



Marc Elrich
County Executive

Dr. Raymond Crowel
Director, DHHS

COMMISSION ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

Tuesday, November 17, 2020

7:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Teams Meeting

CITIZEN MEMBERS PRESENT: Kimberly Alfriend, Diana Barney, Tracey Friedlander, Dan Gaskill, Chris Jennison, Erynn Penn, Joshua Pestaner, Kevin Redden, Melanie Rush, Angela Toliver, Ebony Stoutmiles and Thomas Squire.

AGENCY MEMBERS PRESENT: Joanna Bonner, Amy Daum, Francha Davis, Frank Duncan, Susan Farag, Patty Lyman, Steve Miller, Steve Neff, Mary Siegfried, Nathaniel Tipton, and Carlotta Woodward (Shaun Michael).

EMERITUS MEMBERS PRESENT: Carole Brown and Chris Fogleman

ABSENT MEMBERS: Bonnie DeWitt, Wendy Pulliam, and Vernon Scott, Gwen Williams,

STAFF LIASON PRESENT: Diane Lininger

GUESTS: Viviana Azar, Nick Assante, Delegate Charlotte Crutchfeld, Captain Flynn, Dalbin Osorio, Captain Thomas, Gerald Mcfarland, Avery Smedley, Tom Smith, and Vivian Yao.

7:00 p.m. I. Welcome – Chris Jennison, Chair

7:02 p.m. II. Attendance – Diane will take attendance. Please Mute your microphone unless you are speaking.

7:05 p.m. III. Speakers: Panel to speak on recent bill put out by Councilmen Hans Reimer and William Jawando.

- A.** Steve Neff, Director, Division of Pupil Personnel and Attendance Services
- B.** Captain C. Thomas Jordan, Montgomery County Department of Police, Director, Community Engagement Division.
- C.** Susan Farag, Legislative Analyst, Montgomery County Council
- D.** [Nick Asante](#), Richard Montgomery HS, Student Member, Montgomery County Board of Education
- E.** Captain C. Thomas Jordan, Montgomery County Department of Police, Director, Community Engagement Division.

Bill Information:

- [Bill 46-20](#), Police – School Resources Officers – Prohibited
- County Council Hearing where this bill was introduced can be viewed [here](#)
- Sponsoring Council Members – Hans Reimer and William Jawando

- Description/Issue - Bill 46-20 would prohibit the Montgomery County Police Department from deploying school resource officers in schools.

Discussion:

- County Council –
 - o The bill applies only to MCPD and would not apply to the municipalities (e.g., City of Gaithersburg, City of Rockville)
 - o 3 appropriations were also introduced to add funding to alternative initiatives around restorative justice and mental health/behavioral supports
 - o Several Council Members are interested in hearing MCPS' recommendations before taking any next steps
 - o Public Hearing is scheduled for January 12th at 7pm
- MCPS -
 - o Board of Education has asked the Superintendent to conduct a study of the SRO program; this is in progress currently with a preliminary findings report expected in January.
 - Most recent report to the Board of Ed from this workgroup can be found [here](#)
 - o Under the MOU, SROs are in the schools to enhance safety within the schools, serve as liaisons between school/community/MCPS, providing programming if/as requested, provide information to school staff, etc. – they are not in place to enforce MCPS behavior codes
 - The Principal has the final say in most matters that happen in a building.
 - There are clear delineations around incidents that an SRO would take lead versus the school administrator.
 - There are specific expectations set forth in the MOU that must be considered any time arrests on school grounds is considered.
- MCPD
 - o SROs are not part of the disciplinary process within MCPS.
 - o SROs write reports on a regular basis; this data is pulled and reviewed by MCPD
 - o MCPD has been working with MCPS in a workgroup for several months now to support the study of the SRO program requested by the Board of Education. One thing identified in the workgroup is a need to create a uniform criteria and agreement of how incidents are defined/reported/tracked.
- MCPS Youth Perspective
 - o Reasons students have shared that they oppose the SRO program include but are not limited to:
 - Having an armed officer in the building impacts the culture/environment within the schools which affects some students more significantly than others including minority groups. Highlights the trauma that having an armed officer in may cause or trigger in what is supposed to be a safe environment.
 - Many feel that SROs are reactive rather than proactive and feel alternative resources would help address issues proactively.

- Students feel that there are many alternative adults within the buildings that can serve as the safe adults.

Questions from Commissioners:

- What is driving the variations in arrest rates at the county, state, and national levels?
 - Classification/definition of an “arrest” can vary
 - Numbers fluctuate daily and there is a lot of data available without context
 - 269 arrests occurred in 2019-2020 school year; only 27 of those involved physical arrest on school grounds (e.g. handcuffs)
- What additional training do SROs receive?
 - They receive additional training that a routine patrol officer does not receive. Trainings include but are not limited to: informal counseling, disability awareness, de-escalation, youth development, principles of learning, building/maintaining positive school culture, SORAT (single officer response to active threat), DARE, etc.
 - Annual follow up and reinforcement of trainings occurs as well.
- If there is an arrest in the school - what is the protocol for that?
 - The number of physical arrests on school grounds is low – 10% or less of arrest of youth reach this level
 - Adequate notification of parents is part of the process when working with youth; questioning that would take place on school grounds would be focused on imminent threat
- What defines adequate communication to parents?
 - In most cases, MCPS contacts parents regarding arrests prior to police leaving campus. MCPD officers or detectives then contact parents as well.
- Are the SROs hand-picked based on their temperament?
 - When a position vacancy becomes available on the police department, officers who are off their probationary period are welcome to apply. All the applicants are interviewed, and many times, the school principal is involved at some level in the discussion.
- Does SRO program have surveys completed by students and teachers about their performance?
 - MCPS and MCPD communicate often. In my [Amy Daum] previous role as a Deputy Commander and SRO supervisor, I spoke on a weekly, if not daily, basis, with principals. In my experience, principals do not hesitate if they have a concern to reach out. Many SRO supervisors ask the principals to provide comments for SRO ratings, which are completed at least yearly.
- Is there improvement seen or measured by SRO program? (If yes, what is being measured?)

8:10 p.m. IV. Old Business

- a. **Minutes from October 2020** – approved, no objections or abstentions
- b. **No Meeting in December** – next meeting is January 19th
- c. **Annual Report** – Chair has reached out to all members who are writing articles to establish a timeline/work plan to complete the annual report.

8:20 p.m. V. Subcommittee Reports

- a. **Legislative Committee** (co-chairs - Kevin or Thomas) – the subcommittee is still working on outreach to delegates, no other updates at this time.
- b. **Youth in Adult detention Facilities Subcommittee** (chair – Tracey) – no updates currently

8:20 p.m. V. New Business

- a. **Announcements from Commission members or Members of the Public** – no updates/events/news shared.

8:30 p.m. VI. Meeting Adjourned

I. VI. Meeting Adjourned

Commission on Juvenile Justice

7300 Calhoun Place, Suite 600 Rockville, MD 20855 • 240-777-3317 • 240-777-4447 fax
www.montgomerycountymd.gov
