



Observer Report

Date:	8/18/2022
Media coverage?	Not sure
Was there a quorum?	Yes
Number of attendees	Many (20+)
Was the agenda posted in advance?	Yes it was
Sufficient time for public comments?	Yes
Topics of Note/Interesting Topic	<p>Speakers:</p> <p>Resident #1: Expressed disappointment over SRO agenda item. Is not clear of the problem D64 is trying to solve. Thinks it is critical that the board and admin understand alternative approaches for D64. Expressed concern over prior statement of board member that "of course the SRO would take an active role in discipline." Concerned for students with special needs. Cited that of the 40 hours of training, ~1.5 hrs of training for vulnerable populations. Wants behavioral supports + evidence based strategies.</p> <p>Resident #2: Concerned about SRO's and how they'd "be involved in school discipline" as stated by a D464 board member in last board meeting. Encouraged the formation of a D64 community advisory committee as required in board policies. Student behavior should be tracked - for annual review. SRO's would be in violation with both SB100 and D64 Board Policy.</p> <p>Resident #3: The SRO agenda items is a huge distraction of the BOD's time. Has seen no need for SRO's in our schools. Teachers and administrators are mentors. Has seen no evidence that SRO's prevent school shootings. Cost is relevant to discuss. Salary per officer/year. Question is "whether they should be in this role at all." Students with disabilities need to be considered. Hope's there is a strong legal advisory to the parent advisory committee.</p> <p>Resident #4: Expressed an experience of the first time they were shot at in 6th grade. Has seen stabbings. As a child, wanted to know "where's the police?" Does not believe an SRO should be a disciplinarian, but there for security purposes.</p> <p>Resident #5: An alum of Park Ridge schools. People go where they feel "safe." Does not recall fears of school shootings in her past. It's not a matter of if, it's a matter of when Park Ridge will be impacted. Believes in support staff but the majority in attendance tonight are not experts and do not perform school security analyses. Wants D64 to hire someone with expertise to get an analysis</p>

for need of SRO/s.

Resident #6: Agreed with 1st three speakers and is not in favor of the SRO program. Wanted to clarify points: Has spent a considerable amount of time as social psychologist/professional - has researched that very seldom is a school shooter an "outside intruder." Often times a shooter is a current student or prior student. ~70% had discipline issues in the past. And current modern data indicates where resources need to be placed.

Interventions are needed to come from staff, teacher, coach, etc. There have been behavioral problems exacerbated by COVID 19. D64 needs strong behavioral interventions.

Resident #7: Cited # of people who have died in school shootings since 1970's. Cited # of people that have died/year. Cited # of schools in IL. Cited # of children in US. Cited the probability that any particular child would die from a school shooting. Cited salaries of SRO's. ("Going to be high.") Cited # of children that have died from COVID. Parents that are concerned about school shootings have the opportunity to purchase bullet proof vests and backpacks - D64 should not impose ALL children needing to interact with a police officer on a daily basis.

Resident #8: Stated there is no relevant data from scholars or US dept of justice or reason for consensus for police needed in our schools. Board has not provided leadership at our schools to implement district wide consistent discipline policies. Wants to see the data used to support this SRO recommendation. Would personally request the data via a FOIA to see why the D64 Board would make this decision. Stated that not everyone has positive feelings about police. Would strongly encourage parents to OPT OUT of interaction with SRO's - cited Naperville teen suicide.

(Student) Resident #9: Current student at Maine South - stated SRO's are not necessary, esp not for 6-8th graders because "they are still developing." There are trained professionals to make schools a safe environment for students. Students need to be handled by teachers and professionals - many children have had both positive and negative experiences with police. Believes police should NOT be in D64 schools.

Resident #10 - From NW Side Coalition that also organizes within this community. Wanted to focus on who the "experts" are on policing. Asserted that those that live with being policed are the "experts." Cited info about Laquan McDonald case (16 bullets in a teen by a police officer). Regardless of how "nice" a SRO is, they are still part of "the school to prison pipeline." Encouraged the board to invite a true expert to next meeting.

Resident #11 - Cited a disproportionate # of number of students that are not being prioritized. SPED students, LD, discipline issues, etc. Stated that even when charges are dropped, a child impacted by policing needs to be labeled for the rest of their lives that a charge/s were made. Cited appreciation for social workers that look at ways to address issues to help identify kids with troubles/issues.

Resident #12: Appreciated public comment opportunity. Concerned about public comment being the only vehicle - is not meaningful enough. Wants an opportunity for dialogue in real time. Still does not know what is on the table with SRO's. Has so many questions. Wants to know the needs and goals of what it is that is trying to be addressed. Would appreciate a forum for dialogue. Wants clearly articulated goals - opportunity costs - questions raised so as not to rush this decision.

Resident #13: LWV Statement ([link](#)) Wanted to draw BOD's attention to D64 board policies and how that intersects with state law. Expressed focus on parent advisory committee and behavioral interventions committee. LWVPR encourages the formation of these two committees. USLWV prioritizes students when allocating funds, trauma informed practices, to recuse discipline issues. Wants to educate residents about policy issues.

Resident #14: Believes Emerson (co teaching with assigned SRO) is a wonderful model. Wants to understand the exact reason behind each officer that would be placed in D64 schools. Wants to know the outcomes that the board is desiring. Wants the district to pay attention to tax dollars and resources.

DISCUSSION

Chief of Police Depts did not attend.

Ryles: Had a list of questions for Chiefs. Respects everyone's opinion in attendance and has changed his stance from last month. His interest is for a security officer alone - not an officer that would interface with children, esp special needs children. Expects that everyone should respect his opinion. Primarily wants a security officer in both Middle Schools - for enhancement. "The public out here is right." Did not mention elementary school placement of SRO/s. QUESTIONS that Ryles wanted to ask officers not in attendance:

- How long have we had officers at HS
- Has it been successful
- Has there ever been a complaint filed
- Has having an officer saved tax payer \$
- How many times has the D207 officer been called to D64
- What is the cost to taxpayer

Pearl: Is in favor of forming committees (Strategic Planning should guide what the board and admin does). Wants to depend on process that has been approved by the board (have it guide the work of the BOD). Believes in multi tiered systems of support + SEL - "that is what we should follow." Regarding school expansion - D64 needs to look at a crisis plan. Whatever is decided should be a process. Questioned if middle schools would be prioritized but not the elementary schools. Does not want to go against the administration (Super) who is not in favor.

Lubinski: Had abstained from the vote previous meeting. Is not ready to vote/make a decision. Disappointed the chiefs did not show up. Struggles with the decision. Cited the earlier stated fact that most shooters are from within the school. Does not agree SRO's for discipline. Wants the community to stop being

	<p>so divisive. Would like to see a plan and not rush to vote one way or another. Concerned that community groups are spreading “false information.” Does not want to be talking about this for the next few years.</p> <p>Sales: A D64 committee was already created under board policy - a Parent/Teacher Advisory Committee PTAC (was formally established in April). Districts are encouraged to secure/create MOU's with local law enforcement agencies. Taking in all perspectives, PTAC could review and make recommendations to the BOD. Cited another D64 policy that the Board President appoints people to serve on the PTAC. Policy states that it convene parents, guardians and teachers.</p> <p>Dr Olson: Expressed concern over this agenda item. Would need to gather data, time to analyze in order to make suggestions for any such committee. If this does fall under the committee goal/s, he would need to take time to prepare for SRO topics in that group appropriately.</p> <p>Woitowich: SRO discussion does not/has not supported other priorities for the school district. Thus far the board has not seen an implementation strategy. Mentioned that might be something a committee could address. Asserted that the SRO topic cannot take time from BOD's during a meeting if this remains to be such a vague topic. Believes this is not productive. Wants something in front of the board that provides appropriate context to discuss.</p>
Topics of Note//Interesting Topic	<p>COVID guidelines: Voted on whether families can make their own choices on what they'd like to do regarding the pandemic/vaccines based on the CDC recommendations in effect. “It is a much different story this year in regards to the pandemic.” Motion passed unanimously.</p>
Topics of Note/Interesting Topic	<p>Construction and Enrollment: Updates were presented by the CSBO and Facilities Manager. There have been some issues with construction that they are working around to make changes. The rush is to make sure everyone is settled. Lubinski wanted to make a public statement about the construction process - urged the community to say thank you to the Admin and District for getting things done vs complaining about “dirt” that is piled up (cited comments on social media and residents writing negative letters to the BOD with anger). Facilities manager is proud of the companies that were contracted.</p> <p>Enrollment has been tremendously busy (returning families that have waited til the last minute) Did need to pop some bubbles and hire for some last min staffing changes/needs. Note: Ryles mentioned that he believed the #'s should have been potentially higher bc of Full Day K - CSBO mentioned that this may be due to skepticism in the community of whether or not the building/s would be complete in time.</p>
Topics of Note/Interesting Topic	<p>none</p>
Any topics relevant to LWVPR positions?	<p>Yes SRO topic. LWVPR statement read.</p>
Were members civil to each other and the public?	<p>Yes</p>



LWW LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS[®] OF PARK RIDGE

If no, explain:	
Facilities (select any deficits)	Lincoln is a great location for D64 BOD meetings
Officials attentive and alert?	Yes
Adequate discussion of issues?	
Any other observations about the meeting?	Ryles made a final closing comment before board adjourned regarding statements he overheard being made earlier about Former Chicago Police Chief Garry McCarthy - Ryles wanted it stated for that record that McCarthy led a 9/11 effort in NYC (and is a highly decorated police officer - is current chief in Willow Springs now.) Ryles believes McCarthy deserves respect.
Was the agenda followed as it was published?	
If agenda was not followed as it was published, describe why:	Yes
Meeting Adjourned	8:58:00 PM