MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County School Board, Select Committee of the School Board Regarding MOU between LCPS, LCSO, and LPD, Thursday, November 12, 2026

Date	Thursday, November 12, 2026
Place	Loudoun County Public Schools / School Board meeting (see BoardDocs / LCPS-TV)
Length	2h 4m (video)

- Official meeting video (Vimeo / LCPS-TV): https://player.vimeo.com/video/1246398762?rel=0
- BoardDocs (School Board): https://go.boarddocs.com/vsba/loudoun/Board.nsf/Public

> Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-11-13. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:06] Good afternoon. This is April Chandler, and I call to order this November 12, 2026, Select Committee of the School Board regarding the MOU between LCPS, LCSO, and LPD. First up, we'll start with the approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Has everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes?

[00:00:29] Okay, I'll now entertain a motion. Madam Chair, I move to approve the minutes from the last meeting. Vice Chair Donohue has moved to approve the meeting, I guess, the minutes from the last meeting. Is there a second?

[00:00:44] Second. Thank you, Mr. Svensson. Is there any discussion? All right. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the last meeting, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. All right. That motion passes unanimously. All right. We'll move on now to item number three on our agenda, that's public comment.

[00:01:05] These are the procedures for public comment. Thank you for engaging with the school board through the public comment process. The school board welcomes comments from Loudoun County

residents and believes that strong community engagement and outreach are important components of a successful school system. Speakers must limit comments to the time allotted.

[00:01:22] Based on the number of speakers in the agenda this evening, all speakers have been allotted two minutes each for public comment. Please be advised that speakers who miss their time slot will not be called at a later time. All audience members shall maintain civility, decorum, and respect for the functioning and dignity of the school board at all times.

[00:01:39] Please remain seated unless arriving, departing, speaking at the podium or during a break. Violations of civility, decorum, and respect include shouting, heckling, jeering, applause, and other noise which disrupts or delays the meeting, obstructing speakers from being able to see the school board and vice versa, interrupting speakers attempting to speak when not called to do so by the chair, and approaching a speaker or otherwise attempting to intimidate, disparage, or distract a speaker, staff member, or other meeting attendees.

[00:02:04] Speakers should refrain from vulgarity, obscenities, defamation, profanity, and other like breaches of respect, Nor may speakers target, criticize, or attack individual students or individual division employees during public comment. The school board requests that comments on an individual student or employee-related matter not be shared at public meetings where the disclosure could violate applicable confidentiality requirements.

[00:02:26] The speakers should communicate those concerns to their school principal or another appropriate school official. Speakers should face the dais and direct their comments to the school board. school board policy 2520 members of the school board will not answer questions or respond directly to the public during the public comment period to the extent necessary i will warn of breaches of decorum civility and respect from attendees prior to taking other actions to preserve the orderly conduct of the meeting violations of decorum civility and other meeting attendees may result in the chair directing staff to remove the attendee from the remainder of the meeting

[00:03:03] repeated or persistent violations of decorum or civility by the audience may result in on the decision of the chair public comment being tabled until a later point in the meeting's agenda limiting the number of attendees in the meeting room during public comment for safety reasons or public comment period ending for the evening distribution of materials to school board members copies of materials for board members should be given to the public information officer in the media box at the back of the boardroom before the start of the meeting please provide 12 copies under no circumstances may a speaker approach the dais the public is reminded that access to the school board meeting is available through lcps tv on 1070 hd and fries and fios channel 43.

[00:03:42] the live stream of the meeting may be viewed on the website we look forward to hearing your comments um our only speaker this afternoon is amy riccardi um miss riccardi the floor is yours thank you madam chair i just wanted to say i've had a chance to take a look at the the mou drafts and red lines that we've had before us to consider for the school board right now and I understand the direction that Sheriff Chapman has gone with his MOU draft and I was reminded

[00:04:20] as a business owner when I don't have a client or I have a client that has taken a long time to do a renewal sometimes you just have to craft it and then give it to them and let them have a chance to respond to it and work from there i'm really hoping that we can take a look at the documents that we have before us and get to a quick resolution and come up with the right solution that's in in compliance with the

current virginia code it is noted i don't believe that the current version that we've got addresses elementary school sros i know that the sheriff has put forth a

[00:04:54] recommendation and a proposal to the board of supervisors which is a phased in approach and i think that's a very wise one. I think when you get feedback from the public in general and you take out the kind of both ends of the extremes from a political perspective and you just take a look at what mainstream Loudoun County residents want, I think by and large you're going to find that they want SROs in elementary schools. How we get there is the question and I do like a phased-in approach.

[00:05:25] I think it's reasonable and I want to kind of put that out there on the table as something that I definitely will be looking at, but I want to make sure also that we get this to a conclusion, that we get a document on the table that we can work with if it's two separate or one combined. I don't know that I have a preference for either one, but I really would like us to see a very earnest effort in the next, you know, 30 days to get something done. We've got to get this completed so that we're working under a current agreement that follows current law, and right now I'm worried that we're under an agreement while it's working fine.

[00:05:59] It doesn't actually fold in all the... Thank you for coming out today and for providing your public comment. With that, we will move on to item number four, our memorandum of understanding between LCPS and law enforcement, including a new proposal from LCSO.

[00:06:17] I just wanted to sort of level set before we start the discussion. Our item today is meant to be a discussion item, so it will be treated like a discussion item, information item. This is a perfect time to ask questions and to work through the process, but I don't foresee that any motions would be made today.

[00:06:43] We can discuss our plans for the next meeting at the end of the meeting. But with that, we'll start this evening with a presentation from Ms. Rae Mitchell regarding the current status of the joint MOU.

[00:06:59] Thank you, Ms. Chandler. Good afternoon, members of the school board, Chair Chandler, LCSO, and LPD. This afternoon, I will be presenting a final draft version of the Memorandum of Understanding between Loudoun County Public Schools, the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office, and the Leesburg Police Department.

[00:07:22] The current red line version of the MOU used the previously agreed upon MOU, which was executed in 2023 and which was updated with technical changes in 2024 to include updating names of the signing parties and editing punctuation as a starting place for discussion. As mentioned in our previous select committee meeting, the three stakeholder agencies that collaborated to provide edits to the current redline version of the MOU are representatives

[00:07:59] from Loudoun County Public Schools, Loudoun County Sheriff's Office, and Leesburg Police Department. This process involved the members of each agency collaborating to provide input, align the document with Virginia Code where applicable, and review feedback from committees and the public received during the feedback period, and to come to consensus regarding what changes would be made in the document.

[00:08:25] Portions of the current red line draft version of the MOU are those that are in all previous versions of the MOU with the exception of three new sections which were reviewed at the October 22nd select committee meeting.

[00:08:47] This afternoon, I will provide some highlights of the edits that were made while showing portions of the MOU on the screen. We will begin with the preamble and purpose. In the current redline draft version of the MOU starting with line 9, the preamble sets forth the respective roles and responsibilities of all parties to include LCPS, LCSO, and LPD to maintain safe, supportive, and secure school environments.

[00:09:24] At line 32, the purpose of the MOU is to clarify the roles of SROs, school administration, and teachers and outline expectations between the parties of LCPS, LCSO, and LPD as these parties work to foster a relationship of cooperation and mutual respect to maintain a safe and secure environment for students, staff, and visitors.

[00:09:56] Beginning at line 60, the MOU sets forth to clearly define the roles of all the parties. School Resource Officers, or SROs, is defined in the Code of Virginia and who are assigned to schools who should operate under the MOU.

[00:10:20] Additional information regarding the various ways in which SROs support our middle and high schools will be provided as we move throughout the MOU. LCSO and LPD designate points of contact that will establish and maintain effective relationships with school personnel, be responsible for the selection, assignment, scheduling, training, supervision, and evaluation of their respective personnel who serve as SROs.

[00:11:01] SROs receive a Department of Criminal Justice course as well as agency-defined training, And these trainings are listed beginning at line 102. Starting at lines 126 through 182, SROs serve in multiple roles and have responsibilities.

[00:11:31] They are expected to be familiar with the students' rights and responsibilities, exchange information with school administrators, and LCPS safety and security officers. They also provide a visible deterrent to crime and assist school administrators in developing school crisis management and response plans.

[00:11:56] SROs may also deliver law-related education to students, serve as informal mentors, and collaborate with school administrators when working with students with disabilities. It is important to note that the feedback from the Special Education Advisory Committee, or SEAC, was considered and integrated into the MOU.

[00:12:19] Communication and collaboration between the administration and SRO will occur so that should a student require additional support, it can be provided. SROs receive training on the various types of disabilities and LCPS has also agreed to make training available to any SROs in order to support students with disabilities.

[00:12:42] It is the responsibility of the school division to ensure that each SRO is provided with a secure work area, that school administrators and teachers handle student discipline, and that the division communicates the goals and role of the SRO to all administration, staff, parents, guardians, and students.

[00:13:12] LCPS, whose roles are clarified in the MOU starting at lines 221, are that of the school administrator and safety and security officer. As school administrators, they are to review the MOU with SROs annually and report any reportable offenses to LCSO or LPD.

[00:13:32] Safety and Security Officers, or SSOs, are LCPS employees who also work with school administration to help implement the Division Safety and Security Best Practices and who are also DCJS certified prior to or within 60 days of the assignment in a school.

[00:14:02] Operationally, starting at line 256, LCPS school officials have a direct responsibility for student behavior as well as school safety and security to cooperate with and report offenses to law enforcement authorities to the extent permitted by law, and when permissible, concurrently investigate allegations of violations of criminal laws committed on school property.

[00:14:28] Information sharing is governed by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, known as FERPA, which allows school officials to access and disclose student records for legitimate educational reasons.

[00:14:45] Access to real-time live video feed, which is a new section added to the MOU starting at line 306, outlines the instances when LCSO and LPD shall access real-time live video when there are concerns for officer or fire official health and safety.

[00:15:09] All recorded images, video, and associated information shall be treated as confidential and is protected by state and federal law. The access to real-time live video shall be documented on a quarterly basis and distribution of the information beyond LCSO and LPD is prohibited.

[00:15:31] However, if there is an inadvertent third-party disclosure, LCPS Division Council must be informed immediately. SROs have the authority to question students or staff who may have information about criminal activities.

[00:15:49] Information regarding how that is conducted with juveniles or adult students and students with disabilities are outlined in the second appendix of the MOU, which will be referred to in a moment. The actions of both law enforcement and LCPS administrators are aligned with Virginia Code and or the students' rights and responsibilities.

[00:16:15] Body-worn cameras, or BWCs, at line 375 have been in use during previous school years. It was added as a new section to the MOU, and they are to be worn and used in accordance with applicable LCSO and LPD policies and procedures.

[00:16:33] Cameras will only be activated during official law enforcement interactions. School searches and seizures are done in alignment with School Board Policy 8265, searches involving students and seizure of contraband, which was updated in June of this year.

[00:16:53] While school officials may conduct searches and seize contraband, the SRO shall be contacted immediately to take custody of any suspected illegal contraband. Otherwise, SROs shall not become involved in administrative school-related searches.

[00:17:14] Should an arrest be made, attempts to conduct the arrest are done outside of school hours and off of school grounds. However, there are instances when they must be done during school hours and or on school grounds, and should that be the case, to the greatest extent possible, there is coordination with the school administrator to minimize disruption.

[00:17:42] If physical intervention by the SRO is necessary, the action will be promptly reported to the school administrator and SRO supervisor with a documented rationale. Also, in alignment with LCPS Policy 5345, Restraint and Seclusion of Students, which was updated in 2025, physical restraint is a last

resort emergency procedure and should only be used if the student is in imminent danger to self or others.

[00:18:14] Other statutory responsibilities, which start at line 450, include crime reporting, threat assessment, school safety audits, and overdose notification. Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, law enforcement agencies are required to notify a division superintendent, principal, or designee when a student in their school commits certain offenses.

[00:18:43] In alignment with School Board Policy 8290, Threat Assessment for the Protection of Schools, SROs are required members of a school's threat assessment team and may assist in monitoring of students and, if needed, determine the need for any law enforcement action.

[00:19:12] School safety audits are conducted annually and meet all DCJS requirements to support school safety practices and conditions, and SROs are included in this process. New in the red line version of the MOU at line 489 is a section on overdose notification.

[00:19:37] LCPS has been following the guidance established by the Code of Virginia where we are required to notify parents and guardians within 24 hours of a school suspected or confirmed overdose. A school-suspected or school-connected student overdose is one for which the response is the administration of naloxone, another opioid antagonist, or another similar medication with the intent to counter or temporarily reverse the effects of such overdose.

[00:20:08] Line 506 provides that the MOU shall be reviewed annually and amended or affirmed at least once every two years or at any time upon the request of either party.

[00:20:31] There are two appendices in the MOU to clarify FERPA and student interview guidelines for law enforcement and school administrators. In the first appendix of the draft MOU, it was amended to remove the list of safety and emergency-related communications as they are detailed in Policy 3070.

[00:20:54] In this appendix, it does outline in detail the parameters of when an SRO may access educational records in accordance with FERPA to include but are not limited to when there is a health or safety emergency, a report to Child Protective Services, or surveillance video.

[00:21:21] Appendix 2 was largely amended to clarify the differences between juvenile and adult suspects, witnesses or victims, and students with disabilities when needing to be questioned by law enforcement for offenses that occur on or off campus.

[00:21:45] As a juvenile suspect, the actions of the SRO are in alignment with Virginia Code, clarifying that they will attempt to notify the parent or guardian and will notify the principal of an interview prior to questioning.

[00:22:02] For off-campus offenses, questioning shall only occur on school grounds if a delay may result in danger, destruction of evidence, or flight from the jurisdiction by the person suspected of having committed a criminal offense.

[00:22:17] As with the juvenile suspect, the same information applies with notification to a parent or guardian for an on-campus offense, as well as when questioning shall occur for an off-campus offense.

[00:22:39] The revisions in this portion of the appendix set forth to clarify when a student is recognized as an adult, and in such case, the SRO, or law enforcement officer, will not need to notify the student's parent or guardian of the interview.

[00:23:00] As with a student who is a juvenile, the same information applies for when there is questioning for an off-campus offense. As with an adult suspect, the same information applies to adult witnesses or victims regarding the SRO or law enforcement officer not having to notify the parent or guardian, as well as when questioning shall occur for off-campus offenses.

[00:23:30] Regardless of whether a student with a disability is a suspect, witness, or victim, consideration will be given on a case-by-case basis.

[00:23:45] If the student is a juvenile and has a disability, the parental notification will be provided in accordance with the juvenile students. If the student is an adult with a disability, the SRO is not required to make parental notification.

[00:24:03] Thank you, and this concludes the overall summary of the current redline version of the MOU. I will now turn it back over to Chair Chandler. Thank you, Ms. Mitchell, for the overview. At this time, committee members, are there any questions?

[00:24:19] Okay. Then, Lieutenant Colonel Sawyer, would you like to present the proposal by LCSO? So, Sheriff Chapman has joined today, and I would turn it over to you. Pardon me, Sheriff Chapman.

[00:24:35] It's so nice to see you. Thank you for being here. Sheriff Chapman, would you like to present your proposal? Yeah, absolutely. First of all, thank you, committee, for having me here. I appreciate that. And Dr. Spence and the L.P.'s, Loudoun County Public School staff, Leesburg Police, and school security and our community at large.

[00:24:55] I want to kind of just go back on Ms. Mitchell's proposal and all the items that are in there are in what we have also proposed. But let me get on with my remarks here. My job, as you know, is to keep our community safe.

[00:25:11] Tonight, I want to cover our school resource officer program and why we streamlined the MOU to conclude this process. I'd also like to explain our commitment to the children and their parents of this county that we are here to keep everybody safe. First, our record of excellence.

[00:25:27] It's important that you know that we have a record of excellence for our children in our school environment from elementary schools all the way up through high schools. And our record is second to none. In 2018, our SRO program was recognized as only one of nine in the entire country by the National Association of School Resource Officers, NASRO, as a model program.

[00:25:52] That is amazing when you consider that there are over 6,000 law enforcement agencies nationwide with SROs. Loudoun County School Board recognized us as well with the proclamation that same year. This past April, NASRO recognized Senior Deputy Michael Sennett with a Regional Exceptional Service Award.

[00:26:14] That's this year. He was one of 10 SROs out of 23,000 nationwide to receive this award. Our school resource officers were the first in the Commonwealth to mandate that all of our SROs were trained in crisis intervention. Our initiative prompted Virginia to mandate this training statewide.

[00:26:34] In elementary schools, we have taught D.A.R.E. since 1987. I was awarded the DEA DARE Executive of the Year Award in 2017 for our efforts in teaching our children about safety and making the right choices. Just this year, Deputy Robert Hefner was the only DARE officer out of 22,000 nationwide to be named National DARE Officer of the Year.

[00:26:58] And Master Deputy Phil Largent received DARE's Lifetime Achievement Award. With regards to our partnerships, our SROs and the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office have an outstanding partnership with Loudoun County Public Schools. Our mandate at the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office is always to improve safe service, technology, efficiency, and professionalism.

[00:27:19] In doing this, common-sense solutions almost always rise to the top. Unfortunately, the Red Line Agreement, and I know there's a lot of work that went into this, I read it. I found it to be verbose, redundant, and desperate in need of streamlining. Considering that MOUs are a basic function of business, and considering that we have over a decade of completing these agreements, a year and a half of writes and rewrites is beyond inefficient.

[00:27:48] It's ridiculous. And to tack on a select committee to delay the signing of this document even further is unconscionable. I sign probably a dozen various MOUs each year and have never seen such a process like this.

[00:28:04] This MOU is not a social experiment. It's a document that simply defines our roles and responsibilities to keep our children, teachers, and administrators safe. It is modeled after the Department of Criminal Justice Services template.

[00:28:21] Pretty simple, at least it should be. Why I streamlined this. In reviewing the Redline version, which inexplicably took a year and a half to get to that point, it was clear to me that this document could easily be cleaned up.

[00:28:37] Consequently, I took the red line version, saw where their redundancies were, and took them out. There was no need to say the same thing two or three times. I followed the DCJS format, which we have always done. All the changes proposed in the red line version were kept.

[00:28:54] Everything that's in there has been kept. There were only two changes that I made. The first was to provide the correct language which defines SROs in the Code of Virginia, which states, quote, A certified law enforcement officer hired by a local law enforcement agency to provide law enforcement and security services to Virginia elementary and secondary schools.

[00:29:16] The other change I made was to remove the Leesburg Police Department from our agreement with the schools to allow them to have their own separate agreement with the school board. Considering both agencies have different reporting structures, attorneys, and exist within different bureaucracies, this will enable either agency to resolve any issues they may experience directly with Lyon County Public Schools, instead of attempting to come to some type of a three-way resolution.

[00:29:44] After circulating this through my executive step for input and coming to a clean, almost final version, I had our county attorney's office review this document. A few final edits were made, and that was the final version of what I provided Dr. Spence last week.

[00:30:00] We have already proven that we can make this process work when it comes to MOUs. When the county recently opened its new crisis receiving center, the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office and Leesburg Police Department each signed individual MOUs with the center. This was accomplished in less than two months, not a year and a half.

[00:30:18] elementary schools. Briefly on elementary schools and every middle school and high school in Lyon County has a full-time elementary school or elementary schools do not. Full-time SRO or elementary

schools do not. Last school year SROs pulled from their own middle and high schools and answered 1,340 calls at elementary schools. So far this school year there have been 11 school shootings nationwide with injuries or deaths as reported by Education Week. Two of those were elementary schools, which tracks with long-standing data that about 20% of all school shootings occur

[00:30:54] at elementary schools. About four weeks ago, as we all know, in Bend, Oregon, three children and a teacher were killed at Silver Rail Elementary School. That district assigned SROs only to its high schools and to middle schools. After the shooting, it placed an SRO at Silver Rail and more than 3,000 people signed a petition asking for an SRO in every school. Here in Loudoun we have approximately 200 threat assessments in elementary schools alone last year and it had

[00:31:28] about 50 so far this school year. So this is what is obviously also wanted by the citizens of Loudoun County. We have three media surveys that have shown that between 60 and 70 percent of the people that responded to these surveys are in favor of elementary school SROs. So I'd like to close my remarks by discussing elementary school SROs. I understand this issue came up in the last meeting here with your committee, and I'd like to mention a few things here. My ask is that we

[00:32:05] work together and at least start a pilot program. I believe we had talked about, and we'd even talked about this in the past, about starting with clusters. Not to fund everyone, not to fund every elementary school in the county but to do it in clusters, monitor it, and see how that goes and see where we go from there. You may notice that the proposed draft of the SRO coverage as agreed upon between the sheriff's office rather than limiting it to middle and high schools. We put that in there because that's what the law states. That's what the code of Virginia states. It's between middle elementary and secondary schools.

[00:32:45] And what we can do here is whether we go in that direction or not, we're covered either way. That change is important as we have flexibility to begin a program without having to draft another MOU that would cover elementary schools.

[00:33:02] To close, I want to simply ensure that our youngest students have the same protection we already give our older brothers and sisters, their older brothers and sisters. It's important that everybody, from children on up, and I think we have a record that shows that. When you look at everything that we've done, the successes that we've had in elementary schools, there is no threat.

[00:33:23] The people love them. We have an outstanding D.A.R.E. program, I think, that reflects well in elementary schools. The community loves it. If they didn't, we wouldn't still have it. They absolutely love that program, and it just shows the connection that we have with the children in those schools and the relationship we have with school, with the students, the staff, the teachers and the administrators and the parents of those schools. So these are the things that we need to capitalize on to make sure that we keep everybody in this county safe. Thank you. Thank you, Sheriff Chapman.

[00:34:01] Committee members, any questions? Yes, Vice Chair Donahue. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for being here. Sheriff Chapman, I appreciate the opportunity to have conversations with you directly about the MOU and your request for elementary school SROs. I did want to start with, I have several questions. Your proposed MOU references numerous times the Virginia School Law Enforcement Partnership Guide. So I assume you're familiar with that document and its contents. So I have a few questions related to that document. So first of all,

[00:34:40] The SLEP guide on page 19 suggests that the parties to an MOU have quarterly meetings throughout the year to gauge how the program is going. Is that something that's been happening currently between LCSO and LCPS? I don't know if we have quarterly meetings, but I can tell you every year I know we meet with John Clark, with the security people here.

[00:35:00] We go through everything that's expected of our SROs and everybody in all of the middle and high schools there. And as far as quarterly meetings go, I don't know. Do you know? Chris? So I don't know that there's formal structured quarterly meetings that are occurring.

[00:35:21] I do know that there's constant communication between LCPS administration and our SRO unit and the staff there. And when you say administration, Colonel Sawyer, you mean Mr. Clark? Just for purposes of my clarity? So I would say on a couple different levels. From the school security side, Mr. Clark, for sure. But there's also significant communication with the chief of schools, Dr.

[00:35:43] Thank you. I also was wondering if LCSO tracks use of force incidents which are alleged to be perpetrated by SROs during their while they're executing their responsibilities as SROs. I'm sorry do we track what? Use of force incidents by SROs. We track all use of force incidents by every deputy in this in London County Sheriff's Office. Is that information publicly available? We tried to find it on your website and weren't able to do so. So I'd like to know if that information is published. Sure, so there is an annual report published on our website

[00:36:21] related to all of our internal affairs investigations, use of force. And does that include a category for SROs? I don't believe there's a breakout specifically for SROs. I do know use of force in schools is extremely rare. Have you seen any incidents of that? Are you aware of any excessive use of forces in elementary school? I'd like to know Sheriff Chapman, if your office is following the law, because Virginia Code requires that you keep track of those statistics. I know my question is if there's a there's a report of that we would certainly investigate it so of course we investigate every use of force and with all of our deputies

[00:36:56] no matter where they are. So my next question Sheriff Chapman is on the section of your MOU that refers to required training for SROs in which you have listed cultural diversity awareness under as one of the bullets. However you've left you have left out systemic and individual racism and implicit bias, which is recovered by code.

[00:37:20] Why did you remove that language? We can adjust that if we want to keep it exactly to the code like everything else is there. I'm happy to adjust that and put the exact code reference in there. Can you tell me why you decided to remove that language?

[00:37:35] I thought the language was excessive, but we can certainly put that in there since it's part of the Virginia code. I'm also curious why you removed, there was language in the red line draft related to the LCPS policy, policy change related to restraint seclusion.

[00:37:56] It says that seclusion is now an impermissible practice in LCPS, and that has been removed. Can you explain why you removed that language? I'm sorry, can you state that section again? Supporting students with disabilities? It's on page four of the red line.

[00:38:26] I have another question related to that section as well because the last line there says LCPS will also provide additional disability training to SROs as available.

[00:38:47] And I was hoping that you could explain to me what you mean by that because Colonel Sawyer explained previously we cannot compel SROs to take any particular types of training. So what does this mean LCPS will also provide additional disability training?

[00:39:03] While Lieutenant Colonel Sawyer is looking that up, I can tell you that we provide constant training to our people. They have more training than our deputies in the field when it comes to dealing with students.

[00:39:19] And we're always looking at ways to improve that training and capitalize on other opportunities for training. So I can't tell you every training scenario or every training session everybody has been through, but I can tell you that we take a lot of pride in the amount of training.

[00:39:36] And I think when you look at the fact that we have received all these recognitions and awards for the service that we provide, the reputation that we have when it comes to SROs, and the fact that we were the first people to even have crisis intervention training with our SROs shows that we're on the front side of this issue, not on the back side of it.

[00:39:57] So specific to the line on training, and I'd ask you to go back to the other one. I'm still trying to find the other one. But specific to the line on training, that was essentially a rewording of the line. I have it on my copy of this line 197 of the red line document that said LCPS will make available to all SROs any training on supporting students with disabilities.

[00:40:24] So the line in that section is basically a reword of that, that LCSO will also provide additional disability training to SROs as available. I'm thrilled for LCPS to be providing training if LCSO is willing to accept it. We've been told previously that we cannot compel you to take specific training.

[00:40:42] So I just wanted to be clear what you envision to be LCPS's responsibilities under this document. I have another question. I'm looking at the section on school administrator roles and responsibilities in Sheriff Chapman's version of the MOU.

[00:41:05] There's a line in here that I believe is new that says misdemeanor offenses should also be shared and discussed with the SRO to ensure an accurate overall picture of the school climate. Is that our current practice? I don't think we'd change that. And if that question is better directed to Ms. Mitchell and Ms. Scandler.

[00:41:29] Can you do me a favor and tell us exactly where in both documents, where you have that in the document and how it's different from the document that we have? How it's different? It is a sentence that you added, Sheriff Chapman, under school administrator roles and responsibilities that is not in the red line that we've been working on for a year and a half that says misdemeanor offenses should also be shared and discussed with the SRO to ensure an accurate overall picture of the school climate.

[00:42:02] If that is not currently our present practice to report misdemeanor offenses, I would like to know why you chose to add this language. So that is the present practice. I can answer that. So when we talk about misdemeanors, misdemeanors are also school fights. So if a kid gets to a fight, a misdemeanor assault, the principal will inform the SRO that the misdemeanor assault did occur, and the majority of the time, the school will handle discipline.

[00:42:29] A lot of times the reason for that is because if the parents do want to pursue charges, then they will then go to SRO and talk to them about that. Same thing when it comes to vapes, same thing when it

comes to larcenies, all those different misdemeanor things that happen in schools.

[00:42:44] The principals already do contact the SROs and tell them what's going on there. So that is a practice. I appreciate that clarification. So it sounds like I was right that that is not our current practice, and also it's not required by Virginia Code. So we could choose to make, to agree to that if that is the will of LCPS and this board.

[00:43:04] Although, so I, yes, Colonel Sawyer. Sorry, if I can add, that is actually in the existing document. It is under the school administrator roles and responsibilities. On my copy, it's line 239.

[00:43:21] The paragraph starts with all reportable offenses and it lists the code section where it says the end of 239. And further, misdemeanor offenses should also be shared and discussed with the SRO to ensure an accurate overall picture of the school climate. So that's in the existing signed.

[00:43:37] That's not a red line change. So, Colonel Sawyer, my understanding is that that is language that LCSO had previously proposed adding into this and that we struck out. So on my printout, I see that sentence on line 238, but it has been struck through because I believe it was our preference to not include that language because it was not in the previous version.

[00:44:11] I have a couple of additional questions. Next, in the information sharing section, this document very clearly and specifically states SROs are not designated school officials for LCPS.

[00:44:28] However, again, in the Virginia School Law Enforcement Partnership Guide on page 17, that document explicitly states that SROs are school officials for FERPA purposes. Can you please explain why you've stated it differently in this document?

[00:44:49] So I believe our long-standing practice is that we are not school officials. I believe that is at the request of LCPS, but I could be mistaken on that. Would you like to answer that one?

[00:45:08] Well, I mean, I think Wes can also weigh in, Mr. Allen can also weigh in, but I think that's correct, generally speaking, because of the access to records allowed under FERPA. Thank you for that. My next question is with regard to the language for access to real time live video feed, which was a section that we added to our red line and is in the sheriff's version, but the language has been changed.

[00:45:45] So in the in the red line version for lcps of our proposed language we had there was some parameter language indicating when lcso could access the The light the real-life video and that has been that has been changed to an incident at an lcps school and

[00:46:19] Additionally, the previous version said, if LCPS, to the extent LCSO's request for access to real-time live video fall outside the parameters, LCPS safety and security officers will monitor video footage, which has been changed to may monitor.

[00:46:36] So can you explain those changes, please? So the first one, are you talking about the first bullet where it says there's concerns for safety when responding? Under access to real-time live video feed, the first bullet that says LCSO shall only access real-time live video when there are concerns for safety.

[00:46:57] Yes. So in going over this and especially with the county attorney's office, they brought up the fact that there's animal control officers, there are other folks that are there other than just law enforcement officers and fire officials. Those are two very specific things um and so um the the specificity of that is probably a little bit a little bit too specific with only those two things um when it comes to safety

uh concerns for responding to incidents it still covers response to incidents it's only during a response to a an incident in

[00:47:37] a school but that was that was a note that was brought by the uh the county attorney's office Okay. Thank you for that clarification, Colonel Sawyer. My concern is that in my view, although I would defer to Mr. Allen, although I have not asked his opinion about this since he is our attorney, but in my view, the language that was proposed by LCPS that says law enforcement shall only access real-time live video when there are concerns for officer or public official health and safety in responding to an incident at an LCPS school is a narrower parameter

[00:48:13] than the Sheriff's proposed language, which allows LCSO to access real-time video when there are concerns for safety when responding to an incident at an LCPS school. So I have a concern that the proposed language... So I might be misunderstanding you, sir.

[00:48:29] Are you saying that if there's a safety issue at a school and it could be a disastrous safety issue, that you don't think we should have access to the real-time feed? Is that what you're telling us? Sheriff Chapman, I'm saying that I think there need to be parameters on the sheriff's office's access to our video feeds.

[00:48:47] Yes. Well, this has been in existence since 2019, and I think if you— Limited parameters. This has been in existence since 2019, and if—there's never been an incident or a concern about that. Never, you know. It also hasn't been written anywhere. I don't know if you're making it look like we're abusing it.

[00:49:02] Or any other written documentation. I'm sorry. Pardon me. I'm sorry. You're trying to make it look like we're abusing it. Please stop. Let's not speak over each other. Let's let the person who has the floor complete their thoughts, and then we'll have a follow-up. Let's not. Well, that's fine, but if she asks a question or she makes an accusation that's incorrect, we're going to correct it.

[00:49:20] Okay, so the fact of the matter is that there has never been an incident where we've abused that system. Please, this is a school board meeting. I am the chair of this committee. I will ask my committee member to respect the decorum and civility of the school board in much the same way.

[00:49:43] Members, please do not interrupt when someone is speaking. We have guests in our house. Let's be respectful and try to build our relationship with this time together. Thank you. We're not in court.

[00:50:00] If I can ask a point of clarification. On the second one where you said it may be, I think there's a shall to a may. Can you refresh? Yeah, although I, sorry, Colonel, sorry if I may. I realized that I misspoke because I thought LCPS's proposed language said will, but it actually would be willing.

[00:50:19] The changes from would-be-willing to May. Sheriff Chapman, could you address that change of language, would-be-willing to May?

[00:50:42] I think Lieutenant Colonel Sawyer just did. Well, I think you just did because you just said it went from shall to May. Colonel Sawyer, I didn't want to cut you off if you had more to add about that language change from the red line version to the sheriff's proposed version.

[00:51:09] I think it's more so typographical. I don't think there was a meaning behind that. It would be likely fine either way. Thank you. I have two other brief comments, if I may, Chair Chandler, and then I will gladly be done speaking for today.

[00:51:44] The first, my first comment is, I understand what Sheriff Chapman is saying about how long this process has been taking. Many of us on this board have also been frustrated by how long this process has been taking. However, I had hoped, and I believe many of my colleagues had hoped, that we could work collaboratively, And that was the point of convening this select committee.

[00:52:08] I also noted that the SLEP guide also on page 30 emphasizes the importance of engaging community partners. And I was disappointed to receive this document without any notice to us and from my understanding without any notice to the Leesburg police.

[00:52:28] And I personally, my personal feeling is that presenting it in this way is not the optimal way to engage community partners. As to the question of elementary school SROs, that is part of my understanding is that is part of why we convene this select committee is so that we could have this conversation.

[00:52:51] So I do believe that this is the right venue to be having this conversation. And I will say that what we invited a proposal, and I still have not heard a concrete proposal from the sheriff's office. And moreover, again, referring to the SLEP guide, but the SLEP guide itself also says on, I believe it's page 19.

[00:53:22] Sorry, one moment. The SLEP Guide itself refers to concerns over introducing SROs into the school environment and steps that should be taken in advance of doing so.

[00:53:50] And also refers to the fact that there is no reliable evidence documenting or proving or tending to prove that the presence of SROs actually improves safety in the schools. Thank you.

[00:54:06] So I'd like to address a couple of the things that she just mentioned. Sure, Sheriff Chapman. First of all, a collaborative proposal. We've been working at this for a year and a half, and always in the past has been with the school board at large, not a select committee. Okay, so this has been a collaborative proposal, and this is one of several MOUs I've signed over the years, and I've never seen one that has gone on this long to sign what is really a document that is really just designed to provide your roles and responsibilities, the schools roles and responsibilities and our roles and responsibilities. This is not a social

[00:54:40] experiment. This is a very simple document as to what you provide and what we provide. And it's not to bring in like everybody and their brother into this situation and get their opinion. This is a very basic memorandum of understanding. And quite frankly, it's quite detailed for a basic understanding. It's like what is 12 pages long. Now we took out all the addendums on this because everything is referred to, there's a hyperlink to everything in there that refers directly to the laws that we're addressing. This also follows the DCJS protocol with regards to how this should be written, okay? DCJS doesn't ask

[00:55:19] everybody else in the community to be a part of it, they can be a part of the discussions, they don't have to be a part of the MOU, and I think we've been through this exercise long enough, and I just think it just makes no sense to can constantly go over, oh, add this, take this away, add this, take this away.

[00:55:39] It's really a simple process, and that's why I talked about, like the MOU that we just did with the receiving center there, you know, two months, two months to get it done, and we had two separate agreements, so Leesburg had theirs, we had ours, and they both went there. I've never seen anything take this long, and it's just an effort in procrastination, and I think, I think it really is, it's unconscionable that we can't get a simple MOU sign, take care of our children here and get this done and get get on with what

we do um i mean i don't know how how many more iterations you want to do how much longer you want to go on this if you want

[00:56:15] to go for another year and a half i mean i just think this is about as understandable and basic as it can be now if there's some tweaks that you want to make to my version to it which takes into account almost everything um with very little i mean honestly with i think everything just about everything that was in there is uh in in the red line version is in this okay if there's some tweaks that you want to make i would say go ahead and make those tweaks but i don't think it we ought to wait another year and a half to make those tweaks i think we ought to do this in a very

[00:56:46] short period of time thank you sheriff chapman board members any further um miss labelle thank you miss chandler and thank you for that mr ross um i think that uh chef chapman has a very good point. He is totally amenable to making changes that we want to make to his document. I can't say that I have seen the same sense of graciousness to making

[00:57:24] changes in our document. I think that everything is covered. I think he is entirely correct that we could possibly make some changes, send it out ahead of time and meet and sign something now i will say and i i spoke with mr um with west this morning that there have been some documents missing from our policy section uh miss scanlon and i had

[00:57:59] met earlier this week i believe it was on tuesday and we were looking for policy 8260 that had to do exactly with what we're talking about today um it wasn't there i had called miss scanlon because we're going to be taking that up in s back coming up and i spoke with miss scanlon and i said can you find this and she said well maybe i can i thought maybe she might have some access to that

[00:58:30] document that i didn't have and she couldn't find it and then i spoke with wes about it this morning it was not there on Tuesday. It was not anywhere on Tuesday. Anyone from the public, because this is a public area that should be searchable, would anybody from the public, including me, would not have been able to find it. Now, miraculously, it was back there today. I am

[00:59:02] concerned about where it went, but the same thing is happening now. I received a letter earlier today from our LCPS communications that sent me a copy of policy 8260 and it is not the same one that I'm holding in my hand now.

[00:59:28] It was accompanied by what we now know is the red line copy. So I think there's a lot of confusion of papers going back and forth and access to things. So if we do decide that we need to make some changes on Sheriff Chapman's document or rewrite our document, that those changes be sent to one another prior to coming here to discuss it in public.

[01:00:01] And I am very concerned about the part that was missing from our website that day. That's about all I have to say on that. Thank you, Ms. LaBelle. Mr. Swenson? Thank you, Madam Chair.

[01:00:19] First, in terms of speaking about the two versions of the document we have, the LCPS redline version and the sheriff's, I just wanted to note that from my reading of the public feedback we received, one of the most frequent topics we heard about was student interviews by law enforcement on campus and off campus.

[01:00:43] So I think that the appendix that lays out the criteria and guidelines for that based on suspect, victim, witness, is really helpful to have in the red line version from LCPS. So I think that's kind of a reason

that speaks to utilizing that as the base document.

[01:01:02] You know, this committee was created in part to have the opportunity for public feedback, and that was a key piece of public feedback we received was a lot of questions and concerns about what are the guidelines for when a student is questioned by law enforcement. And I think that this portion of the MOU, which is probably the most obvious public-facing document that a parent or a guardian might reference, I think it makes sense to have this appendix in there to kind of lay out that criteria of how that process would work for their student.

[01:01:34] In terms of changes we'd like to make to either document, I just wanted to raise for all the stakeholders here that in the Legislative and Policy Committee, at the school board, we've been working through a series of amendments to a suite of policies to comply with new Virginia law, which is section 22.1-2.2, regarding the protection of citizenship and immigration-related information. And that policy directly speaks to how school resource

[01:02:11] officers utilize that information and interact with the schools in terms and and that policy by the way is to ensure the right to free and public access to education so as we have been amending our policies which will now be before the full board for a vote next month to comply with the state law I think it would be appropriate to have reference to that new part of the of the Virginia code in the MOU and understanding it's a new piece of the code, I think it would make sense

[01:02:49] to have that in there, particularly in light of the conversation we had at the end of the last meeting about the discretion that deputies might have in terms of sharing information related to someone's immigration status. I think that given that this new Virginia law governs school resource officers and and the school system in terms of our how we treat information related to citizenship and immigration status it would make sense to have that codified there and accessible to the public to see how how that may be cabins discretion with respect to utilizing that

[01:03:26] information so that was something I wanted to raise and obviously that's some something we can work on and create language for that we can share to Ms. Labelle's point that we can share with all the relevant stakeholders here as we proceed with the MOU. Thank you.

[01:03:42] Ms. Labelle. And I just wanted to add that when we go through with policy 8260, coming up on the 23rd at our SBAC committee meeting, that we should be able to include any of the information that incorporate, not include, incorporate into the policy any of the information that We're getting through LNP and also through the MOU so that policy 8260 is compliant with everything that we're going through right now.

[01:04:23] Mr. Spenson. Thank you, Madam Chair. And I do think that that point speaks to the benefit of having this committee in the first place to air issues like this that we're having at the committee level and ensure that it's incorporated into the document. I did want to ask a couple questions about the proposal to expand the SRO program.

[01:04:42] I know that last spring the Board of Supervisors appropriated funds for a few additional deputies primarily to address response time in Western Loudoun. And I wanted to understand how how that has been going and what the impact of that has been, because I think from my reading of the of the proposal to expand the program, it's mostly about response time, which obviously varies across the county.

[01:05:10] You know, in Eastern Loudoun, we have elementary schools that share campuses with the middle schools and high schools, and it's different in Western Loudoun. So I'm just curious to understand how that addition has affected response time and coverage out west.

[01:05:26] Sure. So the budget last year, there were five floater SROs, but I think it's important to clarify the basis for the request of those floaters as they came from the previous budget year, brought forward was to backfill for schools where the SRO was vacant. So on average, so we have 30 SROs in total. On average, there are five out on any given day. Someone's sick, someone's on, you know, FEMLA leave. Most of their training doesn't interfere with school days, but they may

[01:06:00] have court or something like that. So on average, we have about five, I say, holes in schools that are just middle schools and high schools per day. So those five floaters are helping to fill those holes. They are not extra SROs. It really, what we've seen so far year to date, every day they are assigned into a school where the regular SRO that would normally be there is out for some, you know, some reason. We've had some unextended FMLA for birth of a child, you know, things like that, normal life events. So those five floater SROs that we got last year are really just patching

[01:06:39] holes. They're not shortening response time. They're not really providing any additional coverage. Basically, every school day, they are assigned into a school that's just without its regular SRO. And so, you know, we're in budget discussions right now with the county, and we have asked for additional ones for that reason to kind of, because really all they're doing right now is backfilling. We were hoping that it would give us a little bit of latitude, but it actually didn't. So we're asking for, what, five, I think, four and a supervisor or five and a supervisor.

[01:07:09] So we are trying to increase our SROs for that very reason so that we're going to have people certainly more in the western end of the county so we can get quicker responses in the event that we have some sort of a school incident out there. Thank you. And thank you for, yes, I recall during our discussions last spring about the need for floaters, substitutes to fill gaps.

[01:07:31] And for the budget requests that you're discussing with the county now, is that to continue to address the need to fill gaps that emerge when someone's out sick or for leave? Or is the idea of those additional floaters to actually be able to be out west and respond in event of an emergency?

[01:07:53] i think it would give us more flexibility uh for that hopefully uh we don't have too many people out sick or on femla or anything like that at any one time but i think it will give us more more availability out there which is what we were striving for but uh but honestly when we found out what we requested it just basically uh barely covered what we what we already needed just to kind of fill the gaps so uh yeah so hopefully it'll give us a lot more ability to protect you know our students out there on the western side of the county thank you thank you mr spenson

[01:08:28] um sheriff chapman thank you so much for being here um i want to start by saying um i'm really grateful that you've taken the time to join us i'm sorry that i didn't acknowledge you when you came in and um we've really only ever met in person one time um outside of a public meeting and so I just wanted to tell you I'm grateful for the time, and I want you to know that I hope that we can have a good, high-quality working and trusting relationship.

[01:09:00] I think it's incredibly important for the shared work that we do, and there's nothing more important than what we do to ensure that our students are safe at school. Well, thank you for that, and I

agree. I would like to have that kind of a relationship.

[01:09:15] I think, you know, we've been through this exercise over the years many times, and like I said, this one has been overly, I think, unnecessarily complicated, and I think what we can do is if we look at the sections that, you know, Mr. Svensson had brought up, and certainly Ms. LaBelle, I'm happy to get whatever tweaks on this document so we can get to some sort of a conclusion here.

[01:09:46] And I do know that Leesburg PD, I think they're fine either way the way this goes, but I think whatever document they do would be almost identical to this. I mean, there may be a couple little different things, but I think it'd be almost identical.

[01:10:02] But it would be nice to get this through, get whatever final tweaks, but to not let this take so long. Maybe, I mean, really, the tweaks that we're looking at here could probably be done in a week or two and just get this thing done, get it out. Truly Sheriff Chapman, I would love to have this done. And, you know, accountability is a big thing for me. And so I will acknowledge the fact that when I wrote in the letter to you, I had a misunderstanding. I had had, and it was based on two things. The board in 24 had been conveyed

[01:10:36] information about technical updates to the MOU and changing the signatories at that time. I remember reading that and had assumed it had happened, and then I had, and again, this is my first year as chair, had had a conversation with a past chair about potentially, since we had not come to an agreement in 25, having it be a renewal at that time.

[01:11:04] So that was really my misunderstanding. But this is a thing about me that I speak to often. And I hope that you'll offer me some understanding. I really like to understand the historical aspects of everything and how things have developed.

[01:11:25] And so that means that I often do things like go back and watch past meetings. And so I went back and watched the May 4th work session on the SRO MOU.

[01:11:44] And I understood from watching that, that you at that time in 21 also dropped a proposal, a new draft proposal, even though the negotiating teams had been working on a draft for two years.

[01:11:59] Is that, do you remember that? I don't recall, honestly, I don't recall much of that. all i do remember from working through that that there were a lot of outside entities that were wanted to be a part of that that were really not part of the way this is supposed to go this is simply an agreement between us and you that's it that's it and and that's where i think we had all these outside entities but that's the only thing i remember offhand i can't remember exactly what we took out what we did but i think it's important to note here you know and i think last year of all the you know activity at the schools and what do you have about 80,000 students

[01:12:38] last year I know you have what 78,000 this year I think there were 39 arrests I mean you've got less than one one tenth of one percent chance of of any law enforcement activity on any on any student in the county for with us for anything I mean we we work very hard to resolve any issues with the schools with the principals with you know with everybody involved so that that we don't have to do that we we really do have a good professional working relationship with uh with the public school system here you know and i just don't want this to to get you know mired in this

[01:13:15] quagmire of of endless back and forth when we have really a document that's just about there and i and i and i feel like let's just get it there let's just get it there sign it move on we've got other other fish to fry here um okay well i will say um one of the things that i noticed about watching that meeting in 21 was that the school board members at that time mentioned community collaboration and so i do want to clarify when we're we accept our board not just

[01:13:48] by process lcps accepts probably more feedback than enough any other school divisions and any other boards and the feedback that we're talking about is feedback that comes from parents and so it's not unusual when we're working on a policy for msac which is our organization that represents the parents of students who are considered minorities although in our county the majority of our students are children of color and and so we are actually they are perhaps technically now

[01:14:23] the majority of our students there's some semantics there to work through but we also receive feedback from SEAC which are the special education parents and I believe and I'd be happy to have Mr. Allen or anyone else who's here correct me if I'm wrong but the SEAC's obligation to provide us with feedback is I believe required by code that's correct so SEAC's feedback to us is required we have to accept it and we have been working really hard to overcome I mean I guess

[01:15:02] there are so many things that are unique to Loudoun County and one of those perhaps is that we're coming outside of a period of great change where we haven't had we've had instability in leadership. Dr. Spence has been here now for four years, but the four-year period before that we had like three superintendents. It was just a great deal of turmoil and change. And one of the things that we've been working on as a board, and I believe with Dr. Spence as our superintendent

[01:15:39] and with the division, is rebuilding trust. And one of the issues and the feedback that we've received from MSAC and SEAC are that there are certain aspects in this MOU that are incredibly important to the parents that we represent. And just to go back, you know, when I reacted and wrote to you, I mentioned that I felt like it was better to collaborate than to take a unilateral approach. And I'm glad that you're here and shared with us the reasons why you created your

[01:16:17] own draft um but i do um understand from this meeting that i watched a couple times that you were represented at that time by retired who's a major easton l mcdonald who's now retired i guess the feedback from that school board was that there had been an overwhelming desire for community food feedback meaning these parent groups feedback to be included in the draft mou

[01:16:47] And there was some back and forth about the process and how the process is typically done and, you know, giving us the document. And, you know, I'll quote from retired Major McDonald.

[01:17:07] So the idea being that, you know, LCSO would agree to the draft, then they would send it to LPD and they would agree it to the draft and they would bring it forward to the school board.

[01:17:22] and the school board would have their opportunity to agree to the draft. And there were some questions about how long that process had been going on in 21. And McDonald says, I understand you think that it was, or let's see, what we're saying is the document that you have that you say is two years old, ma'am, madam chair, that document is seven years old, and they haven't been able to get the MOU passed since 2015.

[01:17:56] i can't you're going back to 2021 i can tell you this in my opinion on that is that you can have whatever agreements you want with anybody on the outside whether it's seac msac anybody that you want

okay that really has nothing to do with the semi-u the semi-u has simply to do with your responsibilities and our responsibilities and we follow the dcs dcjs template okay so so we can you know how many people do you get in and you're talking about being responsive to the to the to the community you put this stuff out you're talking about being responsive to the citizens

[01:18:34] that you serve and yet that you came in against elementary school resource officers went over 60 percent of this county in three different surveys was in favor of that and then when I look at what you all did with the holidays so the holidays you go ahead and you add these holidays in that one and I don't care one way or the other quite frankly I don't have any kids in school anymore But the fact of the matter is, is that 38 percent, I believe, came in against them and over 50 percent.

[01:19:00] So if you're saying that you're really listening to the people in the community about how you should be running your operation, I would challenge some of that. And as far as SEAC and MSAC and all these other elements go, you can have whatever agreement you want outside of the MOU.

[01:19:18] That really has no bearing on this MOU. you. Well, thank you for your feedback, especially related to the survey results. Loudoun County has 400 and about 450,000 residents. We have about 78,000 students. That probably means we have about 27,000 families. And with the calendar survey, I guess that it wasn't technically a survey. It was like a request for feedback. We got about a thousand responses. So, I mean,

[01:19:57] yes, you can look to situations like that and say an overwhelming number of people agreed to that, but are they really reflecting accurately the total picture when there are so many more people? Well, that would be the same for any feedback that you're getting. So, it doesn't really, I mean, it's just a relative sample. Sheriff Chapman, I'm going to ask you just to let me speak for a minute um thank you and I won't interrupt you when it's your turn to respond to

[01:20:25] me um when it comes to community feedback and again I come to the table and and I bring this situation up from the past school board because I'm surprised that you seem surprised that the school board wants to have a say in this I mean we are elected to govern what happens in Loudoun County Public Schools. And I bring it up because I think it's clear from the record that multiple

[01:21:02] past school boards also took some time to make sure that they got the MOU exactly right. And there are certainly other reasons why some of our meetings have been delayed. That's not for me to share. I would like to ask some questions about your draft. I'm sorry, what was your,

[01:21:34] did you ask a question I'm sorry I'm about to ask some questions okay go ahead okay so in your version you want and again I know you've spoken to this and I don't want to harp on it but I would just like to make sure we have a clear understanding why do you feel it's best to take I mean we are all working together across the county to ensure the same standard of service to our students but you have proposed an MOU that only would be a party between your organization and LCPS,

[01:22:14] and then LCPS would then have an agreement with LPD. Why do you feel that's the best approach? Well, if you don't believe you have input into this, I would argue that just based on this document that was provided.

[01:22:32] So this has been a work in progress for a very long time. So I would say that there's been input from you, input from us, and that's, in fact, the vast, vast majority, if not just about everything that's in this document, is in the one that I did.

[01:22:48] It's just simplified. It's just synopsized, so it's not redundant. There is a verbose document. There were several things that were repeated several times in there unnecessarily, so I wanted to make sure that we got that, and we wanted to make sure, instead of having a whatever 20-page addendum that we had hyperlinks to all the elements of concern that were relative to state code. And so that's in there, you know. So it's just a matter of simplifying it so that people can understand it, can read it, it's simple, it's what we do, and it involves your roles and

[01:23:24] responsibilities, school's roles and responsibilities, and our roles and responsibilities. That's it. anything you want to do outside of that is is your business okay it's that that is really very nothing to do with us in this particular document you can have any mous you want thank you um is there a reason why you think that the form like changing the format that has existed at least since 2021 that has all of the entities that are working together to provide the service for our students? Why is taking it down so that it's just between your agency and LCPS the best approach?

[01:24:01] Because that's what's required by the Department of Criminal Justice Services. It's a simplified document. Like I said, it's just about your roles and responsibility and ours. There's no necessity to put superfluous information in there that's not specifically related to that.

[01:24:18] And again, I mean, if you wanted to have MOUs with anybody else, you're entitled to do that. But but this is just a basic understanding of what we do, what services we provide, how we do it and how you do it and how we interact that way has really nothing to do with anything else.

[01:24:35] Thank you. Let's see. So if we're looking at your version, when you look at the roles and responsibilities of the SRO, your version has shortened the SRO roles and responsibilities and provided more of a summary. Why would you see that as being a better approach?

[01:25:07] I don't think it shortened anything. I think what we did was there were several times where things were mentioned in this document, in the original red line version here, that didn't need to be mentioned more than once. I mean, I think our, you know, you're talking about roles and responsibilities. It's still a 13 page document. I think it's pretty detailed as to what our roles and responsibilities are.

[01:25:31] Okay, so then let's look, I know Vice Chair Donna, you talked about cultural diversity awareness. I know that when we put this out for feedback, we got about 38 pages of feedback from our parent partners.

[01:25:53] And that was an issue that was definitely cultural diversity awareness. That was definitely something that was highlighted by being important from parents. But in looking at the next paragraph, when you talk about the SRO supervisor will ensure that day-to-day school coverage is provided as agreed upon between the LCSO and LCPS.

[01:26:20] Should a shortage of SROs occur, high schools will be prioritized for coverage. In the red line, it says beyond that, that LCSO LPD will provide one SRO for each middle school and high school building. In instances where a single facility, multiple educational programs, SRO staffing is needed, will be coordinated collaboratively between LCPS and LCSO LPD. Staffing decisions will be based on unique needs and operational considerations of

[01:26:58] the building and its student population. So in an instance like that, how would staffing be handled and what input would the schools be able to provide? Are you given a specific scenario? I wasn't quite understanding what you were saying in instances where a single facility houses multiple educational

programs sro staffing as needed will be coordinated collaboratively between the lcps between lcps and lcso lpd staffing decisions will be based on the unique needs and operational considerations of the building and its student population sure i can speak to that so um that

[01:27:37] language was um on the heels of schools like roby and the rise academy where they are co-located with another school um and the idea was technically they are and again i'm i'm in your world so i'm i believe i'm right correct me if i'm wrong i believe they are their own separate school technically but they're co-located in a building with another school so in those instances um what our current agreement is is that we would have one sro assigned to that building not to each individual school um unless the workload of you know one of those schools would rise to a level where then we would come back and say hey we have two schools that are currently within i think it's

[01:28:16] time based on the volume of you know whatever is working in that school we may want to add somebody else so the default is that when there's multiple schools in a single building that it's one school resource officer but there's an option that again if something were to change and we need to come back to that then we would come back to lcps and say hey i think i'll just use roby for example i think roby has grown to the size where it needs its own sro and therefore we would then have two technically in the same building but assigned to the school but that would be the exception that has not happened we have not had a need for that we are currently operating in the

[01:28:52] places where schools are co-located they have they each have one sro currently today okay thank you for that and then um in the next paragraph the language is a little bit different um That language that you've included is should a shortage of SRO, excuse me, I'm jumping back to the wrong place.

[01:29:19] Efforts should be made to avoid engaging children in the criminal justice system if possible. Is there a reason why that language is your preference?

[01:29:37] I'm sorry, I couldn't understand what you said. Is there a reason why that language is your preference? So I believe that language was in a couple different places in the previous version, and so it was designed to be streamlined. but we we do make every effort to not involve students in the justice process when possible so it's stated um you know pretty early up front um that we believe most um you know discipline issues um you know things like that can be handled through the school and so we referred back to the school the vast majority of incidents that happen in the school for the school to handle based on

[01:30:15] you know school discipline obviously there are some that rise to the level where that's you know you know, that's not feasible. And, um, uh, you know, specific law enforcement action or criminal charges may need to be brought, but those are the exception. Um, the, the default position is that we avoid charging unless we really need to. Thank you for that clarification. Um, in the red line version, I believe here, these are some examples of language I believe is not in the red line version or that it, excuse me, I stated that wrong. I have some questions about language that

[01:30:53] i believe was in the joint version that has not been included in the lcso version and i would love to hear your thoughts on why these changes were made um so i'm asking does the lcso version include this language and if not why was it taken out um sros are expected to be familiar with the srnr the rules of individual schools and the application of both in day-to-day practices What line are you talking about in the red line version?

[01:31:54] It's on line 131. I think that's in the version I provided.

[01:32:15] Where would I be able to find that? If I don't have the lines numbered, you're probably going to have to read it. If I may, I do also think that the very beginning of it, the second paragraph on page one, where it says that the parties agree that most student misconduct can be addressed through classroom and in-school strategies, outlined in the Student Rights and Responsibilities, the SRNR Handbook, and the Student Code of Conduct.

[01:32:52] I think that would infer, at minimum, that the SROs have to be familiar with that document. In practice. I'm sorry, I missed that.

[01:33:11] So, maybe it would, could you please repeat what you just said? Sure. So, the second paragraph on the very front page says that the parties agree that most student misconduct can be addressed through classroom and in-school strategies as outlined in the Student Rights and responsibilities the handbook for families and other things um so that would infer that they have to be familiar with those documents for them to be able to accomplish that okay um and moving on

[01:33:42] so i'm on the third page um where it talks about sros as role models informal mentors and role models um from my perspective the joint draft includes some helpful language on the process

[01:34:05] and then in school division responsibilities um at the last sentence if this is not possible the superintendent along with the sheriff or their respective designees shall approve of the alternate placement i don't believe the sheriff is included in the joint um document in that way um how would

[01:34:43] you see that working and and why do you feel that's necessary you know okay so again i think this is probably a little bit more technicality but um when it comes to a workspace for a school resource officer um i do think there's an element that we should see where they are not that you would put us in a you know you know cleaning closet or something like that um but um but i think there's an element that um when we're talking about the offices where the sros are going to work

[01:35:17] that if the if the general placement is not available then there's some level for us to also just see and make sure that it's a suitable environment for the things that we have. Thank you. Okay. I have a question about the operational procedures.

[01:35:34] It might take me just a second to get there. Okay. In the operational procedures, we have, in multiple paragraphs, some references to how procedure is followed when we have concurrent joint investigations.

[01:36:23] And I think your draft is a little bit less specific about how that should be handled. I don't see anything like Adline 285 in the event a joint investigation cannot occur.

[01:36:42] LCPS will notify LCSO LPD that it will be moving forward with administrative review. LCPS will notify the LCSO LPD at the conclusion of the investigation.

[01:37:02] And then at 259, do we have some of that? or no, LCPS recognizes that law enforcement agencies are charged with investigating allegations of any violation of criminal laws committed on school property on a school bus or at the school sponsored activity that language is familiar and might be in.

[01:37:24] In the event of a concurrent investigation involving employee or student misconduct of a criminal nature that is school related, the LCSO, LPD, and LCPS may collaborate to the extent permissible under their own respective policies and regulations.

[01:37:48] Given issues that have happened in the past, I think it would be unwise to have less specific or the loss of specificity could be a detriment to our procedures. Okay.

[01:38:04] In the section on live access to real-time live video feed, my question really, and I know Vice Chair Donahue touched on this, if you look at the first bullet point in the red line, our joint version that was the one that we had before, There's a qualifier here where there are concerns for officer or fire official health and safety in responding to an incident at an LCPS school.

[01:38:35] And I was going to ask if anyone on staff would like to explain why that language was included in the draft and how it's different. I think specifically the language that was included in the draft was an attempt to just clarify when video would need to be accessed.

[01:39:01] that the the idea would be would only be accessed if there was specific concern about responders to the scene uh concern for their safety and um to colonel soren's point i guess there are other responders so i wonder if there's just a way to capture that idea of responders to the scene and concern for their safety okay um i feel like we could probably come come with some language that would meet that that goal without narrowing it so so carefully that an animal control officer would be unsafe showing up with a bear on the premises thank

[01:39:33] you for that clarification um and then in i guess in your draft sheriff chapman on the third bullet um there it's included u.s code um in uh the joint draft i don't believe that is specifically called out i was curious if anybody could tell me why right here oh and so we're in the real time live

[01:40:05] video feed all video recordings it's the third bullet here it's but state and federal law but including but not limited to family education rights and privacy, FERPA.

[01:40:22] In the red line version, 20 U.S.C. 1232G is really just the citation for FERPA in the U.S. Code. Well, I mean, and before that, it says state and federal law. I'm just curious, I mean, it's just a difference here.

[01:40:41] Our language doesn't insert the U.S. Code, so it's trying to understand why that would be added or what the benefit is. What is it implied? I don't know what your question was, but I can tell you. You can go through line by line on this if you want.

[01:40:58] There's no need to be redundant if there's a code section that we can refer to. That's why we did this throughout this document. You don't have to cite every word of the code in here when you can refer to the code directly, and that can be looked up.

[01:41:18] Everything that we do is consistent with the Code of Virginia. Everything that we did is consistent with what was in the previous MIU. In fact, I took the previous MAU, the red line version, I went through section by section by section, basically kept everything that was the same. Try to simplify places where we had code section to refer to so we didn't have to have this extraneous addendum on it.

[01:41:39] And so it's all in here. Whatever you need, whatever we're supposed to do and whatever you're supposed to do is already a part of this document. Okay, thank you. I actually was wondering if there is a utility to the addendum, and if you see that as being a place, like having it as a separate addendum is useful.

[01:42:04] Thank you, Madam Chair. If I could speak to that, and certainly I'd encourage Ms. Mitchell or Ms. Scanlon to chime in, but I would say just broadly, yeah, that would be one. We would love, particularly

in Appendix 2, to stay in, and the reason we'd like Appendix 2 to stay in is because we think that's a nice, quick reference for our staff to be able to look at without having to go in and find the bullet points inside of the MOU.

[01:42:28] The notification table, something that they use on a pretty regular basis, just to make sure we're getting it right. So if the Sheriff's Office is open to that idea, we'd love to see Appendix 2 in there. Appendix 1 is just a citation of our policy. It doesn't necessarily have to be in there, but Appendix 2 is helpful for us.

[01:42:49] Thank you. So you would rather have, instead of a referral, a hyperlink to the codes that we just do, all the codes that are cited and list all those in the back as an addendum.

[01:43:10] Is that what you're saying? Yeah, so the addendum is in the form of a table, and it's just a kind of quick reference table for our staff. And I'm just an old-school binder guy, and I know a lot of my other principals are too, and they like to just have that copy right there, and they can just look at it. Well, if you'd like, and if that's a matter of just taking the code and just listing all the codes that are in here and doing those as an addendum and just say, you know, reference school resource officers.

[01:43:40] The first code that we cite is 9.1-101 and just put what that code is. Is that what you're saying? No, no. If you look at Appendix 2 in the red line version, you'll see it's really not about citing code. It's really what we would call a notification table where it just says in the instance that you have, and it goes through each one of them, it says if you have a juvenile suspect and it's an on-campus offense, here's how you notify and who's responsible.

[01:44:07] if you have an off-campus offense here's how you notify and who's responsible and we go through that for each type of student or adult interaction that we might have and it just gives our just gives our administrators an easy reference and frankly I think you know when they're talking with the SRO is an easy reference to say I think this one's on you or I think this one's on you sure so I think that's something we could we could keep in the back okay I'm gonna try to wrap it up I promise I want to make sure that I we have 15 minutes because we have another meeting this

[01:44:46] evening and I want to make sure that everybody has a chance to say or to ask questions as well I just wanted to mention that on the joint version on line 276 there's language that says to be sure the sharing of information does not transfer ownership of any records to LCSO and LPD I don't believe that language is included in your document is that accurate madam jackins i can answer that that thank you dr spence it's not in there and i know um i was talking with division council about

[01:45:25] that that's one of those lawyer things that we wanted to make sure was in there just because it does ensure that there's a there's a nuance we think whereas if we are giving you information it could then be construed as if we're handing those records to you and this is just clarifying that that's not the case. Thank you. That does seem important. In the use of body worn cameras,

[01:45:48] the original reference was LCSO, LCPS, but I believe now it's only LCPS policy in accordance.

[01:46:08] So body worn cameras shall be used in accordance with. I think what you're referencing is that LPD policy was removed and that's because of the suggestion that it be separated between the two agencies. Thank you for that. All right. This will be it for me. Just to come back, the physical intervention by SROs. I understand, and I see it here in the draft, the language says

[01:46:47] use of force by SROs is governed by applicable law and the policies of the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office. SROs shall be informed of policy 5345, which is our policy. And in your language, you said it applies to school personnel, but does not govern law enforcement officers. I was hoping you could speak more to that so that we could understand what the issues are here. But this is an issue that parents have expressed, especially parents of students with disabilities,

[01:47:26] that they find this to be incredibly important and it's something that I would want to make sure that in our working relationship we capture in an appropriate way. I can speak on that. So that is essentially a rewording of the language from the red line in the existing document.

[01:47:50] It ends with the statement says this policy does not apply to law enforcement executing their official duties um so this is essentially a reword to say we are we're aware of the policy as we talked before we don't we don't do restraint and seclusion in the schools we're not part of the bit team um so basically that's like we're aware of your policies on that but we we don't do that any sort of restraint for us would have to fall under our use of force policies we'd have to be executing law enforcement action we don't restrain and seclude students we're aware of your policies and we will be aware of your policies, and I think that's a good thing for us.

[01:48:28] But in both versions, there's a statement that says this doesn't apply to us following our official duties. If we are having to use some sort of restraint as part of our official duties, we're taking law enforcement action, essentially taking someone into custody, so putting someone in handcuffs or things like that.

[01:48:46] That would solely be based on an imminent thing that needs to happen right there that is a violation of criminal law where someone's being taken into custody at that moment. That's not behavioral. That has nothing to do with any of those things that the normal, you know, the school board policy there is really designed to cover.

[01:49:09] Okay. Thank you for that clarification. I'm sorry. I do have this is really, I promise, my last question. The section incident management, I'm not sure that was included in the joint draft. I would love to have clarification on that. I notice there's language that says whenever practical, the principal will consult with law enforcement before deciding on a school's status.

[01:49:33] And then also law enforcement will assume operational control established unified command consistent with the National Incident Management System. That may be the appropriate protocol. But I just wanted to get clarification on whether or not that process has been discussed with LCPS.

[01:49:51] Yes. so that that was actually part of appendix one the first appendix it was kind of it was placed there there's some there's some red lines in there but there's a section from appendix one titled incident management we had just moved it into the main the main body we did we did shorten it a little bit to kind of cover what I think would be the highlights of that but appendix one had a section called incident management. Okay. Thank you. I will ask there are several other school board members present. Would you like to ask any

[01:50:28] questions related to the drafts? Ms. Chernoff? Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate you inviting us to ask questions. I really just have two main questions. We have invited our friends from Leesburg PD to the table because they are an integral part of this negotiation and I would not be doing my

due diligence as a leesburg school board member to ask them their opinion on whether or not they want to go solo on their own mou with lcps or whether they would like to continue the practice

[01:51:04] of the past which is having a joint um mou with the sheriff's department and thank you for being here and for all you do you're welcome and thank you for inviting us um you know i think as i sit here and listen to this i think we all share the same goal as far as the safety and security in the schools and and working together and then also completing this document and wrapping up this process so you know it's an opinion of the department myself the chief spoke extensively with her about this you know we were presented with the this draft MOU from the sheriff's office at the same time that dr. Spence was and dr. Mitchell was so when we learned of it you know I don't

[01:51:44] have an independent draft from LPD here today to present you know I've reviewed obviously we've reviewed extensively both documents we're comfortable with the original red line version that we had worked on collectively um um also i i don't see we don't not major any major changes between what the the sheriff's office has proffered um is it a little bit is it more streamlined is it a little bit more concise i would agree with that um that you know the existing red line document was something that's been worked on and added and revisions and all those things

[01:52:20] of that nature so i think from our opinion we're looking for a little bit of a direction if the direction and of school board administration or the school board and lcps administration is that we need to you know draft our own mou like we're happy in proceeding that in the interest of just like said moving forward um or we're doing uh doing something collectively too so we're good with either either way ma'am thank you madam chair one more um i i want to acknowledge that i understand the frustration of a long process and I echo Sheriff Chapman's sentiments in terms of

[01:52:59] this sort of being unprecedented but I also echo the school board members sentiments and that we are also wanting to get this done I'll speak for myself and I have had good conversations with your office and LPD and just kind of for me I would like to see this come to fruition And so I guess my question is really might be more general for where we go from here is sort of what are the next steps?

[01:53:26] Because I think what's most important is what you just said. We are we're on about the same thing here. We need to keep our kids safe and we do keep our kids safe. I think that that's important for the public to know. From my perspective, none of this is about feeling like our kids are not safe in school.

[01:53:42] Our kids are safe in school in Loudoun County. Could we put provisions in place that would ensure further safety? I think we can always evaluate that, and I have spoken to my support for that. However, I want to know now, we have a new document at the table, and I realize it's more of a summary of the redline version and a streamlined version, but we also have the redline version that we've worked to this point, and we've put a lot of work into that.

[01:54:12] And I think prior to this committee, had we just signed that redline version, we probably would have just signed that redline version and it probably would have been okay with the sheriff's office is my guess. So where do we go next with this? Are we at an impasse here, Sheriff Chapman, or are we still willing to consider signing the redline version from LCPS if we can work on the few tweaks that have been mentioned? I went through the redline version. It's almost impossible to understand. It's redundant, verbose. It was very difficult. Most everything that's in that redlined version is included in our version, in the version that I submitted.

[01:54:50] Now, if it's a matter of putting the appendix in the permission action table and adding that and resubmitting it for you all to look at, that's fine because I think you're going to find that the redlined version and my version are pretty identical.

[01:55:06] It's just that we took out where things were mentioned several times where it didn't need to be mentioned several times, so it was redundant. So that's been streamlined. document of anything, it should be kind of easy to read, easy to understand. Looking at the redline version, it is not. And so I don't know how many times we're going to go over this, but I would say that I'm happy to put in that table that Dr. Spencer asked about, resubmitted to you all for taking another look at it, and bring this thing to a conclusion. I mean, you know, I just don't know how many times we're going to do another redline version of this or that. I mean, we just

[01:55:43] need to, we need to get this going. I mean, there's, it's not doing anybody any good to sit on this thing for, you know, another year and a half. Thank you, Sheriff Chapman. Board members, any other questions? Ms. Riccardo? Thank you, Madam Chair. I just had a couple of quick questions. And this is mostly because I'm not as familiar with kind of the risk and legal mitigation aspects of this. So I'm going to kind of ask both of you, both departments, or just for your, Claire, for your own take on this um from a risk or legal perspective is there a a good rationale for separate agreements has i mean i don't know if something's happened either in the law or in the

[01:56:23] way either organization operates if there's a need for it to be separate or if it was more just the timeline is just taking too long and we just want to get it moving because i'm i'm kind of on the fence on one or one one agreement or two i personally i could go either way but i don't know there's a risk management or business rationale for that I'll answer that from my perspective I think this simplifies it this makes the org this makes this agreement between us simply and Lyon County School Board and those are the only two people I need to be signatures on this okay dr. Spence doesn't even to

[01:57:02] be even need to be a signature on this okay he can if he wants but he doesn't even need to be a signature ours is just it just simplifies it and and for for leesburg and i think leesburgs would probably be almost identical to this okay but the difference is they've got different attorneys they've got different people evaluating things should there be should there be any kind of a difference of opinion in the way we handle things on any particular incident in the future. It could be an issue. And that's why I mean, if it's an issue with Leesburg and the school

[01:57:39] board or the public school system, they can handle it directly. If there's an issue with us, we can handle it directly. Two different reporting requirements. They report to the mayor, to the town manager. That's where theirs goes. I don't. I report directly to the citizens that we serve.

[01:57:58] We have two completely different reporting requirements. If there's some sort of a difficulty with where this is going, who's going to be the arbitrator if we all have a disagreement? Is it going to be the school board?

[01:58:13] Is it going to be public school? It just confuses the issue. It just makes it simple. I mean, we work great together. We always have. We will continue. We have a great working relationship. That has nothing to do with this document. This is just to keep it simple.

[01:58:28] In the event that you have some sort of a bureaucratic obstacle based on the different forms of government that we both serve when it comes to the way that we do our law enforcement services. Thank

you. Can I just do a follow-up on that, too? I just wanted to hear from you. I have one other quick question, which is just, let me hear from you guys first on this topic, and then I'll just ask the other one just a quick, quick question.

[01:58:49] Just as I stated earlier, I think we're comfortable either way. You know, we don't have anything we're inherently worried about as far as in what the sheriff proffered as far as his agreement um you know like i said we're fully prepared with the red line version outside of something um you know coming up in this meeting that needed to be changed that we'd need to go back and and retool or think about um so we're comfortable either way so it sounds like if we use the sheriff's but made the tweaks that we need to make that might be something you all would be amenable to and then we'd get to an agreement relatively quickly hopefully i mean

[01:59:26] i think we could work with what the sheriff has proffered and um the only thing i would add is like we we learned of this last week and what do we what he'd proffer we have been provided a copy of it but we we've not had you know our town attorney or anybody else you know look at that so but i think if we you know we we would be happy with something very similar just like we're happy to what we have now we've worked on together thank you and then just really quickly um are there any schools um that we currently have that would require more than one sro so currently i don't

[02:00:02] think so um what i would say one of the biggest things we see an additional need for is a school that has a threat so currently we don't have the ability to upstaff because we are a one-to-one but when a threat comes in at a school or we need to provide extra presence whether it's just for the opening or for the you know the remainder of the school day whatever based on the nature of the threat we don't have another sro that can be applied to that so um so i would say the biggest the biggest um i don't want to use the word vulnerability but my brain's not coming up with a different one right now um the the biggest issue we have with staffing is when it relates to

[02:00:38] that we are a truly a one-to-one um so if an incident occurs at a school that needs more than one sro we don't we have to pull from another building or if there's a school that we need to up staff based on threats or something else for the day, we don't have additional staff to just apply to that.

[02:00:55] All right. Thank you so much. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Riccardi. We have reached the conclusion. I'm sorry. Oh, Mrs. Griffiths. Thank you, Madam Chair. I would agree with you, Sheriff Chapman, that we have been on a delay, and I'm sorry about that.

[02:01:17] But I did have a question for you. Well, I found your MOU to be very straightforward. My question is, if we were to approve something for SROs, how quickly, and this is, I guess, Ms. Chernoff had mentioned, what are the next steps, how quickly can we get them in the schools, I guess is my question.

[02:01:42] I do not want to delay any longer if we can put something through. Thank you. well nothing uh i mean we're still working off the old mou so you know everybody's got the same protection that they had before so it's still working off the mou so it's not like we're we don't have the school staff because we're not at an mou here we're just trying to get this thing resolved and move forward yeah so if it went through tomorrow how soon could you get sros in the schools so essentially we need funding authority excuse me from the county um to be

[02:02:21] to have positions to be able to do that um so with the uh the county's budget process that would be the first opportunity for that um the sros are not hired in so they come from the internal side so once

we have positional authority from the board of supervisors we can usually turn around pretty quickly which is why we will typically when we get um funding authority it usually hits on july 1st we can have them in place by the the start of that school year for august um so it's probably not something we could turn around like if we were to start elementary school you know sros we know that it's something we could turn around extremely quickly um but funding authority needs

[02:02:59] to proceed thank you i just wanted to ask um to see how long it would take because we're going back and forth here thank you thank you thank you for your time this evening thank you for the conversation um we will reach out with next steps and with that uh the november 12 2026 select Committee of the School Board regarding the MOU between LCPS, LCSO, and LPD is now adjourned.

[02:03:26] Thank you, and please drive home safely.