AGENCY RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT

Report Title: School Resource Officers Revisited

Report Date: May 23, 2019                      Response Date: August 23, 2019

Agency Name: Lagunitas School District           Agenda Date: 

Response by: John Carroll                   Title: Superintendent

FINDINGS

• I (we) agree with the findings numbered: 1, 2, 3

• I (we) disagree partially with the findings numbered: 5, 9

• I (we) disagree wholly with the findings numbered: __________

(Attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed; include an explanation of the reasons therefor.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

• Recommendations numbered 1 have been implemented.
  (Attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)

• Recommendations numbered ______________ have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
  (Attach a timeframe for the implementation.)

• Recommendations numbered 9 require further analysis.
  (Attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.)

• Recommendations numbered 2, 10, 11 will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.
  (Attach an explanation.)

Date: 8/23/19     Signed: [Signature]
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RECOMMENDATIONS

R1:  SRO Programs in Marin County should be retained or expanded where they now exist. SRO programs should be established to cover those school districts where they do not exist.

Response:

This recommendation has been implemented.

LSD has retained its shared SRO services for several years and continues to work closely with the current SRO. The District is highly satisfied with the service.

R2:  Municipalities, school districts, and law enforcement agencies in Marin County should make SRO programs a high budgetary priority.

Response:

This recommendation will not be implemented.

Due to profound budgetary restrictions facing the district. LSD’s unfunded special education mandate along with maintaining reasonable compensation for staff and increases to mandated state-wide retirement systems make it such that prioritizing an SRO position would be imprudent especially given the district’s favorable student discipline record, low crime level on campus and its strong community partnerships.

R9:  School districts should take the lead in working with their city councils and law enforcement agencies to employ and maintain a sufficient number of SRO’s.

Response:

This recommendation will require further analysis. The entirety of LSD is unincorporated areas so there is no city council to work with. The law enforcement agency responsible for the area,
MCSO already provides SRO services to a level that is satisfactory to the District. However, LSD will “take the lead” in opening a conversation with MCSO. The time table will be to schedule a conversation with the SRO prior to October 2019.

R10: School districts and municipalities should explore funding sources such as grants, bond issues, special taxes and other sources.

Response:

This recommendation will not be implemented.

The current SRO meets the District’s needs without having an impact on the school’ budget. With a very small administrative staff responsible for a wide variety of tasks, it is not reasonable to add the responsibility of researching funding streams for a program that the district would see as redundant.

R11: School districts and municipalities should consider sharing the costs and services of SRO Programs.

Response:

This recommendation will not be implemented.

There is a high level of satisfaction with the current SRO program which has no impact on the schools budget.