



SPECIAL BOARD MEETING AGENDA Thursday November 7, 2024 10:00 a.m.

This meeting will be held at the MN POST Board, 1600 University Ave, Ste 200, St. Paul, MN 55104

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Agenda **ACTION**
3. Approval of the minutes from the October 24, 2024 Board meeting (attachment) **ACTION**
4. Comments regarding proposed SRO policy
 - Written comments (attachment)
 - a. SNS letter to POST Board – SRO model policy draft
 - b. LMC letter to POST Board – SRO model policy draft
 - c. Hodson feedback and suggested changes – SRO model policy draft
 - d. MCD letter to POST Board – SRO model policy draft
 - Verbal Comments: comments will be limited to two minutes per presenter*
- * Requests to address the Board on the SRO policy must be received by POST by Monday, November 4, 2024 at 4:00pm
5. Review of proposed SRO policy **DISCUSSION**
6. Adoption of SRO policy **ACTION**
7. Review of SRO course learning objectives **DISCUSSION**
8. Adoption of SRO course learning objectives **ACTION**
9. Adjournment



Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training

1600 University Avenue, Suite 200, Saint Paul, MN 55104
Main: (651) 643-3060 | www.mn.gov/post/

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

AGENDA ITEM 3

October 24, 2024

Members Present

Chair Luke Hennen
Andrew Evans
Jason Bennett
Jim Yang
Justin Terrell
Kelly Phillips
Nigel Perrote
Scott Kent
Shawn Williams
Shelly Schaefer
Stephanie Revering
Tad Farrell
Troy Wolbersen

Staff Present

Alicia Popowski
Angie Rohow
Erik Misselt
Jonathan Hoff
Katie Cederstrom
Michelle Haggberg
Mike Monsrud
Mike Cumiskey
Michael Sullivan
Rob Skoro
Schyler Beaty
Shari Bartness

Members Excused Absence

Jennifer Foster
Stephanie Burrage
Tanya Gladney

Counsel Present

David Cullen, A.G. Office
Christopher Kaisershot, A.G. Office

Others Present

Andrew Sparber (Variance Request)
Winston Martinez (Variance Request)
Rodrigo de Castro Moreira (Variance Request)

1. **Call to order:** Chair Hennen called the meeting to order on October 24, 2024 at 10:06 a.m.
2. **Call to Introduction to meeting tablet and accessing Board materials via SFTP login:** Ms. Bartness announced technical issues with SFTP and meeting recording not available.
3. **Approval of the agenda:** Chair Hennen asked for a motion to approve the agenda.
 - **MOTION:** Mr. Evans made a motion to approve the agenda. Ms. Holtberg seconded the motion. The motion was approved via unanimous voice vote.
4. **Approval of the Board meeting minutes on July 25, 2024:** Chair Hennen asked for a motion to approve the July 25, 2024 minutes.
 - **MOTION:** Chief Kent made a motion to approve the minutes. Dr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion was approved via unanimous voice vote.
5. **Introduction of new Board members:** Director Misselt announced new Board members; Dr. Stephanie Burrage and Mayor Tad Farrell.
6. **Presentation/ acceptance of ALJ decision:** Ms. Popowski provided a summary of the ALJ's decision and asked the Board for approval.
 - **MOTION:** Mr. Terrell made a motion to accept the ALJ's decision. Dr. Schaefer seconded the motion. The motion was approved via unanimous voice vote.

7. **Resolution to sign order adopting rule:** Ms. Popowski referred the Board to the adopting rule handout for part 6700.1600; Standards of Conduct; Revisor ID number 4850 that needs the Board's approval and signature.
 - **MOTION:** Ms. Holtberg made a motion to approve the adoption resolution. Mr. Yang seconded the motion. The motion was approved via unanimous voice vote.

8. **Variance request – Kelly DeBerg:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Mr. DeBerg's variance request as he was not able to attend. Mr. DeBerg is a former Fargo, ND police officer with 7 years of experience. His law enforcement experience is more than 6 years old which disqualifies him for eligibility to take the reciprocity licensing exam.
 - **MOTION:** Chief Revering made a motion for the Board to deny the petitioner's request for a variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0501, supb. 7, because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance has not been met. Mr. Terrell seconded the motion. Motion passed to deny the variance.

9. **Variance request – Andrew Sparber:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Mr. Sparber's variance request. Mr. Sparber was present for the meeting. Mr. Sparber is seeking a variance to allow him to take the reciprocity licensing exam. He has approximately 1.5 years of experience as a federal law enforcement officer, which is less than the 3 years of experience required for applicants with a post-secondary degree.
 - **MOTION:** Mr. Evans made a motion for the Board to grant the petitioner's request for a variance because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance have been met and that the variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0501, supb 7, be granted until June 2026 to take the reciprocity licensing exam. Chief Revering seconded the motion. Motion passed via unanimous voice vote.

10. **Variance request – Winston Martinez:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Mr. Martinez's variance request. Mr. Martinez was present for the meeting. Mr. Martinez is seeking a variance to allow him to take the reciprocity licensing exam. He has just over 2 years of experience as a New York City police officer, which is short of the 3 years of experience required for applicants with a post-secondary degree.
 - **MOTION:** Mr. Terrell made a motion for the Board to deny the petitioner's request for a variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0501, supb. 7, because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance has not been met. Dr. Williams seconded the motion. Motion passed to deny the variance.

11. **Variance request – Chad Swanson:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Mr. Swanson's variance request as he was not able to attend. Mr. Swanson is a former part-time license holder seeking a variance to waive the educational requirements to take the peace officer licensing exam.
 - **MOTION:** Dr. Schaefer made a motion for the Board to deny the petitioner's request for a variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0500, supb. 3, because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance has not been met. Mr. Terrell seconded the motion. Motion passed to deny the variance.

12. **Variance request – Eren Erbay:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Mr. Erbay's variance request as he was not able to attend. Mr. Erbay has a Bachelor's degree, which is not currently recognized as it was not earned in the United States. He is requesting a variance on the definition of "school" so that he may move forward in the hiring process as a cadet for the Minneapolis Police Dept.
 - **MOTION:** Mr. Bennett made a motion for the Board to grant the petitioner's request for a variance because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance have been met and that the variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0100, supb 20. Chief Kent seconded the motion. Motion passed via unanimous voice vote.

13. **Variance request – Logan Adair:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Mr. Adair’s variance request as he was not able to attend. Mr. Adair is seeking a variance to allow him to take the reciprocity licensing exam. He has just over 2 years of experience as a North Dakota police officer, which is less than the 3 years of experience required for applicants with a post-secondary degree.

- **MOTION:** Chief Kent made a motion for the Board to grant the petitioner’s request for a variance because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance have been met and that the variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0501, subp 7. Ms. Phillips seconded the motion. Ms. Bartness took a roll call vote with 7 “yes” votes to approve the variance, 6 “no” votes and one abstained vote.

Discussion ensued on whether the abstain vote is to be registered as a no vote.

- **MOTION:** Mr. Terrell made a motion for legal counsel, Mr. Cullen, to research an abstain vote and then come to a legal decision. Dr. Schaefer seconded. Motion passed.

14. **Variance request – Breck Ehlers:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Mr. Ehlers’s variance request as he was not able to attend. Mr. Ehlers is seeking a variance to allow him to take the reciprocity licensing exam. He has 2 years 9 months of experience as a North Dakota police officer, which is 3 months short of the 3 years of experience required for applicants with a post-secondary degree.

- **MOTION:** Mr. Bennett made a motion for the Board to grant the petitioner’s request for a variance because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance have been met and that the variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0501, subp. 7, be granted with a chance to take the PPOE exam 3 times. Mr. Perrote seconded the motion. The motion was approved via unanimous voice vote.

15. **Variance request – Rodrigo de Castro Moreira:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Mr. de Castro Moreira’s variance request. Mr. de Castro Moreira was present for the meeting. Mr. de Castro Moreira Moreira is seeking a variance to allow him to take the reciprocity licensing exam. He has 20 years of law enforcement experience in Sao Paolo, Brazil which does not meet the definition of a "law enforcement officer" in current rule.

- **MOTION:** Chief Revering made a motion for the Board to deny the petitioner’s request for a variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0501, subp. 3, because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance has not been met. Dr. Williams seconded the motion. Motion passed to deny the variance.

16. **Variance request – Jaaron Kamp:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Mr. Kamp’s variance request as he was not able to attend. Mr. Kamp is seeking a variance to allow him to take the reciprocity licensing exam. He has approximately 1 year and 8 months of experience as a North Dakota police officer, which is less than the 3 years of experience required for applicants with a post-secondary degree.

- **MOTION:** Mr. Evans made a motion for the Board to deny the petitioner’s request for a variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0501, subp. 7, because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance has not been met. Chief Revering seconded the motion. Motion passed to deny the variance.

17. **Variance request – Kyla Jackson:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Ms. Jackson’s variance request as she was not able to attend. Jackson is seeking a variance to allow her to take the reciprocity licensing exam. She has approximately 1.5 years of experience as a Fargo, North Dakota police officer, which is short of the 3 years of experience required for applicants with a post-secondary degree.

- **MOTION:** Mr. Evans made a motion for the Board to deny the petitioner’s request for a variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0501, subp. 7, because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance has not been met. Chief Revering seconded the motion. Motion passed to deny the variance.

18. **Variance request – Stephanie Roberts:** Ms. Cederstrom summarized Ms. Roberts’s variance request as she was not able to attend. Roberts is seeking a variance to allow her to take the reciprocity licensing exam. She has just over 2 years of experience in law enforcement in California which is short of the 3 years of experience required for applicants with a post-secondary degree.

- **MOTION:** Mr. Bennett made a motion for the Board to grant the petitioner’s request for a variance because the statutory criteria for a discretionary variance have been met and that the variance of Minnesota Rule 6700.0501, subp 7. Chief Kent seconded the motion. Ms. Bartness took a roll call vote with 5 “yes” votes to approve the variance and 9 “no” votes. The variance was denied.

19. **Executive Director report:** Director Misselt spoke about the following:

- Board decision was upheld for the Winsell case.
- FY23-24 Biennial report distributed to the Board members.
- IT Project– CE project to bring all forms and CE approval process online.
- Legislative update – budget session. Will be requesting edits of 626.84 to have statute language in line with rule making.
- IT Budget – to rebuild Salesforce exclusively for POST instead of sharing the platform with other state agencies.
- Staffing update – Assistant Executive Director, Michael Monsrud retires in December 2024. Will be hiring a 1-2 year contract position for writing curriculum.
- PPOE standardization being worked on currently.
- SRO policy done. Will be addressing at the next Board meeting on 11/7/24.

20. **Licensure matters (closed to the public)**

21. **Licensure hearing – Wyfells:** Mr. Kaisershot presented arguments and a closing statement during the open portion of the meeting.

22. **Deliberations - Wyfells (closed to the public)**

23. **Licensure hearing – Tinsley:** Mr. Kaisershot presented arguments and a closing statement during the open portion of the meeting.

24. **Deliberations – Tinsley (closed to the public)**

25. **Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.



Solutions Not Suspensions Coalition
1621 E Hennepin Ave #295
Minneapolis, MN 55414

October 11, 2024

Peace Officer Standards and Training Board
1600 University Avenue, Suite 200
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104

To the POST Board Chair and Committee Members,

Throughout the process of the SRO Model Policy creation, a core focus has been on the statutory mandate of this workgroup. While respecting this, we at Solutions Not Suspensions (SNS), center the rights, needs, and wellbeing of children. The final draft from the workgroup encompasses many elements we fought for alongside other advocates, but there are other topic areas that we feel are missing or could be more explicit.

The process the SRO Model Policy workgroup used to create this policy was not collaborative, nor did it feel like community members and advocates had equal opportunities to provide input. This is a disappointing contradiction to the intent and directives of the legislature. Instead of each participating organization having equal voice from the start, certain members' ideas and suggestions were prioritized over others, which had a clear impact on the final draft of the model policy. This context is important when considering the policy before you.

As the POST Board reviews this policy, there are fundamental components that we agree should be adopted. The Definitions section is important and provides clarity, ensuring that all parties have a shared understanding of what the policy encompasses. The sections on Crisis Intervention and De-escalation, Fostering a Positive School Climate, and specific details in Use of Force do a good job of meeting the statutory mandate of Chapter 78. The points listed under the School Climate section provide an important minimum standard for how officers should conduct themselves in school settings and the importance of de-escalation and crisis Intervention cannot be understated.

There are also sections which we believe should be developed further. The section on Use of Force addresses the ability for an officer to use force in an emergency situation, however several of the components of this section do not go far enough to meet intent of the law or to keep children safe. Chapter 78 asks the SRO Model Policy to address strategies to reduce the duration and use of prone restraints. The current language technically meets that standard, but we believe the lack of specificity about prone restraint reduction in the current Model Policy draft will put children at risk. De-escalation as a whole is important, but by not naming specific tactics to reduce duration and use of prone restraints, an opportunity was missed to provide detail, leaving a disappointing gap in the policy draft. The policy should include specifics such as stating that in the case of a prone restraint, the student must be taken out of that position as

quickly as possible. We would have also liked to have seen language that prevents prone restraints that cause airway restriction, pressure on the chest and torso, and other holds that can cause lifelong damage to a child's body. Additionally, the policy should explicitly outline scenarios in which use of force is and is not allowed.

The Fostering a Positive School Climate section should also be expanded. Based on the conversations during the work-group meetings, it was clear that officers are not well trained in this area. SNS provided specific examples of ways to foster a positive school climate based on feedback from youth and asked that those examples be included, but those recommendations were ignored in favor of the inclusion of behavior standards for SROs. This, in the eyes of our coalition, does too little to assist in the creation of a robust and positive school climate. The model policy would be improved by providing more focus on the different responsibilities of officers and school personnel in this regard.

The language on arrests within schools and training should be strengthened. And, there are entire areas of policy that this draft does not consider, including searches of student property, interrogations, and data collection on SRO interactions.

We know that having a model policy for School Resource Officers is important, and a significant benefit to the districts around Minnesota that have SROs. We believe that this policy, as currently written, misses an opportunity and provides a very low minimum standard for conduct. While districts might choose to do more, we believe that students in Minnesota deserve better. We recommend revisions to address the issues raised above prior to adopting the policy.

Sincerely,

Solutions Not Suspensions Coalition



October 10, 2024

VIA EMAIL

Mr. Mike Monsrud
 Assistant Executive Director
 Minnesota POST Board
 1600 University Avenue, Suite 200
 St. Paul, MN 55104
Michael.Monsrud@state.mn.us

Re: School Resource Officer Model Policy (October 3, 2024)

Dear Mr. Monsrud:

Please allow me to introduce myself: my name is Patricia Beety, and I am the General Counsel for the League of Minnesota Cities (LMC) and the League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust (LMCIT). These two organizations, often referred to as “the League”, have a significant interest in the legislation covering law enforcement agencies and schools utilizing school resource officers. We have reviewed the POST Board’s draft School Resource Officer Model Policy and believe it reflects a thoughtful balancing of interests and policy objectives. The League has identified some concerns with the policy as currently written which, if not addressed, could result in unintended liability consequences as well specific conflicts with the text of the enabling statute. Below is a succinct listing our concerns along with recommendations to resolve them. I would appreciate your consideration of the League’s feedback as part of the November POST Board special meeting. I would also be happy to answer questions or provide additional information/explanation as needed.

1. The policy language on SRO involvement in school rule violations arguably authorizes behavior that is prohibited by statute.

Explanation: The SRO enabling legislation (see first bullet, below) prohibits SROs from using their peace officer authority in situations where there is no crime. The rationale for this restriction is the heightened risk of a civil rights violation when a SRO stops, searches, detains, or arrests a student in the absence of a criminal incident. *See Evans v. Cabot Sch. Dist.*, No. 22-3290, __F. 4th__, 2024 WL 3819786 (8th Cir. Aug. 15, 2024) (SROs could be found liable for arresting students for noncriminal behavior).

- The enabling legislation addresses this concern by prohibiting SROs from using their peace officer powers in situations not involving a crime. Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482, subd. 2(c) provides:
 - “A school resource officer must not use force or the authority of their office solely to enforce school rules or policies or participate in the enforcement of discipline for violations of school rules.”
- The first sentence of the model policy’s fourth guiding principle carries this principle forward by stating:
 - “Enforcement of school rules or policies or enforcement of discipline for violations of school rules are properly the responsibility of school district staff and administration.”

But then it continues with a second sentence as follows:

“SRO discretion should be used when becoming involved with incidents that are school rule violations versus criminal conduct.”

The meaning and effect of the “school rule violations versus criminal conduct” clause in the second sentence is unclear. The overall import of the second sentence is that it modifies the first by indicating that SROs have discretion to become involved in school rule violations. But this cuts against the plain language of the statute. Presumably, this language was intended to remind SROs that just because a behavioral incident *could* support criminal charges, that does not foreclose dealing with it as a violation of school rules.

Risk: The language of the policy fosters a false impression that SROs have discretion to exercise peace officer authority in matters that are not criminal in nature. This threatens to violate the civil rights of students and expose officers and their agencies to liability.

This affects:

- Guiding Principles, fourth bullet
- Section E (4), Use of Force

Proposed solution: Modify the language of these sections as follows:

Keep the first sentence the same:

Enforcement of school rules or policies or enforcement of discipline for violations of school rules are properly the responsibility of school district staff and administration.

Then, select either option A or option B:

[A] When a criminal incident also involves a violation of school rules, SROs should consider referral of the matter to school authorities in lieu of a formal criminal referral, as appropriate for the incident, the students and families involved, the victim(s) and the larger school community. [This language is based on section F (1) (Arrest considerations)].

Or,

[B] SROs should exercise discretion when becoming involved with criminal matters that could, alternatively, be addressed as violations of school rules.

Options A and B more precisely advance the outcome the policy is presumably trying to achieve, while avoiding the impression that SROs have discretion to exercise their powers in matters that are solely violations of school rules.

2. The draft policy requires that SROs should provide students with treatment that is appropriate to their disability status, even when the SRO has no knowledge of their status.

Explanation:

- Policy section III(D) (Definitions) defines “**developmentally appropriately [sic] practices**” as “individualized, responsive care that is appropriate for the child’s age, cultural context, disability status and personality.”

- Policy section IV(E)(5) (Use of Force) provides:
“SROs should exercise **developmentally appropriate practices** when interacting with children, youth and individuals with physical, mental health, developmental or intellectual disabilities recognizing that the individual’s disability may affect their ability to understand or comply with commands from SROs.
- This policy language is modeled after section 609.066, subd. 1a(4) (Use of Deadly Force by Peace Officers):
“[P]eace officers should exercise special care when interacting with individuals with *known* physical, mental health, developmental, or intellectual disabilities as an individual's disability may affect the individual's ability to understand or comply with commands from peace officers.” (Emphasis added).

In simple terms, the deadly force statute requires that officers should try to accommodate a person’s disability when they know of it. The SRO policy on using force requires that officers should try to accommodate a person’s disability whether or not they know about it. Compounding matters, when the policy’s definition of “developmentally appropriate practices” is considered, it means that SROs should provide “individualized, responsive care”—based on the child’s “disability status and personality”—without regard to whether the officer has any knowledge of the child or their disability status.

Risk: Section IV(E)(5) establishes a standard of performance that in many cases will be impossible to meet. It will also create expectations for parents and stakeholders that officers cannot reasonably meet. This exposes SROs who fail to provide the care that is appropriate in light of a student’s disabilities and personality to criticism and liability risk, even when the SRO has no knowledge of the student’s disability status.

This affects: Section IV(E)(5).

Proposed solution: Modify the policy language to (1) require age-appropriate care to children, since what is age-appropriate can be generalized; and (2) incorporate the same “knowledge” condition that is used in the statutory requirement for officers to exercise special care toward persons with disabilities:

“SROs should exercise ~~developmentally~~ age-appropriate practices when interacting with children, *and developmentally appropriate practices with* youth and individuals *known to have* physical, mental health, developmental or intellectual disabilities, recognizing that the individual’s disability may affect their ability to understand or comply with commands from SROs.

3. The draft policy creates undue risk for agencies that lawfully place SROs in schools prior to training.

Explanation:

- Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482, subdivision 3 establishes training requirements for SROs. Subdivision 3(c) allows officers to begin serving as SROs so long as they complete the required training within six months, if the employing agency is unable to provide the training beforehand.

- Policy section IV(G)(3) (Training) provides: “It is highly recommended and best practices that a peace officer completes the training required under this section prior to filling the role of SRO.”

There is little doubt that having officers trained before they step into SRO roles is desirable. The Legislature, however, has made an allowance for having pre-trained SROs serve in these roles for a period of time until they can complete their training. The “highly recommend” and “best practices” language of the policy weighs against exercising this option. It does so by indicating that having pre-trained officers serve temporarily as SROs goes against best practices and contravenes what is “highly recommended” by the POST Board (and the agency itself, upon adoption of the model policy).

Risk: If a pre-trained SRO becomes involved in a controversial incident, it may result in criticism of the agency and its chief law enforcement officer for using a staffing option that the Legislature has explicitly made available. The draft language could also be cited in support of a claim for failure-to-train liability. Agencies might reasonably refrain from placing pre-trained SROs in service based on these concerns, leaving these roles vacant until training can be completed.

This affects: Section IV(G)(3).

Proposed solution: Temper and qualify the implicit criticism of using the pre-training staffing option:
“~~Whenever practicable, it is highly recommended and best practices preferable that~~ a peace officer completes the training required under this section prior to filling the role of SRO.”

By these changes, the policy expresses strong encouragement for using only trained personnel in SRO roles. But this expression of encouragement does not reflect such strong implicit disapproval for using a legislatively provided, pre-training staffing option.

With these recommended changes, the League would support this model policy language and work with our members to develop policy/programs in furtherance of the important objectives of the SRO legislation. Thank you for your kind consideration of these concerns, and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,



Patricia Beety
General Counsel

From: [Rick Hodsdon](#)
To: [Beety, Patricia](#)
Cc: [Monsrud, Michael \(POST\)](#); jeff@mnchiefs.org; [James Stuart](#)
Subject: Re: Model POST SRO policy
Date: Thursday, October 10, 2024 11:56:07 PM
Attachments: [Beety Letter to POST Bd 10.10.24.pdf](#)

You don't often get email from rick_hodsdon@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Thank you for sharing this analysis. I concur in your comments and I authorize you to so indicate as MSA counsel.

I have one suggestion to your last point and it is a concern I have with many sections. Where the draft speaks to “when practical” I encourage the term to use is “when reasonably practical”.

I have been around a really long time and drafted and edited thousands of policies and litigated the minutia of verbiage. I do not like having a situation where in a deposition a client is cross examined that something g was practically feasible in theory when in actual operations it was unreasonable. Sure, they can try to explain that distinction, but if the word reasonably always precedes the word practical they do not have to explain it because they can point to the exact language of the policy.

Again, nice job catching some potential liability issues and let me know if I can assist you in any way.

Rick Hodsdon

On Oct 11, 2024, at 9:18 AM, Beety, Patricia <PBeety@lmc.org> wrote:

Good afternoon!

I am attaching a letter containing feedback from the League on the proposed school resource officer model policy. I would appreciate it being included in the board packet for the November special POST Board meeting.

Sincerely,

Patricia Y. Beety | General Counsel

Phone: (651) 281-1270 | Mobile: (651) 402-6509

pbeety@lmc.org

League of Minnesota Cities | 145 University Ave. West | St. Paul, MN 55103

www.lmc.org | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Podcast](#)

SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER MODEL POLICY

Minn. Stat. 626.8482

I. POLICY

The primary purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines that **which** define the relationship between law enforcement agencies and the schools utilizing school resource officers (SRO). It will further facilitate the understanding of this relationship with regards to criminal matters and law enforcement situations, which will arise at the local school level. The goal of the SRO programs is to provide safe learning environments, provide valuable resources to school staff members, foster a positive relationship with students and develop strategies to resolve problems that affect our youth with the goal of protecting all children, so they can reach their fullest potential.

II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- The SRO employed by (School Name/Police Agency) should be carefully selected, thoroughly trained, and appropriately equipped to fulfill their role within the school community. The SRO should actively engage in early prevention and early intervention educational programs that focuses on and support student needs.
- SROs shall be specially trained in the principles and standards identified in Minn. Stat. 626.8482, Subd. 4 that **which** recognize the unique role of an SRO to foster positive relationships, open communication and mentorship while providing a safe and constructive environment for students, staff and visitors in the school setting.
- SROs are expected to recognize and consider alternatives to formal criminal referral such as diversion and restorative justice programs where reasonably possible and as appropriate for the incident, the involved students and families, victim(s) and the larger **school** community.
- Enforcement of school rules or policies or enforcement of discipline for violations of school rules are properly the responsibility of school district staff and administration. SRO discretion should be used when becoming involved with incidents that are school rule violations **versus** that are not criminal conduct.
- Nothing in this policy should be construed as limiting any other duty or responsibility imposed on peace officers; the expectation that peace officers will exercise professional judgment and discretion to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the public when carrying out their duties; or creates a duty for school resource officers to protect students, staff, or others on school grounds that is different from the duty to protect the public as a whole.

III. DEFINITIONS

- A. **School:** An elementary school, middle school, or secondary school, as defined in section 120A.05, subdivisions 9, 11 and 13.
- B. **School resource officer:** A licensed peace officer who is assigned to work in an elementary school, middle school, or secondary school during the regular instructional school day as one of the officer's regular responsibilities through the terms of a contract entered between the peace officer's employer and the designated school district or charter school.
- C. **Positive School Climate:** A school environment that makes students feel safe, supported and welcome.
- D. **Developmentally appropriately practices:** Means individualized, responsive care that is appropriate for the child's age, cultural context, disability status and personality.
- E. **Great bodily harm:** As defined in Minn. Stat. 609.02 Sub. 8 means bodily injury which creates a high probability of death, or which causes serious permanent disfigurement, or which causes a permanent or protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ or other serious bodily harm.
- F. **Prone restraint:** As defined in Minn. Stat. 121A.58 and for purposes of this policy, prone restraint means placing a **child student** in a face down position.
- G. **Custodial arrest:** A custodial arrest is the actual, physical restraint of a person and subsequent detention. Custodial arrest may occur with or without a warrant depending on the circumstances.
- H. **De-escalation:** Refers to the methods and actions taken to decrease the severity of a conflict, whether physical or verbal in nature.

IV. PROCEDURE

- A. General contractual requirements: The law enforcement agency's contract with a school district or charter school shall define the SRO's duties in compliance with Minn. Stat. 626.8482, Subd. 2.
 - 1. Additional issues to be addressed in contract. The contract between the parties:
 - i. Must address a mutually agreed upon policy regarding the use of plain clothes, modified uniforms, and other changes to SRO attire with the goal of fostering a positive school climate, facilitating the establishment of positive relationships with students, and promoting open communication;
 - ii. Shall articulate the role, if any, of the school district in the selection, vetting and retention of the SRO;

E. Use of Force.

1. SRO use of force is governed by and will comply with Minn. Stats. 609.06 Authorized Use of Force; 609.066 Authorized Use of Deadly Force by Peace Officers; 626.8475 Duty to Intercede and Report; and the Law Enforcement Agency's Use of Force Policy.
2. Specific tactics and strategies to minimize uses of force or the use and duration of prone restraint or physical holds of students:
 - a.
 - i. Employ de-escalation techniques, the least restrictive physical intervention strategies, as reasonable, for addressing conflicts in schools as identified in the training required under Minn. Stat. 626.8482, Subd. 4., and use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.
 - ii. b. Consistent with training after any use of force, the SRO shall assess the condition of the student and render aid as needed including restoring the student to a non-prone position as soon as reasonably possible,
3. Additional considerations for SROs when using force as allowed in Minn. Stat. 609.06 in a school situation, should include:
 - a. Immediacy and severity of the threat to officers or others, including the potential for injury to officers, students, and others. (change numbers to letters in remaining provisions)
 2. The conduct of the student individual being confronted, as reasonably perceived by the officer at the time.
 3. Officer/individual factors (e.g. age and/or maturity, physical size and/or abilities).
 4. The student's individual's ability to understand and comply with officer commands
 - a. The effects of suspected drug or alcohol use.
 - b. The student's individual's mental state or capacity.
 - c. The student's education plan or accommodations, if known.
 5. Proximity of weapons or dangerous improvised devices that could be used as a weapon.
 6. The degree to which the student individual has been effectively restrained and his/her their ability to resist despite being restrained.
 7. The availability of other reasonable and feasible options and their possible effectiveness (Minn. Stat. § 626.8452).
 8. The immediate need for intervention versus allowing time and distance for additional de-escalation.

- a. Seriousness of the suspected offense or reason for contact with the student individual.
 9. Training and experience of the officer.
 10. Whether the student individual appears to be resisting, attempting to evade arrest by flight, or is attacking the officer.
 11. The risk and reasonably foreseeable consequences of escape.
 12. Whether the conduct of the student individual being confronted no longer reasonably appears to pose an imminent threat to the officer or others.
 13. Prior contacts with the student individual or awareness of any propensity for violence.
 14. Any other exigent circumstances.
4. SROs shall not use force or the authority of their office solely to enforce school rules or policies or participate in the enforcement of discipline for violations of school rules. SRO discretion should be used when becoming involved with incidents that are school rule violations **versus** that are not criminal conduct.
 5. SROs should exercise developmentally appropriate practices when interacting with children, youth and individuals with physical, mental health, developmental or intellectual disabilities recognizing that the student's individual's disability may affect their ability to understand or comply with commands from SROs.

F. Arrest considerations.

1. As much as is reasonably practical, SROs should seek to utilize alternatives to formal criminal referral such as diversion and restorative justice programs where reasonably possible and as appropriate for the incident, the students and families involved, victim(s) and the larger **school** community.
2. Custodial arrests in school should be avoided if reasonably practical. If a custodial arrest is necessary because of exigency or public safety considerations, the arrest should be made in a non-communal area away from the view of other students if reasonably practicable.
3. When reasonably practicable, appropriate school staff should be notified prior to and/or present during the custodial arrest of a student.

G. Training

1. Except as provided for in paragraphs E.2., E.3., and E.4. below, beginning September 1, 2025, a peace officer assigned to serve as a school resource officer must complete a training course that provides instruction on the learning objectives identified in Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482, subdivision 4 prior to assuming the duties of a school resource officer.

2. A peace officer who has completed either the School Safety Center standardized Basic School Resource Officer Training or the National School Resource Officer Basic School Resource Officer course prior to September 1, 2025, must complete the training mandated under paragraph E.1. above before June 1, 2027. A peace officer covered under this paragraph may complete a supplemental training course approved by the board pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482, subdivision 4, paragraph (b), to satisfy the training requirement.
3. It is **highly recommended and best practice** encouraged that a peace officer completes the training required under this section prior to filling the role of SRO.

However, if an officer's employer is unable to provide the required training course to the officer prior to the officer assuming the duties of a school resource officer, the officer must complete the required training within six months of assuming the duties of a school resource officer. The officer is not required to perform the duties described in Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482, subdivision 2, paragraph (a), clause (4) or (5), until the officer has completed the required training course. The officer must review any policy adopted by the officer's employer pursuant to section 626.8482, subdivision 6 before assuming the other duties of a school resource officer and must comply with that policy.

4. An officer who is serving as a substitute school resource officer for fewer than 60 student contact days within a school year is not obligated to complete the required training or perform the duties described in Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482 subdivision 2, paragraph (a), clause (4) or (5), but must review and comply with any policy adopted pursuant to subdivision 6 by the law enforcement agency that employs the substitute school resource officer.
5. An SRO will complete a refresher course at a minimum of once every three years.
6. For each school resource officer employed by an agency, the chief law enforcement officer must maintain a copy of the most recent training certificate issued to the officer for completion of the training mandated under this section.

H. Data practices

1. The contract between the school district and the law enforcement agency must address data practices policies and procedures. These procedures and policies shall identify the education records that can be shared with the law enforcement agency generally and with the SRO specifically and for what purposes.
2. Law enforcement records that contain student and parent data that are maintained by the law enforcement agency shall be governed by the agency's data practices policy and in compliance with the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, including,

but not limited to, the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minn. Stats., chapter 13, and Minnesota Rules, parts 1205.0100-1205.2000.



Minnesota Council on Disability
1600 University Avenue, #8
St. Paul, MN 55104

October 11, 2024

Erik Misselt
Executive Director
Police Officer Standards and Training Board
1600 University Avenue, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55104

Greetings,

The Minnesota Council on Disability was honored and privileged to participate as an appointed member of the School Resource Officer Model Policy group hosted by the POST Board. Our paramount priority is to maintain the civil rights of disabled students while balancing the need for safety.

We largely support the policy as presented to the POST Board. However, we would have liked to see further exploration of guidelines to reduce the use of school resource officers for pupil intervention, increased attention on de-escalation, and to further limit the use of SROs in the school to interact with students regarding issues not concerning the school.

We hope this policy will continue to enhance the qualifications, training, and decision-making by SROs in schools to protect and limit the adverse experiences of students with disabilities in the education system and disrupt the school-to-prison pipeline in special education.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'David Dively'. The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized 'D' at the beginning.

David Dively
Executive Director

SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER MODEL POLICY

Minn. Stat. 626.8482

I. POLICY

The primary purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines which define the relationship between law enforcement agencies and the schools utilizing school resource officers (SRO). It will further facilitate the understanding of this relationship with regards to criminal matters and law enforcement situations, which will arise at the local school level. The goal of the SRO programs is to provide safe learning environments, provide valuable resources to school staff members, foster a positive relationship with students and develop strategies to resolve problems that affect our youth with the goal of protecting all children, so they can reach their fullest potential.

II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- The SRO employed by (School Name/Police Agency) should be carefully selected, thoroughly trained, and appropriately equipped to fulfill their role within the school community. The SRO should actively engage in early prevention and early intervention educational programs that focuses on and support student needs.
- SROs shall be specially trained in the principles and standards identified in Minn. Stat. 626.8482, Subd. 4 which recognize the unique role of an SRO to foster positive relationships, open communication and mentorship while providing a safe and constructive environment for students, staff and visitors in the school setting.
- SROs are expected to recognize and consider alternatives to formal criminal referral such as diversion and restorative justice programs where possible and as appropriate for the incident, the involved students and families, victim(s) and the larger school community.
- Enforcement of school rules or policies or enforcement of discipline for violations of school rules are properly the responsibility of school district staff and administration. SRO discretion should be used when becoming involved with incidents that are school rule violations versus criminal conduct.
- Nothing in this policy should be construed as limiting any other duty or responsibility imposed on peace officers; the expectation that peace officers will exercise professional judgment and discretion to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the public when carrying out their duties; or creates a duty for school resource officers to protect students, staff, or others on school grounds that is different from the duty to protect the public as a whole.

III. DEFINITIONS

- A. **School:** An elementary school, middle school, or secondary school, as defined in section 120A.05, subdivisions 9, 11 and 13.
- B. **School resource officer:** A licensed peace officer who is assigned to work in an elementary school, middle school, or secondary school during the regular instructional school day as one of the officer's regular responsibilities through the terms of a contract entered between the peace officer's employer and the designated school district or charter school.
- C. **Positive School Climate:** A school environment that makes students feel safe, supported and welcome.
- D. **Developmentally appropriately practices:** Means individualized, responsive care that is appropriate for the child's age, cultural context, disability status and personality.
- E. **Great bodily harm:** As defined in Minn. Stat. 609.02 Sub. 8 means bodily injury which creates a high probability of death, or which causes serious permanent disfigurement, or which causes a permanent or protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ or other serious bodily harm.
- F. **Prone restraint:** As defined in Minn. Stat. 121A.58 and for purposes of this policy, prone restraint means placing a child in a face down position.
- G. **Custodial arrest:** A custodial arrest is the actual, physical restraint of a person and subsequent detention. Custodial arrest may occur with or without a warrant depending on the circumstances.
- H. **De-escalation:** Refers to the methods and actions taken to decrease the severity of a conflict, whether physical or verbal in nature.

IV. PROCEDURE

- A. General contractual requirements: The law enforcement agency's contract with a school district or charter school shall define the SRO's duties in compliance with Minn. Stat. 626.8482, Subd. 2.
 - 1. Additional issues to be addressed in contract. The contract between the parties:
 - i. Must address a mutually agreed upon policy regarding the use of plain clothes, modified uniforms, and other changes to SRO attire with the goal of fostering a positive school climate, facilitating the establishment of positive relationships with students, and promoting open communication;
 - ii. Shall articulate the role, if any, of the school district in the selection, vetting and retention of the SRO;

- iii. Should address how the SRO will be informed of school district resources available to school staff to assist with de-escalation of conflicts in school, e.g. specialized crisis teams, mediation opportunities, etc; and
 - iv. Shall establish a public notification process that an SRO will be present in the schools.
2. A school district or charter school may contract with a school resource officer's employer for the officer to perform additional duties to those described in paragraph IV.A.

B. Fostering a Positive School Climate and Constructive Relationships:

1. SRO's should consider establishing a presence at times that allow opportunities to build connections and relationships.
2. SRO's should establish connections based upon mutual trust and respect while encouraging communication.
3. SRO's are a resource for educating students on what concerns should be reported to a responsible adult.

C. SRO's work in collaboration with the schools to Providing Campus Safety Training:

1. Use developmentally appropriate practices that take into consideration differences in culture, language, trauma and an individual's disabilities.
2. Use methods that help ensure school safety and security, focusing on safety over violence.
3. Encourage students to ask questions about school safety.

D. Crisis Intervention and De-escalation

1. SRO's are often required to make assessments of rapidly evolving situations, analyze potential responses and act upon various levels of safety concerns. Crisis intervention and de-escalation strategies should be used whenever possible in response to crisis or safety situations. The safety of the individual, SRO's, school staff, students, and others present should not be compromised during de-escalation tactics.
2. SRO's should understand and use developmentally appropriate principles of evidence-based crisis intervention and de-escalation strategies. These strategies include, but are not limited to:
 - i. Be empathetic and non-judgmental
 - ii. Respect personal space
 - iii. Use non-threatening nonverbal communication
 - iv. Avoid challenging questions
 - v. Allow time for decisions

E. Use of Force.

1. SRO use of force is governed by and will comply with Minn. Stats. 609.06 Authorized Use of Force; 609.066 Authorized Use of Deadly Force by Peace Officers; 626.8475 Duty to Intercede and Report; and the Law Enforcement Agency Use of Force Policy.
2. Specific tactics and strategies to minimize uses of force or the use and duration of prone restraint or physical holds of students:
 - i. Employ de-escalation techniques, the least restrictive physical intervention strategies, as reasonable, for addressing conflicts in schools as identified in the training required under Minn. Stat. 626.8482, Subd. 4., and use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.
 - ii. Consistent with training after any use of force, the SRO shall assess the condition of the student and render aid as needed including restoring the student to a non-prone position as soon as possible,
3. Additional considerations for SROs when using force as allowed in Minn. Stat. 609.06 in a school situation, should include:
 1. Immediacy and severity of the threat to officers or others.
 - a. Potential for injury to officers, students, and others
 2. The conduct of the individual being confronted, as reasonably perceived by the officer at the time.
 3. Officer/individual factors (e.g. age and/or maturity, physical size and/or abilities).
 4. The individual's ability to understand and comply with officer commands
 - a. The effects of suspected drug or alcohol use.
 - b. The individual's mental state or capacity.
 - c. The student's education plan or accommodations, if known.
 5. Proximity of weapons or dangerous improvised devices.
 6. The degree to which the individual has been effectively restrained and his/her ability to resist despite being restrained.
 7. The availability of other reasonable and feasible options and their possible effectiveness (Minn. Stat. § 626.8452).
 8. The immediate need for intervention versus allowing time and distance for additional de-escalation.
 - a. Seriousness of the suspected offense or reason for contact with the individual.
 9. Training and experience of the officer.
 10. Whether the individual appears to be resisting, attempting to evade arrest by flight, or is attacking the officer.

11. The risk and reasonably foreseeable consequences of escape.
 12. Whether the conduct of the individual being confronted no longer reasonably appears to pose an imminent threat to the officer or others.
 13. Prior contacts with the individual or awareness of any propensity for violence.
 14. Any other exigent circumstances.
4. SROs shall not use force or the authority of their office solely to enforce school rules or policies or participate in the enforcement of discipline for violations of school rules. SRO discretion should be used when becoming involved with incidents that are school rule violations versus criminal conduct.
 5. SROs should exercise developmentally appropriate practices when interacting with children, youth and individuals with physical, mental health, developmental or intellectual disabilities recognizing that the individual's disability may affect their ability to understand or comply with commands from SROs.

F. Arrest considerations.

1. As much as is practical, SROs should seek to utilize alternatives to formal criminal referral such as diversion and restorative justice programs where possible and as appropriate for the incident, the students and families involved, victim(s) and the larger school community.
2. Custodial arrests in school should be avoided if practical. If a custodial arrest is necessary because of exigency or public safety considerations, the arrest should be made in a non-communal area away from the view of other students if practicable.
3. When practicable, appropriate school staff should be notified prior to and/or present during the custodial arrest of a student.

G. Training

1. Except as provided for in paragraphs E.2., E.3., and E.4. below, beginning September 1, 2025, a peace officer assigned to serve as a school resource officer must complete a training course that provides instruction on the learning objectives identified in Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482, subdivision 4 prior to assuming the duties of a school resource officer.
2. A peace officer who has completed either the School Safety Center standardized Basic School Resource Officer Training or the National School Resource Officer Basic School Resource Officer course prior to September 1, 2025, must complete the training mandated under paragraph E.1. above before June 1, 2027. A peace

officer covered under this paragraph may complete a supplemental training course approved by the board pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482, subdivision 4, paragraph (b), to satisfy the training requirement.

3. It is highly recommended and best practice that a peace officer completes the training required under this section prior to filling the role of SRO.

However, if an officer's employer is unable to provide the required training course to the officer prior to the officer assuming the duties of a school resource officer, the officer must complete the required training within six months of assuming the duties of a school resource officer. The officer is not required to perform the duties described in Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482, subdivision 2, paragraph (a), clause (4) or (5), until the officer has completed the required training course. The officer must review any policy adopted by the officer's employer pursuant to section 626.8482, subdivision 6 before assuming the other duties of a school resource officer and must comply with that policy.

4. An officer who is serving as a substitute school resource officer for fewer than 60 student contact days within a school year is not obligated to complete the required training or perform the duties described in Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8482 subdivision 2, paragraph (a), clause (4) or (5), but must review and comply with any policy adopted pursuant to subdivision 6 by the law enforcement agency that employs the substitute school resource officer.
5. An SRO will complete a refresher course at a minimum of once every three years.
6. For each school resource officer employed by an agency, the chief law enforcement officer must maintain a copy of the most recent training certificate issued to the officer for completion of the training mandated under this section.

H. Data practices

1. The contract between the school district and the law enforcement agency must address data practices policies and procedures. These procedures and policies shall identify the education records that can be shared with the law enforcement agency generally and with the SRO specifically and for what purposes.
2. Law enforcement records that contain student and parent data that are maintained by the law enforcement agency shall be governed by the agency's data practices policy and in compliance with the requirements of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minn. Stats., chapter 13, and Minnesota Rules, parts 1205.0100-1205.2000.

Peace Officer Mandated Learning Objectives for School Resource Officer Training

In 2024 the Minnesota Legislature Passed statute 626.8482 School Resource Officers that required several actions from POST:

- One component of the statute required by September 1, 2025,
 - A peace officer assigned to serve as a School Resource Officer must complete a training course that provides instructing on the learning objectives identified in the listed statute prior to assuming the duties of a School Resource Officer.
 - A peace officer who has completed either the School Safety Center’s Standardized Basic School Resource Officer Training or the NASRO Basic School Resource Officer course prior to June 1, 2025, must complete the mandated training before June 1, 2027.
 - A peace officer covered under this paragraph may complete a supplemental training course approved by the board to satisfy the requirement. For each School Resource Officer employed by an agency, the chief law enforcement officer must maintain a copy of the most recent training certificate issued to the officer for completion of the training mandated under the statute.

- By January 15, 2025, the Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training in consultation with the Department of Public Safety’s School Safety Center shall prepare learning objectives for training courses to instruct peace officers serving as School Resource Officer, at a minimum, the learning objectives must ensure officers receive training on the 14 required objectives. Listed below are the proposed learning objectives developed by staff from the POST Board and School Safety Center:

SRO LEARNING OBJECTIVES

1. Demonstrate understanding of the juvenile justice system by:

- A. Reviewing history and formation of the juvenile justice system.
- B. Understand differences between adult and juvenile legal processes.
- C. Reviewing juvenile case law specific to school resource officers.
- D. Understanding alternatives to juvenile justice system referrals.

2. Demonstrate understanding of legal standards for peace officers to use force to detain or arrest students in schools by:

- A. Review Use of Force Legal standards for peace officers under MN State Statute 609.06, 609.066, and 626.8475.
- B. Review of legal standards to detain or arrest juveniles under MN State Statute 260B.175.

3. Demonstrate understanding of legal standards for school employees and contractors to use force to detain, discipline, and arrest students in school by:

- A. Review Use of Force Legal standards for school employees and contractors under MN State Statute 121A.58 and 121A.582.

- 4. Identify de-escalation techniques and use of least restrictive physical intervention strategies for handling conflicts in schools to include:**
 - A. Discuss Verbal and non-verbal communication techniques that diffuse tension and reduce emotional intensity (i.e. rapport building, active listening, body language, voice).
 - B. Discuss social implications and special considerations for developmentally appropriate use of force.
 - C. Behavioral and logistical de-escalation strategies, (i.e., use of space, sensory distractions).
- 5. Identify strategies for responding to persons experiencing a mental health crisis in a school setting, with an emphasis placed on juveniles to include:**
 - A. Awareness of common mental health crises in a school setting.
 - B. Identify verbal and non-verbal communication techniques that diffuse tension and reduce emotional intensity (i.e. rapport building, active listening, body language, voice).
 - C. Behavioral and logistical de-escalation strategies, (i.e., use of space, sensory distractions).
 - D. Identify and collaborate with school-based intervention services.
 - G. Review legal standards for emergency admission per MN Statute 253B.051.
- 6. Demonstrate an understanding of working with students with disabilities and students receiving special education services:**
 - A. Awareness of common educational, physical, and mental health disabilities in school settings.
 - B. Summarize special education services, processes, and classifications.
- 7. Demonstrate an understanding of juvenile brain development, including limitations on impulse control by:**
 - A. Summarize stages of brain development during childhood and adolescence.
 - B. Identify areas of the brain responsible for decision making and impulse control.
- 8. Demonstrate understanding of the impact of childhood trauma on juvenile behavior by:**
 - A. Discuss types of childhood trauma (i.e.: physical, emotional, neglect and sexual abuse).
 - B. Explain the impacts of childhood trauma on brain development, mental and physical health, and social-emotional wellbeing.
 - C. Recognize manifestations of childhood trauma in school settings.
- 9. Identify strategies for responding to threats of violence against students and schools:**
 - A. Discuss threat data, trends, and commonalities.
 - B. Review best practices and strategies for evaluating threats of violence against persons and educational facilities.
 - C. Familiarization of school-based emergency operation plans.

D. Discussion of prevention and management strategies in school and community settings.

10. Identify strategies for detecting juvenile exploitation by:

A. Identify common indicators of exploitation and the methods used for recruitment.

B. Identify support services specific to exploited youth.

11. Legal standards for investigating crimes committed in schools, including student and parental rights by:

A. Review of case law specific to crimes committed on school property.

B. Review investigative procedures established by state and federal laws (i.e. as Miranda interviews and the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act).

12. Identifying vulnerabilities in school facilities and safety protocols by:

A. Understanding of school emergency operations plans, policies, and procedures.

B. Reviewing strategies for conducting site assessments and evaluating safety protocols.

13. Demonstrate understanding of mandated safety drills and best practices in conducting safety drills by:

A. Review mandated student safety drills per MN State Statute 121A.038.

B. Discuss best practices for conducting school safety drills.

14. Demonstrate understanding of the topics identified in section 626.8469, subdivision 1, as they pertain to juveniles or students to include:

A. Review of MN Statute 626.8469 subdivision 1 topics and its application in the school setting.