaps between associated best practice(s) and Kirkland's current status and provided a space for the task force's recommendation(s) for addressing those gaps. The three spreadsheets became helpful tools for the subsequent work of the task force, and the task force referenced and edited them as part of its work. Throughout the task force process, the group received a variety of District and City documents as well as articles for reference, including the City/District SRO contract, the SRO job description, various Kirkland Police Department policies, and articles and reports regarding best practices.

The group next met on November 14. This meeting primarily consisted of small group discussions that used the three working spreadsheets described above. These discussions led to the initial drafting of task force recommendations related to each best practice. At the group's fourth meeting on December 5, the task force again met in small groups to further refine its recommendations.

In addition to the discussions of SRO program concerns and recommendations at the task force meetings, City staff solicited task force members for groups or individuals to reach out to for additional feedback. City staff reached out to all groups or individuals suggested by task force members including ACLU of Washington, Washington Autism Alliance and Advocacy, and Seattle King County NAACP. Washington Autism Alliance and Advocacy was the only organization that has responded to the City's request for more information or point of contact as of March 2020. City staff conducted three interviews with parents of District students, including one who is the Special Needs PTSA Chair for a District school, and one interview with the President/CEO of Washington Autism Alliance and Advocacy. The purpose of the interviews was to ensure that voices beyond those of the task force were being heard and that perspectives not covered by the task force were included in the process.

Based on the feedback collected at all the meetings and direction provided by the task force, City staff drafted an initial letter that would comprise the task force's recommendations to City Council and the School District Board of Directors.

The task force met on December 16 to review and provide edits to the draft letter, the final recommendations charts, and provide any changes. At that meeting, task force members inquired as to the next steps for the recommendations as well as any additional involvement of task force members in the implementation of the recommendations. The task force recognized that it needed more time to further refine its recommendations and to identify how task force members could continue to be involved. The task force met two additional times on January 8 and 28, 2020, to continue discussions and finalize the recommendations of the task force.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The task force drew from the personal experience and expertise of its membership and on research conducted on national best practices to develop recommendations for the City and District. The below recommendations are split into three categories related to the SRO program's authorizing documents, the program in general, and experience and training requirements for SROs.

### Recommendations related to the SRO program's various authorizing documents

**Recommendation 1.1:** Define a clear statement of purpose for the SRO program that includes "help keep students out of the criminal justice system" as one key purpose of the SRO program.

The task force reviewed various documents related to the SRO program, including the City/District contract for SRO services, KPD Policy 435, the SRO job description, and Resolution R-5339, which authorized the creation of the task force. It was clear that the documents had been written at various points in time, as certain elements or concepts that were present in some documents were not present in others. Unifying these documents with a consistent statement of purpose will bring clarity to the intent of the SRO program.

Nationally, one of the most serious concerns about police in schools is that some SRO programs have increased the likelihood of students, especially students of color, becoming involved in the criminal justice system. This often occurs when SROs are made responsible for school discipline, which can result in children's misbehavior being treated as criminal activity rather than a teaching moment.

In the Lake Washington School District, SROs are not involved in the enforcement of the District's discipline policies. And, in practice, Kirkland SROs choose intervention techniques that rarely include the arrest of a student. Rather, they focus on recognizing when students exhibit at-risk behaviors and work with parents and the District to ensure students are directed to the proper resources for counseling and support. The task force supports this approach and believes that it should be a clearly-stated goal of the program.

The task force developed the following purpose statement for the SRO program, which should be used to inform the documents listed above and any other documents related to the SRO program:

The Kirkland School Resource Officer program is a partnership between the City of Kirkland and the Lake Washington School District. The primary purposes of the School Resource Officer (SRO) Program are to:

- Help keep students physically, socially and emotionally safe at school.
- Provide for positive interactions between the SROs and students, families, and community members in order to make the Police Department more accessible and approachable.
- Connect students with supportive services.
- Help keep students out of the criminal justice system.

**Recommendation 1.2: Align authorization documents related to the SRO program to use a consistent purpose statement and roles and responsibilities.**

In addition to Recommendation 1.1, the various authorizing documents that relate to the SRO program should be unified with program roles and responsibility. This will bring clarity to the intent of the SRO program, SROs' roles and responsibilities, and District administration roles and responsibilities, as well as align with newly adopted state law RCW 28A.320.124. For example, any documents should clearly articulate, to the extent possible, that the responsibility of discipline lies with the District and is not within the scope of the SRO program.

**Recommendation 1.3: Include future documents currently being developed by the State Superintendent's Office to update relevant authorizing documents, such as the City-District contract, KPD policies, and SRO job description.**

In January 2020, the State Superintendent Office was drafting model policies and contracts consistent with the RCW provisions described above. The City and District should use these resources to update and inform the authorizing documents that govern the SRO program, and policies and practices should be consistently written and applied between schools while utilizing, to the extent possible, the SRO program purpose statement listed in Recommendation 1.1.

## Recommendations related to the SRO program in general

Recommendation 2.1: Create proactive communication materials to better introduce the SRO program to the school community, including potentially-impacted community members.

As articulated by several task force members, generally the community may not be fully aware of the specifics of Kirkland's SRO program, including the experience level of the officers, SRO training requirements, their roles and responsibilities, student rights, and recourse for concerns about an SRO from community members. This can lead to concerns or questions about the program, particularly for students of color, LGBTQ+ students, students with disabilities, and immigrants as well as families of those students. Options for communication tools include:

- Dedicated webpage about the SRO program, including a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. One element of an FAQ could be to develop a general list of actions or behaviors that will *not* be referred to SROs (with appropriate caveats). For example, cell phones in class are against the rules as is carrying a sharpie, but these will generally not involve an SRO referral. The Dignity in Schools campaign has a good example of such a list in their document "Avoiding Criminalization in School Discipline: Law Enforcement." Other elements of an FAQ could include information on student rights regarding SROs, as well as detailing the scenarios where use of force likely would or would not be required. Clear information on the process to file a complaint or provide other feedback should also be included.
- Video series that introduces the SROs to the community and explains best practices used by the program. This series can be a good resource for continued community education, and the series could be used as a District-wide resource.
- In-person meetings to introduce the SROs to the community through a variety of means, including at PTSA Council and individual PTSA meetings, meet-and-greet opportunities at the schools, and meetings with affinity groups.
- Revise School District information (e.g. Student Handbook and/or Parent Handbook) to include updated information about the SRO program, including its purpose and activities, student rights, and clear grievance procedures.

Such informational materials should be provided to various groups in the community prior to direct engagement with the SRO. Additionally, introductions of the SRO program should occur every year to ensure that students and families that are new to the middle and high schools are oriented to the program.

Recommendation 2.2: SROs should meet with affinity groups, which are groups formed around a shared interest or common goal, to learn about the varied perspectives and experiences of students and families.

Understanding the specific interests and perspectives of affinity groups will help SROs better serve the school community. For a variety of reasons, there are students, families, and other community members that may feel uncomfortable with having armed officers in schools. It is

important to recognize this and to build relationships and rapport with such affinity groups and other communities. Understanding the perspectives of various community groups will help inform how such relationship-building activities can be done most effectively. Learning from affinity groups will help SROs and other staff develop cultural competencies and reduce implicit bias.

Outreach should include regular communication with those in the community potentially impacted - perhaps once or twice a year - to see how community members view the program. As articulated earlier in this report, potentially-impacted community members include, but is not limited to, students of color, LGBTQ+ students, students with disabilities, students new to the country, and their families. This dialogue should seek out diverse perspectives, instead of only relying on people coming forward, with an emphasis on understanding the first-hand perspectives of community members. Additionally, such outreach should include ways to communicate to an intersectional population, especially those with invisible disabilities such as autism.

**Recommendation 2.3: Formalize the community feedback requirement of RCW 28A.320.124, with a particular focus on proactive outreach to potentially-impacted community members.**

Since the District spans four jurisdictions (the cities of Kirkland, Redmond, and Sammamish, and King County), the process for community feedback should be responsive to the needs of specific communities within the District, while also providing for consistent outcomes to the SRO programs in the various jurisdictions. The feedback collection should include qualitative and quantitative data, and could include the use of surveys, focus groups, community meetings, or other feedback collection techniques. For qualitative feedback, metrics should be used to ensure that student perspectives are considered. Also, as required by state law, a process should be established by which concerns about an SRO can be registered and evaluated, and such concerns should be conveyed to the District and the City.

**Recommendation 2.4: Explore ways for SROs to be provided information on student behavior-intervention plans for use in emergency response situations, so SROs are best prepared to interact with students who may have specific needs.**

Students with Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIP) and emergency response protocols may engage in undesirable behaviors which school staff are trained to respond to. Their BIP is very specific about how school staff should respond to specific behaviors.

SROs are not and should not be involved in the administration of behavior plans. However, it could in some cases be valuable for SROs to know that behavior plans exist, so that if an SRO encounters a student exhibiting an undesirable behavior, the SRO knows how best to respond.

This issue is complex and will require further research and evaluation. This recommendation will require compliance with all relevant privacy regulations, including parental or student authorization for that knowledge to be given.

**Recommendation 2.5:** Explore ways to regularly collect and report relevant data that indicates whether disparate negative impacts are occurring for particular groups of students, including students of color, LGBTQ+ students, and students with disabilities.

Accurate data collection is required to understand whether the SRO program is having disparate negative impacts. The District and/or City should develop a system for data analysis for referrals and arrests. This data should only be publicly disclosed in a manner that will avoid identifying individuals when presented.

At least annually, and in accordance with [RCW 28A.320.124](#), the District and City should meet to review the data collected and determine whether changes to the SRO program, as expressed in the SRO program contract, are warranted in order to address any possible negative impacts, particularly disparate impacts as described above.

**Recommendation 2.6:** Evaluate additional mechanisms for feedback, such as 360 or other similar evaluation tools, that includes students, staff, and families to help inform existing evaluation protocols.

In addition to the formal community feedback process referenced in Recommendation 2.4, additional feedback opportunities should be explored. Develop performance measures that articulate what success looks like for the program and individual SROs, including the goals the program aims to achieve and how successful it is in achieving those goals can be measured. Such feedback opportunities should be for both the SRO program and individual SROs.

## Recommendations related to SRO experience and training

**Recommendation 3.1: Update training requirements and offerings for SROs to meet or exceed expectations for RCW 28A.320.124.**

This includes requiring reality-based training so that potential SROs have practical experience working with kids in school settings prior to becoming an SRO, such as on-site shadowing, internships, or similar experiences.

**Recommendation 3.2: Maintain the current expectation of NASRO training for all SROs.**

All Kirkland SROs are required to attend training from NASRO prior to the beginning of their SRO assignment. In addition, ongoing education is available through NASRO as well as training made available on a state-wide or local level. The task force believes that the initial training from NASRO should be supplemented with more advanced training to keep SROs current with trends and best practices.

**Recommendation 3.3: Ensure SROs receive training on referring students to counseling or other services.**

This recommendation supports the SRO purpose of helping keep students out of the criminal justice system by identifying services and supports that can address the underlying causes of at-risk behaviors. Additionally, SROs should be trained on how to provide proactive referrals to support services outside of a criminal behavior context.

**Recommendation 3.4: Maintain the current hiring requirement of a minimum of two years of experience as a commissioned police officer. Additionally, in the SRO job description, pursuant to bargaining with the Police Guild, consider replacing "willingness and desire" with "demonstrated ability" with respect to interactions with youth.**

The Kirkland Police Department promotes from within the department for the special assignment of SRO. The Department does consider the applicants' experience in working with youth populations, including working with special needs populations. The task force believes that it is important to continue this practice and to specifically include it in the Department policy.



Recommendation 3.5: Continue emphasizing retention of SROs through the current five-year SRO assignment commitment.

SROs are intended to be a resource to the students, their families, and to District staff. However, for a variety of reasons, some students and parents have strong concerns about a police presence in schools. The five-year assignment of SROs provides continuity as well as an opportunity for SROs to become acquainted with students and their families. Creating and supporting relationships takes time, and student's familiarity with individual SROs can help relieve some of the apprehension related to uniformed officers in the schools. Continuity in the assignment of officers can help build trust.

## NEXT STEPS

Evaluating and implementing the above recommendations is a process involving multiple authorizing entities, including the City Council, the School District Board of Directors, the Kirkland Chief of Police, the Police Guild, and others. In some cases, further involvement of community member stakeholders should be sought to inform the operationalizing of the recommendations. Although some recommendations may be actionable relatively quickly, others will take time to implement. Finally, some recommendations will be required under the new RCW 28A.320.124

The following table provides an overview of the recommendations and associated authorizing entity or entities.

**Table 1.** SRO Task Force Recommendations

Recommendation	Authorizing Entity(-ies)
<b>Recommendation 1.1:</b> Define a clear statement of purpose for the SRO program that includes “help keep students out of the criminal justice system” as one key purpose of the SRO program.	Kirkland City Council LWSD Board Kirkland City Manager LWSD Superintendent Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland Police Guild
<b>Recommendation 1.2:</b> Align authorization documents related to the SRO program to use a consistent purpose statement and roles and responsibilities.	Kirkland City Council LWSD Board Kirkland City Manager LWSD Superintendent Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland Police Guild
<b>Recommendation 1.3:</b> Include future documents currently being developed by the State Superintendent’s Office to update relevant authorizing documents, such as the City-District contract, KPD policies, and SRO job description.	Kirkland City Manager Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland Police Guild
<b>Recommendation 2.1:</b> Create proactive communication materials to better introduce the SRO program to the school community, including potentially-impacted community members.	Kirkland City Manager’s Office LWSD Office of the Superintendent
<b>Recommendation 2.2:</b> SROs should meet with affinity groups to learn about the varied experiences of students and families.	Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland SROs LWSD Office of the Superintendent
<b>Recommendation 2.3:</b> Formalize the community feedback requirement of RCW 28A.320.124, with a particular focus on proactive outreach to potentially-impacted community members.	Kirkland City Manager’s Office LWSD Office of the Superintendent
<b>Recommendation 2.4:</b> Explore ways for SROs to be provided information on student behavior-intervention plans for use in emergency response situations, so SROs are best prepared to interact with students who may have specific needs.	LWSD Office of the Superintendent

<b>Recommendation 2.5:</b> Explore ways to collect data on student interactions (contacts), specifically in such a way that helps understand whether disparate impacts are occurring for students of color, LGBTQ+ students, and students with disabilities.	Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland SROs LWSD Office of the Superintendent
<b>Recommendation 2.6:</b> Evaluate additional mechanisms for feedback, such as 360 or other similar evaluation tools, that includes students, staff, and families to help inform existing evaluation protocols.	Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland SROs LWSD Office of the Superintendent
<b>Recommendation 3.1:</b> Update training requirements and offerings for SROs to meet or exceed expectations for RCW 28A.320.124.	Kirkland City Manager Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland Police Guild
<b>Recommendation 3.2:</b> Maintain the current expectation of NASRO training for all SROs.	Kirkland City Manager Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland Police Guild
<b>Recommendation 3.3:</b> Ensure SROs receive training on referring students to counseling or other services.	Kirkland Police Chief
<b>Recommendation 3.4:</b> Maintain the current hiring requirement of a minimum of two years of experience as a commissioned police officer. Additionally, in the SRO job description, pursuant to bargaining with the Police Guild, consider replacing "willingness and desire" with "demonstrated ability" with respect to interactions with youth.	Kirkland City Council LWSD Board Kirkland City Manager LWSD Superintendent Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland Police Guild
<b>Recommendation 3.5:</b> Continue emphasizing retention of SROs through the current five-year SRO assignment commitment.	Kirkland City Manager Kirkland Police Chief Kirkland Police Guild

## Attachment A – Additional References

- American Civil Liberties Union
  - Know Your Rights – Students’ Rights:  
<https://www.aclu.org/know-your-rights/students-rights/>
  - ACLU of WA SRO Report:  
<https://www.aclu-wa.org/docs/students-not-suspects-need-reform-school-policing-washington-state>
- Advancement Project – We Came to Learn:  
<https://advancementproject.org/wecametolearn/>
- Department of Education
  - Letter on SROs:  
<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/secletter/160907.html>
  - Local Implementation Rubric:  
<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/files/sro-local-implementation-rubric.pdf>
  - Policy Rubric:  
<https://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/safety/usdoe-sro-state-and-local-policy-rubric.pdf>
- Dignity in Schools Campaign
  - Counselors Not Cops:  
<https://dignityinschools.org/take-action/counselors-not-cops/>
  - Law Enforcement:  
[https://dignityinschools.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/AvoidingCriminalization\\_LawEnforcement.pdf](https://dignityinschools.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/AvoidingCriminalization_LawEnforcement.pdf)
  - Model Code:  
<https://dignityinschools.org/take-action/model-school-code/>
- Georgetown Law – Be Her Resource, A Toolkit About SROs and Girls of Color:  
[https://www.law.georgetown.edu/poverty-inequality-center/wp-content/uploads/sites/14/2018/05/17\\_SRO-final-\\_Acc.pdf](https://www.law.georgetown.edu/poverty-inequality-center/wp-content/uploads/sites/14/2018/05/17_SRO-final-_Acc.pdf)
- Leadership for Educational Equity – Emerging Models for Police Presence in Schools:  
[https://educationalequity.org/sites/default/files/documents/emerging\\_models\\_for\\_school\\_resource\\_officers\\_final.pdf](https://educationalequity.org/sites/default/files/documents/emerging_models_for_school_resource_officers_final.pdf)
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights – Beyond Suspensions:  
<https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2019/07-23-Beyond-Suspensions.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Justice – Assigning Police Officers to Schools:  
[https://rems.ed.gov/docs/DOJ\\_AssigningPoliceOfficers.pdf](https://rems.ed.gov/docs/DOJ_AssigningPoliceOfficers.pdf)
  - Community Oriented Policing Services
- Washington Mass Shootings Work Group - Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs:  
[https://waspc.memberclicks.net/assets/docs/Mass%20Shootings%20Work%20Group%20Report%20\(Co%20mpressed%20File\).pdf](https://waspc.memberclicks.net/assets/docs/Mass%20Shootings%20Work%20Group%20Report%20(Co%20mpressed%20File).pdf)