Actively Building
Competency, Character, Culture & Community
OREGON SCHOOL DISTRICT

Oregon School District
123 East Grove Street, Oregon WI 53575
608-835-4000
www.OregonSD.org

September 18, 2026

Re: September 22 Meeting Regarding School Resource Officer Agreement DRAFT

Dear Martin,

We look forward to meeting with you next week to discuss the SRO agreement. To support a productive discussion and make efficient use of our time together, we want to share the Oregon School Board's perspective in advance.

Our goal is to maintain an SRO Program that aligns with the District's values, meets the school community's expectations, supports school safety, builds positive relationships with students, and clearly defines the respective responsibilities of the District, the Village, and the Oregon Police Department. Please see the details below.

Shannon

Format of the SRO Agreement

As we have previously shared, the format and language of the District's proposal have developed over time with significant community input. Since at least 2016, the parties have held community engagement sessions regarding the SRO Program, collaboratively evaluated the program on generally an annual basis, and refined the agreement in response to family and community feedback and the parties' operational needs. For that reason, the District used the 2024–2026 SRO Agreement as the starting point for its current proposal and retained most of its language.

We understand that the Village is proposing a new format for the next agreement. The Board believes it is important to retain the general format of the previous agreement so the school community can clearly see that the principles, expectations, and safeguards it helped develop remain in place. We also believe that the SRO Program's strong community support is due, in part, to an agreement shaped by community feedback.

Working from two substantially different documents has made it more difficult to identify and address the parties' remaining differences, and reach a new agreement. Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Village and OPD come prepared on

September 22 to work from the format of the District's proposal, which is based on the previous SRO Agreements. We remain open to revising specific language within that format.

The District has carefully reviewed the Village's August 11, 2026 proposal. Although it contains several provisions on which we agree, it omits or materially changes a number of provisions from the 2024–2026 SRO Agreement that the District has retained in its current proposal. The Board believes the substance of the provisions discussed below must be included for the parties to reach a new agreement, (along with previously agreed upon provisions). We remain open to discussing their wording and placement, provided their essential purposes and protections are preserved.

Essential Provisions Not Yet Resolved

Law-Enforcement Actions Reporting — District's Proposal, Paragraph 5

Wisconsin Stat. § 118.124 requires public high schools to collect, maintain, and report statistics concerning certain criminal and safety-related incidents occurring on school grounds or at school-sponsored events. The reporting requirement applies when an incident is reported to law enforcement and results in a criminal charge or citation. The District must report these statistics annually to the Board and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. To fulfill this responsibility, the District needs a reliable process through which the SRO or OPD informs the District when a qualifying citation or charge results from a school-related incident.

Our school community also expects the District to evaluate whether students' interactions with the SRO are fair and nondiscriminatory and whether implicit bias may be affecting students. As a public school district, we are legally responsible for maintaining an educational environment free from unlawful discrimination. Wis. Stats. 120.13. A meaningful reporting mechanism is necessary for the District and Board to evaluate the program and fulfill that responsibility.

The parties have previously used the Law Enforcement Actions spreadsheet to document law enforcement actions. In response to OPD's concerns about the administrative burden on the SRO, the District has narrowed the information required. While we believe this process has worked successfully, we are open to considering another reporting process that provides the information the District needs to meet its legal and oversight responsibilities.

Student Custody, Questioning, and Law-Enforcement Interactions — District's Proposal, Paragraph 8

Families have consistently emphasized that the SRO Agreement should include clear procedures governing law-enforcement interactions with students during the school day. We were encouraged to learn that OPD's internal policies may already include some of these procedures.

Because these interactions occur in the school environment, the Board believes the procedures should also be detailed in the SRO Agreement. Including them will ensure that students, families, school employees, administrators, the SRO, and other OPD personnel have a shared understanding of the applicable expectations.

If these procedures are already consistent with OPD policies, there should not be a barrier to retaining them in the new agreement. We could also clarify that the procedures apply to all OPD officers conducting law-enforcement activities in District schools, rather than only to the assigned SRO, to avoid any confusion.

The provisions the District seeks to retain include:

- Limits on taking a student into custody at school unless there is an immediate safety threat, a warrant or other legal authority, or prior District approval.
- A requirement that taking a student into custody be handled in the least disruptive manner reasonably possible and with appropriate regard for the student's privacy.
- Prompt parent or guardian notification when a student is taken into custody.
- Limits on questioning students at school about off-campus matters unrelated to school activities, school transportation, school discipline, or school safety.
- Procedures governing the time, location, confidentiality, and manner of student questioning.
- A requirement that a school administrator or designee notify the student of the meeting rather than law enforcement coming to a classroom
- Advance notice to a parent or guardian and a reasonable opportunity for the parent or guardian to attend when a student is suspected of committing a crime, subject to appropriate legal and emergency exceptions.
- Prompt notice to a parent or guardian following questioning when advance notice cannot be provided, subject to appropriate safety and legal exceptions.
- Clearly defined roles and responsibilities concerning school discipline and related matters. (For example, the National Association of School Resource Officers recommends that SROs not administer formal school discipline, which remains the responsibility of school administrators.)

Use of Police Cameras at School — District's Proposal, Paragraph 8(f)

We understand that the SRO will wear a body camera and may need to use other recording devices while performing law-enforcement duties. Paragraph 8(f) is intended to permit appropriate recording while also protecting student confidentiality and privacy within the educational environment.

The District seeks to retain language establishing that recording on school property will occur in connection with the performance of law-enforcement duties and under the circumstances identified in the agreement. This distinction is important because the SRO also serves as an educator, informal counselor, mentor, and member of the school community. Routine interactions undertaken in those non-enforcement roles should not be recorded.

We are open to discussing language that aligns with OPD's body-camera requirements while preserving appropriate protections for students and the educational environment.

Student Records and Information Sharing — District's Proposal, Paragraphs 9–10

The District has a legal obligation to protect pupil-record confidentiality under both the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA") and Wis. Stat. § 118.125. At the same time, there are circumstances in which the District may or must share information with law enforcement. We want those lawful disclosures to occur promptly and efficiently.

We recognize that this issue has caused confusion or frustration this past year. We are committed to developing clear language and a workable process that meets the needs of both parties while allowing the District to fulfill its legal obligations.

For example, Wis. Stat. § 118.125(2)(n)2. requires a school board to disclose pertinent pupil records to an investigating law-enforcement agency or district attorney when the recipient provides the required written certification. The certification must address the relationship of the records to the juvenile justice system, an ongoing investigation or pending delinquency petition, and the limits on further disclosure.

The District therefore needs a process for obtaining the required certification and documenting the disclosure in the student's record as required by law. We have been using a Release of Information Form for this purpose, but we are open to considering other efficient and legally compliant approaches. The final agreement must include a clear process for requesting, reviewing, disclosing, and documenting access to pupil records.

Training for the SRO — District's Proposal, Paragraph 11

Our school community has consistently emphasized the importance of training in school-based policing, nonviolent crisis intervention, mental health, trauma-informed practices, and equity. Identifying the required training in the agreement will promote shared expectations, ensure responsiveness to the community, and allow both parties to plan and budget appropriately.

We are willing to discuss how these training requirements are scheduled, provided, and funded. The final SRO Agreement, however, must identify the core training expectations for the SRO.

SRO Selection — District's Proposal, Paragraph 14

The District must have a meaningful role in selecting the individual assigned as the SRO, and the final selection must be mutually acceptable to the Village and District.

The Board designates the SRO as a school official who works in District schools, interacts extensively with students, participates in school-safety planning, and may receive access to educational information when legally authorized and necessary to perform the SRO's duties. The SRO is also a critical member of the District's school-safety team. Given the significance of that role, mutual agreement regarding the individual selected is essential.

We recognize that the SRO remains a Village employee under OPD's supervision and chain of command. The District's participation in the selection process is not intended to change that employment relationship.

Term of the Agreement — District's Proposal, Paragraph 20

The Board supports a one-year agreement ending August 31, 2027. A one-year term will allow the parties to implement and jointly evaluate any revised program provisions before committing to a longer term.

If the revised program is successful, the parties can use that experience to negotiate a future agreement informed by actual implementation. The Board is not prepared to enter into the five-year term proposed by the Village at this time.

Determine Protocols to Support Collaboration

The District proposes that the parties develop a protocol (i.e RACI) addressing recurring situations involving the SRO, OPD, and District personnel. The protocol would identify specific situations that indicate which party is responsible for performing a task, accountable for the final decision, who must be consulted, and who must be informed.

A protocol could provide practical guidance concerning matters such as:

- School discipline and potential criminal conduct.
- Requests for and disclosure of pupil records.
- Access to security-camera footage.
- Speak Up Speak Out tips and other safety reports.
- Communications following significant school incidents.
- SRO absences and substitute coverage.
- Program reporting and evaluation.

This protocol would not alter either party's legal authority. Instead, it would provide a shared operational framework, reduce uncertainty, and help District and OPD personnel respond consistently. We are open to discussing whether the protocol should be incorporated into the agreement or included as an appendix.

Moving Forward

We recognize that the Village may prefer different wording or processes for some of these provisions. The District is prepared to work collaboratively on those details. At the same time, the substance of these provisions is necessary to ensure that the SRO Program reflects the District's values, provides appropriate safeguards for students and families in non-emergency situations, complies with the District's legal responsibilities, clearly defines the parties' respective roles, and honors the community input that shaped our past agreements.

We value our longstanding relationship with the Village and OPD. We remain committed to working together in good faith to develop an agreement that serves our students, staff, families, law-enforcement partners, and the broader community.

We look forward to working with you on September 22.

Sincerely,

Dr. Shannon Anderson and Jina Jonen

cc: Oregon School Board