COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

312 SOUTH HILL STREET, THIRD FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90013
(213) 974-6100
http://oig.lacounty.gov

MAX HUNTSMAN
INSPECTOR GENERAL

April 18, 2023

TO: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

FROM: Max Huntsman
Inspector General

SUBJECT: REPORT BACK ON IMPROVING SCHOOL CLIMATE AND SAFETY (ITEM NO. 20, AGENDA OF JUNE 28, 2022)

On June 28, 2022, in the *Improving School Climate and Safety* Board of Supervisor's (Board) motion, the Board directed the Inspector General, in consultation with the Sheriff, County Counsel and other relevant County Departments, to analyze School Resource Deputy (SRD) contacts with students in the school districts contracting with the County for SRD services to determine if racial disparities exist in student contacts, arrests, suspensions and expulsions similar to what was discussed in the Inspector General's report *Allegations of Racial Disparities in Contacts with High School Youth by the Sheriff's Department's Lancaster Station* (*Racial Disparity Report*).

INTRODUCTION

To accomplish the objectives set forth in the Board motion, the Office of Inspector General analyzed two sets of data: (1) SRD student contact data from the Sheriff's Department's Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD)[1] system and (2) discipline and

[1] The Sheriff's Department's primary data system for tracking patrol-related contacts with the public is the Computer Aided Dispatch System (CAD). The CAD system is linked to Sheriff's Department dispatch centers, which assign deputies to respond to calls for service.

demographic data from the California Department of Education[2] for all schools in school districts under contract with the Sheriff's Department for SRD services. For purposes of comparison, the schools reviewed in this report were separated into two groups: the first group consisted of seventy-six schools from fifteen school districts staffed by thirty-three SRDs from eleven patrol stations and are referred to as the "Schools Outside of Lancaster," and the second group consisted of forty schools in three school districts staffed by eighteen SRDs from the Lancaster Station and are referred to as the "Lancaster Schools."

The Office of Inspector General then compared the contact and discipline data from the Schools Outside of Lancaster to the Lancaster Schools to determine if the same racial disparities found in the *Racial Disparity Report* were observed in the other school districts that contract with the Sheriff's Department for SRD services. Under the previous Sheriff's Administration, the Office of Inspector General was not provided with all the CAD system data necessary to complete an analysis of racial disparity in the Lancaster Schools. The current Sheriff's Administration provided all CAD system data necessary to thoroughly analyze this issue.

The Office of Inspector General bifurcated the analysis into two school groups in order to verify the prior findings in the *Racial Disparity Report* and to provide a benchmark to compare the level of disproportionality observed in other school districts against the known disproportionality found in the schools serviced by Lancaster Station SRDs.

Based on this review, the Office of Inspector General determined the following:

- In the Schools Outside of Lancaster, SRDs contacted Black and Hispanic students more than any other racial group. Moreover, Black and Hispanic students were contacted at a rate disproportionately higher in comparison to their respective percentage of school enrollment.
- In the Lancaster Schools, only Black students were contacted at a rate disproportionately higher in comparison to their percentage of school enrollment. However, the degree of disproportionality of Black student contacts was much

[2] The Office of Inspector General downloaded suspension, expulsion, and demographic data from the California Department of Education's public website. This data set consisted of suspensions, expulsions, and demographics for 110 schools in 18 school districts (6 schools serviced by SRDs did not report discipline data and were not included in the discipline review). For the purposes of this report, the Office of Inspector General used the "unduplicated" suspensions or expulsion incidents to account for students who were suspended or expelled multiple times. Students who were suspended or expelled multiple times were only counted once. Lastly, the statewide suspensions and expulsion rates for all race groups were used to compare them to the suspension and expulsion rates of the schools analyzed.

higher in the Lancaster Schools than what was observed in the Schools Outside of Lancaster.

- In the five school districts with the highest number of SRD student contacts, Black students were disproportionately contacted in four of the five school districts.
- SRDs contacted children ***as young as 5 and 7***. There were 21 contacts with elementary school children (ages 5 through 11), 166 contacts of middle school aged students (ages 11 through 14), and 625 contacts of high school aged students (ages 13 through 19).
- There were only 2 instances out of a documented 812 school contacts in which SRDs indicated they referred a student to a diversion program.
- In the Schools Outside of Lancaster, Black and Hispanic students were subject to arrest and citation at a disproportionately higher rate in comparison to their respective percentage of enrollment.
- In the Lancaster Schools, only Black students were disproportionately arrested and cited. However, the level of disproportionality in arrests and citations of Black students in Lancaster Schools was three-and-a-half times greater than the disparity observed in the Schools Outside of Lancaster. In one school district serviced by Lancaster Station SRDs, Black students were arrested more than 86% of the time they were contacted by an SRD.
- Significant inaccuracies were found in the Sheriff's Department's CAD data system entries with respect to the reason for the student contacts – deputy "observations" or "calls for service" by school staff.
- The suspension rates of Black students in SRD contract schools exceeded statewide averages.

- Black students were suspended and expelled at higher rates than their percentage of school enrollment. However, the degree of disproportionality observed in the Lancaster Schools was greater than what was observed in the Schools Outside of Lancaster.

    - In the Schools Outside of Lancaster, the 8.4% suspension rate for Black students was three times greater than the second highest suspension rate of 2.6% for Hispanic students.

  - In the Lancaster Schools, the 12.5% suspension rate for Black students was four times greater than the second highest suspension rate of 3.2% for Hispanic students.
  - In both the Schools Outside of Lancaster and the Lancaster Schools, Black students were expelled at disproportionately higher rates than their percentage of school enrollment.

- Improving the specificity of the terms and conditions in SRD contracts regarding the roles and responsibilities of the SRD and the process of student referral to SRDs is warranted to ensure that the potential bias of school officials is accounted for.
- Failure to modify the SRD contacts increases the potential that the County will be held liable for civil rights violations or the conduct of the deputies during the contact.

METHODOLOGY OF REVIEW

The Office of Inspector General reviewed data corresponding with the 2019-2020 school year for all the school districts contracting with the Sheriff's Department for SRD services, which covered the period from July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2020.[3] This is the same time period analyzed in the *Racial Disparity Report.* By using the same time period, the Office of Inspector General was able to verify the general findings in the *Racial Disparity Report* with the more comprehensive CAD data provided by this Sheriff's Administration and use of the findings from the Lancaster Schools as a benchmark to which to compare the findings for the Schools Outside of Lancaster.

During the 2019/2020 school year, the Sheriff's Department provided SRD services to one-hundred and sixteen schools in eighteen school districts[4] with deputies from twelve patrol stations. The schools consisted of elementary, middle, high schools, a continuation school and one adult school.

The following table lists the school districts reviewed, the number of schools in each district, the patrol station providing SRD services to that school district, and the grouping

[3] The Board of Supervisor's June 28, 2022, Motion instructed the Office of Inspector General to analyze SRD contacts for the 2021-2022 school year, however, data relating to suspensions and expulsions from the California Department of Education was not available for that time period when the Motion was passed. Due to time constraints on this analysis, the Office of Inspector General was unable to perform a complete analysis for that time-period and used the complete data set available for the 2019-2020 school year.

[4] This does not include Special Event contracts which the Sheriff's Department contracts with schools for extra-curricular school events that occur outside of regular school hours such as sporting events, dances, or graduations. These events are on an as needed basis at the request of school administrators.

of the schools analyzed. (See "Attachment 1" for a list of the individual schools analyzed.):

#	School District	Schools	Deputies	Station	Grouping
1	ABC Unified	3	2	Cerritos, Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
2	Centinela Unified	3	1	South Los Angeles	Outside Lancaster
3	El Rancho Unified	1	1	Pico Rivera	Outside Lancaster
4	Glendale Unified	1	1	Crescenta Valley	Outside Lancaster
5	Green Dot Public (LAUSD)	1	2	Century	Outside Lancaster
6	Hacienda La Puente Unified	1	2	Industry	Outside Lancaster
7	La Canada Flintridge Unified	1	1	Crescenta Valley	Outside Lancaster
8	Lawndale Elementary	7	1	South Los Angeles	Outside Lancaster
9	Lynwood Unified	4	2	Century	Outside Lancaster
10	Norwalk / La Mirada Unified	3	2	Norwalk	Outside Lancaster
11	Palmdale Elementary	30	4	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
12	Paramount Unified	8	6	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
13	Rowland Unified	2	2	Industry, Walnut	Outside Lancaster
14	Whittier Union High	2	2	Norwalk, Pico Rivera	Outside Lancaster
15	William S. Hart Union	9	4	Santa Clarita	Outside Lancaster
	Subtotal-Outside of Lancaster	***76***	***33***		
16	Antelope Valley Union High	13	14	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
17	Eastside Union Elementary	6	1	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
18	Lancaster Elementary	21	3	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
	Subtotal-Lancaster Schools	***40***	***18***		
	Grand Total	**116**	**51**		

Office of Inspector General staff obtained and analyzed 15,640 CAD system entries by Sheriff's Department staff for the 2019-2020 school year. Each of these entries contained a clearance code of 801 (School Resource Deputies-Criminal) or 802 (School Resource Deputies-Non-Criminal), indicating these contacts were handled by SRDs.

Not all 15,640 entries involved SRDs contacting students; therefore, the Office of Inspector General filtered these entries further to obtain only those entries which

involved a deputy contacting a person under twenty years of age.[5] Next, the entries were filtered to obtain only those student contacts which occurred in the school districts with contracts for SRD services. This yielded a data set of 812 SRD school contacts with students. These 812 SRD school contacts represented approximately 625 contacts of high school aged students (ages 13 through 19),[6] 166 contacts of middle school aged students (ages 11 through 14), and 21 contacts of elementary school aged students (ages 5 through 11).[7]

According to the data entries in the CAD system, the 21 elementary school student contacts were coded as follows: 5 assault, 3 disorderly conduct, 2 attempted suicide, 9 mental illness hold, 1 escape of mentally ill person, and 1 investigation regarding a threat assessment of a potential school shooting.[8] (See Attachment 2.) The CAD system clearance code entries for the 166 middle school students included the following: directed patrol time, assist citizen, juvenile citation, possession of marijuana infraction, vehicle/boating laws citations, station service, disorderly conduct (telephone annoyance), truancy, non-criminal special investigations, assault, disorderly conduct (interference with school activities), mental illness hold, weapons laws, School Resource Deputies-non-criminal, habitual truancy, vandalism, and disorderly conduct (disturbing the peace). (See Attachment 3 for the list of SRD contacts with the clearance code, gender, race, and age for each contact.)[9] The Office of Inspector General requested documentation for the contacts with elementary and middle school students and will review and analyze the documentation once received.

Lastly, the 812 SRD contacts were separated into the two groups: SRD contacts from the Schools Outside of Lancaster and SRD contacts from the Lancaster Schools. As stated earlier, the Office of Inspector General bifurcated this analysis to verify the prior findings in the *Racial Disparity Report* and to provide a benchmark to compare the level

[5] Federal law requires schools to provide disabled students special support up to the age of twenty-two years. The Office of Inspector General was not able to determine from the CAD data whether a particular person had a disability and therefore could be a student up to the age of twenty-two years. As a result, we limited our analysis to contacts of people up to the age of nineteen years.

[6] There were three contacts in the high school aged group that involved of students aged of 10, 11 and 12 years. The Office of Inspector General is unaware of the circumstances that led to the contacts of these students given that they were not of normal high school age.

[7] See, "Attachment 2," which provides additional information on elementary school student contacts and "Attachment 3," which provides information on middle school student contacts.

[8] This contact is noted in contact #12 in Attachment 2 with clearance code 441.

[9] Due to the greater number of SRD contacts with high school aged students, and the expectation that high school students are more likely to engage in behavior warranting an SRD contact than pre-high school students, a list of the SRD contacts for these 625 contacts is not included with this report.

of disproportionality observed in other school districts with the known disproportionality found in the schools serviced by Lancaster Station SRDs.

SRD CONTACTS WITH BLACK AND HISPANIC STUDENTS WERE DISPROPORTIONATE TO THEIR RESPECTIVE PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

Office of Inspector General staff separated the 812 student contacts by the race of the student contacted and divided that number by the total number of contacts to determine the percentage each racial group comprised of the total number of student contacts. This number was then compared to the racial demographics reported by the various school districts to the California Department of Education[10] to determine whether the percentage of SRD contacts with certain racial groups disproportionately exceeded that group's reported percentage of the student enrollment.

The Office of Inspector General found that in the Schools Outside of Lancaster, Black and Hispanic students were disproportionately contacted in comparison to their percentage of school enrollment. In the Lancaster Schools, only Black students were disproportionately contacted in comparison to their percentage of school enrollment. However, the degree of disproportionality of Black Student contacts was much higher in the Lancaster Schools than what was observed in the Schools Outside of Lancaster.

Schools Outside Lancaster

The Office of Inspector General analysis found that Black and Hispanic students were the only groups that were disproportionately contacted when compared to their school enrollments. Hispanic students made up 74.6% of the contacts while being only 70.0% of the enrollment of those schools. Black students made up 18.3% of the contacts while being only 8.5% of the enrollment of those schools.

White student and Asian student contacts were lower than their respective proportion of student enrollment with White students making up 5.0% of contacts out of 10.9% total enrollment, and Asian students making up 1.8% of contacts out of 8.1% of total enrollment. The remaining 0.3% of student contacts represented a single contact with a student whose race was classified as "Other."

[10] The Office of Inspector General redesignated the statistics associated with the racial group identifiers of 'Two or More Races' and 'Not Reported' used by the California Department of Education and grouped them into the CAD designation of 'Other,' to ensure consistency of analysis and comparison between the two data sets.

The chart below compares the overall contact percentage to the racial demographics of the Schools Outside of Lancaster:



Lancaster Schools

In the Lancaster Schools, the disproportionality in SRD contacts with Black students was much greater than the disproportionality in the Schools Outside of Lancaster. Black students comprised 59.0% of student contacts while being only 23.1% of school enrollment of those schools. And Black students were the only racial group whose contact percentage exceeded their proportion of student enrollment.

Hispanic and White student's percentage of contacts were lower than their proportion of the student enrollment with Hispanic students making up 34.7% of contacts out of 60.2% of total enrollment, and White students making up 6.3% of contacts out of 10.3% of total enrollment. All other student racial groups did not have any SRD contacts during the time-period of this review. The disproportionality found in the Lancaster Schools in this analysis is consistent with the findings in the *Racial Disparity Report*.

The chart below compares the overall contact percentage to the racial demographics in the Lancaster Schools:



In the Five School Districts with the Most SRD Contacts, Black Students Were Disproportionately Contacted in Four of the Five School Districts

The Sheriff's Department provides SRD services to school districts throughout Los Angeles County. The Office of Inspector General identified the top five school districts with the highest number of SRD student contacts. These five school districts accounted for 86.9% of the 812 SRD contacts reviewed in this analysis. We found that Black students were disproportionately contacted in four of the five school districts.[11]

In three of the top five school districts, Black students were the most disproportionately contacted racial group while Hispanic students were the most disproportionately contacted racial group in the two other school districts.

The following table lists the top five school districts in order of the level of observed racial disproportionality:

[11] Paramount Unified and ABC Unified school districts exhibited disproportionalities for White students and Black students, respectively. However, the disproportionality for each was only 0.1%, which translated to less than one student contact for each racial group.

Five School Districts with Greatest Percentage of Disproportionate Deputy Contacts						
School District	**Station**	**Group**	**Race**	**Contacts**	**Enrollment**	**Difference**
Antelope Valley Union High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools	Black	60.4%	17.8%	42.6%
Paramount Unified	Lakewood	Outside of Lancaster	Black	27.9%	7.7%	20.3%
Lancaster Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools	Black	59.4%	30.3%	29.1%
Rowland Unified	Industry/Walnut	Outside of Lancaster	Hispanic	88.2%	65.6%	22.6%
			Black	5.9%	1.2%	4.7%
ABC Unified	Cerritos/Lakewood	Outside of Lancaster	Hispanic	75.8%	47.6%	28.2%
			White	15.2%	6.3%	8.8%

MOST SRD STUDENT CONTACTS RESULTED IN ARREST OR CITATION

The Office of Inspector General analyzed CAD system data to track the outcomes of SRD contacts with students. In general, we found that students of color had a higher probability of being arrested or cited. Even though some of these contacts may have been the County's first point of contact with high-risk youth, there were only two instances out of 812 school contacts where deputies indicated that they referred a student for a diversion program.[12]

Arrests or Citations Resulting from SRD Contacts at Schools Outside of Lancaster

The analysis of SRD contacts at the Schools Outside of Lancaster found that 87.6% (297 of 339) of the SRD contacts resulted in an arrest or a citation of the student. Of the 297 arrests/citations, Black students experienced the highest percentages of these outcomes at 93.5%, followed by Hispanic students at 88.5%, Asian students at 83.3%

[12] The CAD system had only two entries out of the 812 SRD contacts, one with a clearance code of "826-Juvenile Diversion (Non-Criminal)" and the other with a clearance code of "827-Juvenile Diversion (Criminal)".

and White students at 52.9%. A single contact with the racial classification as “Other” also resulted in a citation.

The following table lists the arrest and citation percentages for each student racial group:

Arrest and Citation Percentages						
School Districts	**Race**	**Contacts**	**Arrests**	**Citations**	**Arrests & Citations**	**Arrest & Citation %**
OUTSIDE LANCASTER	Black	62	3	55	58	93.5%
	Hispanic	253	51	173	224	88.5%
	Asian	6	5	0	5	83.3%
	White	17	2	7	9	52.9%
	Other	1	0	1	1	100.0%[13]
Totals		**339**	**61**	**236**	**297**	

Arrests at these schools constituted 18.0% (61 of 339) of all student contacts while citations made up 69.6% (236 of 339) of student contacts.

Arrests or Citations Resulting from SRD Contacts at Lancaster Schools

The analysis of SRD contacts at the Lancaster schools showed that 78.6% (372 of 473) of SRD contacts with students resulted in an arrest or citation. Of the 372 arrests/citations, Black students had the highest percentage of arrest/citation at 82.4%, followed by White students at 76.7% and Hispanic students at 72.6%. There were no arrests and/or citations of any other race groups.

The following table lists the arrest or citation percentages for each student racial group:

Arrest and Citation Percentages						
School Districts	**Race**	**Contacts**	**Arrests**	**Citations**	**Arrests & Citations**	**Arrest & Citation %**
LANCASTER SCHOOLS	Black	279	214	16	230	82.4%
	White	30	21	2	23	76.7%
	Hispanic	164	78	41	119	72.6%
Totals		**473**	**313**	**59**	**372**	

[13] Because ‘Other’ is a nonspecific racial group, we do not reference this contact in the body of the report. The single student contact classified as ‘Other’ was not statistically material to the broader issues discussed in this analysis.

While the arrest and/or citation percentages are lower in the Lancaster Schools in comparison to the Schools Outside of Lancaster, the Lancaster Schools exhibited a higher level of disproportionality in SRD arrests and citations of Black students. Black students made up only 23.1% of student enrollment, but they represented 61.8% (230/372) of the arrests and citations. This is consistent with the findings in the *Racial Disparity Report* with respect to disproportionality in arrests and citations of Black students in Lancaster schools.

Moreover, focusing on arrests (the most serious outcome of a deputy contact), Black students in Lancaster Schools were arrested 214 times which is more than double the arrests of Hispanic students (78) and ten-times the number of White students (21). Black students had the highest probability of being arrested when contacted by an SRD with an arrest resulting from nearly **eight out of every ten contacts** (76.7%).

The issue of disproportionate arrests is even more pronounced in the Antelope Valley Union High School District – one of the three school districts serviced by SRDs from the Lancaster Station. The Antelope Valley Union High School District alone accounted for 93.9% (294 of 313) of all the arrests made by SRDs in the Lancaster Schools. **Black students were arrested 86.5% of the time during contacts with SRDs in the Antelope Valley Union High School District**. The arrest percentage of Black students was higher than any other racial group as indicated in the following table:

Antelope Valley Union High School District			
Race	**Arrests**	**Contacts**	**Percentage**
Black	198	229	86.5%
White	20	26	76.9%
Hispanic	76	124	61.3%
Total	**294**	**379**	

BLACK AND HISPANIC STUDENTS WERE DISPROPORTIONATELY SUBJECT TO ARREST AND CITATION

When Office of Inspector General staff compared the overall percentages of arrest and citations of various racial groups to their percentage of student enrollment, the findings showed that Black and Hispanic students were disproportionately arrested or cited in the Schools Outside of Lancaster. In the Lancaster Schools, the data showed that Black students were arrested and cited at a level of disproportionality (38.7%) nearly **three-and-a-half-times greater** than the level of disproportionality observed in the Schools Outside of Lancaster (11.0%).

Disproportionality of Arrests and Citations in Schools Outside of Lancaster

In the Schools Outside of Lancaster, Black students exhibited the highest level of disproportionality in arrests and citations at 11.0% followed by Hispanic students at 5.4%, while Asian students and White students exhibited negative levels of disproportionality at -6.4% and -7.9% respectively, as illustrated by the following table:[14]

Disparity In Arrest and Citations				
School Districts	**Race**	**Arrests / Citations %**	**% of Enrollment**	**Disproportionality**
OUTSIDE LANCASTER	***Black***	***19.5%***	***8.5%***	***11.0%***
	Hispanic	***75.4%***	***70.0%***	***5.4%***
	Asian	1.7%	8.1%	-6.4%
	White	3.0%	10.9%	-7.9%
	Other	0.3%	2.2%	-1.9%

Disproportionality of Arrests and Citations in Lancaster Schools

In the Lancaster Schools, Black students were the subjects of 61.8% of total arrests and citations while their percentage of enrollment was only 23.1%, a level of disproportionality of 38.7%. Hispanic students and White students had negative levels of disproportionality at -28.2% and -4.1% respectively, as illustrated by the following table:

Disparity In Arrest and Citations				
School Districts	**Race**	**Arrest/Citations %**	**% of Enrollment**	**Disproportionality**
LANCASTER SCHOOLS	***Black***	***61.8%***	***23.1%***	***38.7***
	Hispanic	32.0%	60.2%	-28.2%
	White	6.2%	10.3%	-4.1%

In addition, it appears that SRDs at Lancaster Schools arrested students much more frequently than the SRDs at Outside of Lancaster Schools. Arrests at Lancaster Schools constituted **66.2%** (313 of 473) of all SRD contacts and citations made up only 12.5%

[14] There is a general correlation between size of the student enrollment of a racial group and the percentage of arrests and citations experienced by that racial group. For example, Asian students who made up only 1.7% of the arrests/citations made up only 8.1% of the student enrollment, whereas Hispanic students who had the highest percentage of arrest/citations at 75.4%, made up 72.7% of the enrollment of these schools.

(59 of 473) contacts. Conversely, SRDs at Schools Outside of Lancaster only arrested students 18.0% of the time and issued a citation in 69.6% of their contacts.

SIGNIFICANT INACCURACIES WERE FOUND IN CAD DATA SYSTEM ENTRIES WITH RESPECT TO THE REASONS FOR STUDENT CONTACTS – DEPUTY OBSERVATIONS OR CALLS FOR SERVICE

In both the Lancaster Schools and the Schools Outside of Lancaster, all 812 SRD contacts were initially entered into the CAD system as "observations."[15] However, the SRDs reclassified 157 (19.3%) of these entries as "calls for service" by selecting "call for service" in the "Pcause/StopReason" or "ContactType" data fields[16] (this process is referred hereafter as reclassification). The remaining 655 (80.7%) contact entries were left in the CAD system as "observations".

The following graph reflects the general reasons for the initiation of the 812 student contacts – deputy "observations" or "calls for service:"



Of the 812 student contacts, 655 (80.7%) of the contacts were entered as deputy "observations." According to CAD system data, the overwhelming majority of SRD contacts appear to be the result of a deputy's "observation" and not from a "call for

[15] As defined by the Sheriff's Department's Manual of Policy and Procedures section 5-09/520.25, observation stops are any "significant public contacts and activities" which a patrol deputy self-initiated and were not from a call for service. These types of public contacts and activities are entered into the CAD system as an "OBS" or observation.

[16] For "observation" entries in the CAD system, Deputies can enter the reason for the stop in the "Pcause/StopReason" field and can select a variety of options that provides a reason for contacting or stopping an individual, such as Penal Code, Vehicle Code, City-County Ordinance, Health & Safety, or Call for Service etc. Deputies may also select a "Contact Type" such as Detainee-Driver, Family Abuse, Witness, BSD: Call for Service, etc.

service". However, Office of Inspector General staff spoke to Sheriff's Department personnel for the *Racial Disparity Report* who stated that the "vast majority" of SRD contacts were based on referrals from school staff who requested assistance (calls for service).[17] For this analysis, Office of Inspector General staff also spoke with individual SRDs who also stated that school staff referred the majority of the students to them (calls for service). Consequently, there was a significant discrepancy between the anecdotal information from Sheriff's Department personnel and the data reflected in the CAD system with respect to the reason for student contacts – deputy "observations" or "calls for service".

Office of Inspector General staff suspected that the cause of the discrepancy between "observations" and "calls for service" was that SRDs did not properly reclassify some of the remaining "observation" entries to "calls for service." To verify this theory, Office of Inspector General Staff reviewed the narrative sections of the CAD system entries to determine if any of the remaining "observation" entries were actually the result of "calls for service" by school staff.[18]

A review of the narrative sections identified at least an additional 311 (38.3%) of the 812 total student contacts should have been reclassified as "calls for service." In the Schools Outside of Lancaster, at least 77 (30.6%) of the remaining 252 "observation" entries should have been reclassified as "call for service." In the Lancaster Schools, at least 234 (58.1%) of the remaining 403 "observation" entries should have been reclassified as "calls for service."

The following graph illustrates the ***adjusted*** totals for how the 812 student contacts were initiated:

[17] See also, *Racial Justice: In a California Desert, Sheriff's Deputies Settle Schoolyard Disputes. Black Teens Bear the Brunt*, by Emily Elena Dugdale, KPCC/LAist, and Irena Hwang, ProPublica, Sept. 29, 2021.

[18] For example, a CAD system narrative section might state the following: "referred to student by school administrator" – thus identifying the student contact as resulting from a "call for service." For this review, only those narrative entries that could definitively be linked to a request for service by school staff were counted. As a result, the number of contacts we attribute to "calls for service" is likely a conservative total.



Given the significant inaccuracies found in the CAD system "observation" entries, the Sheriff's Department should take steps to ensure that SRDs properly memorialize the reason for their contacts with students. Proper memorialization of the reason will improve the accuracy of the contact data in the CAD system and will also help the Sheriff's Department track whether SRD contacts are initiated by school administrators or by the SRDs themselves. The Sheriff's Department should also publish CAD system statistics on SRD contacts with students, including the data points listed in the Board's June 8, 2021, motion *Strengthening Oversight of School Law Enforcement Services*, to facilitate transparency and public oversight of SRD activities and outcomes.

SCHOOL DISCIPLINE: BLACK STUDENTS WERE SUSPENDED OR EXPELLED AT HIGHER RATES THAN THEIR PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

Suspension and expulsions are in the sole purview of the school administrators and SRDs are not involved in that process. The Office of Inspector General reviewed expulsion and suspension data to see if there were disparities in how the schools meted out discipline amongst various racial groups. In the *Racial Disparity Report*, the Office of Inspector General analyzed suspension and expulsion data from eleven high schools in the Antelope Valley patrolled by Lancaster station and found that Black students in those schools were suspended and expelled at far greater rates than any other racial group when compared with their proportion of the student enrollment in those schools. For this review, the Office of Inspector General conducted a similar analysis for the Schools Outside of Lancaster and compared the results to those of Lancaster Schools.

The schools grouped as Schools Outside of Lancaster totaled 73 schools[19] from fifteen school districts with a total enrollment of 86,111 students. The Office of Inspector General identified 2,450 “unduplicated” suspensions[20] and 56 expulsions for the 2019-2020 school year. The schools grouped as Lancaster Schools totaled 37[21] schools from three school districts with a total enrollment of 43,676 students. The Office of Inspector General identified 2,343 “unduplicated” suspensions and 36 unduplicated expulsions for the 2019-2020 school year.

In both groups of schools, Black students were suspended and/or expelled at rates higher than their percentage of the student enrollment.

Student Suspensions in the Schools Outside of Lancaster

This analysis found that Black students were suspended at disproportionately higher rates than their percentage of the student enrollment in the Schools Outside of Lancaster. Black students accounted for 25.1% of the suspensions while making up only 8.5% of the enrollment of those schools. Black students were the only racial group whose suspension percentage exceeded their percentage of student enrollment.

Suspension percentages of the three other racial groups were all lower in relation to their proportion of the student enrollment, with Hispanic students making up 63.6% of suspensions (70.0% enrollment), White students 7.2% of suspensions (10.9% enrollment), and Asians 1.6% of suspensions (8.1% enrollment).

The chart below compares the overall suspension percentages to the racial demographics in the Schools Outside of Lancaster.

[19] There were three schools in the Schools Outside of Lancaster which did not report suspension or expulsion data for the 2019-2020 school year. These schools were: Kit Carson Elementary, Palmdale Academy Charter and Site 18 Head Start.

[20] "Unduplicated” suspensions refer to the “distinct count of all students suspended one or more times at the selected entity for the selected enrollment using the available filters. Students who are suspended multiple times” were only counted once. General Description of the Suspension Data File from the CA Department of Education.

[21] There were three Lancaster schools which did not report suspension or expulsion data for the 2019-2020 school year. These schools were: Eastside Academy, Promise Academy and Antelope Valley Adult/Independent Study.



Student Suspensions in the Lancaster Schools

This analysis found that suspensions of Black students in the Lancaster Schools were also disproportionate to their percentage of the student enrollment. However, the level of disproportionality observed in Lancaster Schools was greater than what was observed in the Schools Outside of Lancaster.

In the Lancaster Schools, Black students made up 53.8% of all suspensions while having an enrollment of only 23.1%. Here again, Black students were the only racial group exhibiting suspension percentages which exceeded their proportion of the student enrollment. Hispanic, White, and Asian student suspension percentages were far lower than their respective enrollment, with Hispanic students making up 35.9% of suspensions (60.2% enrollment), White students 4.8% of suspensions (10.3% enrollment), and Asian students 0.5% of suspensions (1.9% enrollment).

The chart below compares the overall suspension percentages to the racial demographics in the Lancaster schools.



Black Students Exhibited the Highest Level of Disproportionality in Suspensions Compared to Their Percentage of Student Enrollment

Taken as a whole, Black students experienced the highest level of disproportionality in suspensions in both the Schools Outside of Lancaster and the Lancaster Schools as shown in the following table:

Race	Outside Lancaster	Lancaster
Black	***16.5%***	***30.7%***
Hispanic	-6.4%	-24.3%
White	-3.8%	-5.5%
Asian	-6.6%	-1.4%

For all other racial groups, their percentage of suspensions was less than their percentage of student enrollment.

SUSPENSION RATES FOR BLACK STUDENTS WERE FAR HIGHER THAN STUDENTS OF OTHER RACES

Suspension rates measure the number of suspended students per racial group as a percentage of their respective enrollment. For example, if ten students of a specific

racial group were suspended and their total enrollment was one hundred, then their suspension rate would be 10%. The Office of Inspector General calculated the suspension rates for the four racial groups with the largest student enrollments by dividing the unduplicated count of students suspended by the cumulative enrollment at the selected schools for the selected student racial group enrollment. The analysis showed that the suspension rates for Black students were far higher than the other racial groups.

Suspension Rates for the Schools Outside of Lancaster

In the Schools Outside of Lancaster, the observed 8.4% suspension rate for Black students was more than ***three times*** greater than the second highest suspension rate of 2.6% for Hispanic students.



In other words, **1 out of every 12** (8.4%) Black students were suspended in the 2019-2020 school year. In comparison, 1 out of every 39 (2.6%) Hispanic students, 1 out of 54 (1.9%) White students, and 1 out of 184 (0.5%) Asian students were suspended.

Suspension Rates for the Lancaster Schools

The suspension rates for Black students in the Lancaster schools were approximately **50% higher than** rates found in the Schools Outside of Lancaster with a suspension rate of 12.5%, which was nearly ***four times*** greater than the second highest race group as shown in the following chart:



Approximately 1 out of 8 (12.5%) Black students were suspended in the Lancaster Schools during the 2019-2020 school year. In comparison, approximately 1 out of every 31 (3.2%) Hispanic students, 1 out of every 40 (2.5%) White students, and 1 out of every 76 (1.3%) Asian students were suspended during that same period.

The Suspension Rates of Black Students in SRD Contract Schools Exceeded Statewide Averages

In the Schools Outside of Lancaster, the suspension rates of Black and Hispanic students exceeded statewide averages.[22] The suspension rate of Black students exceeded the statewide average by 1.6%, followed by Hispanic students at 0.1%. The suspension rates of White students at 1.9%, and Asian students at 0.5% were under the statewide averages for their respective groups.

The following table compares suspensions rates for the Schools Outside of Lancaster against those statewide:

[22] California Department of Education Data Quest, 2019-20 Suspension Rate, https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dqCensus/DisSuspRate.aspx?year=2019-20&agglevel=State&cds=00.

Race	Outside Lancaster	Statewide	Difference
Black	***8.4%***	***6.8%***	***1.6%***
Hispanic	2.6%	2.5%	0.1%
White	1.9%	2.0%	-0.1%
Asian	0.5%	0.7%	-0.2%

The suspension rate for Black students in the Lancaster Schools at 5.7% was far greater than any other racial group. All other major racial groups in the Lancaster Schools exhibited lower suspension rates than their statewide average as demonstrated in the following table:

Race	Lancaster Schools	Statewide	Difference
Black	***12.5%***	***6.8%***	***5.7%***
Hispanic	3.2%	2.5%	0.7%
White	2.5%	2.0%	0.5%
Asian	1.3%	0.7%	0.6%

In summary, Black students constituted the majority of all suspensions for the 2019-2020 school year in both the Schools Outside of Lancaster and the Lancaster Schools, and their suspension rates far exceeded those of Hispanic, White, and Asian students. In addition, the suspension rates of Black students exceeded the statewide average in both the Schools Outside of Lancaster and the Lancaster Schools.

Black Students Were Expelled at Disproportionately Higher Rates Than Their Percentage of the School Enrollment

Due to the severity of the punishment, expulsions are much less common than suspensions and are often used as a last resort. School administrators recommend expulsions to the school district's governing board, which will then decide whether to expel a student or not.[23] The Office of Inspector General analyzed expulsion data for the Schools Outside of Lancaster and the Lancaster Schools and found that Black students were expelled at disproportionately higher rates than their percentage of school enrollment.

[23] https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/se/expulsionrecomm.asp.

Expulsions in the Schools Outside of Lancaster

In the Schools Outside of Lancaster, there were 56 expulsions of which 32.1% (18 of 56) involved the expulsion of a Black student, 58.9% (33 of 56) of a Hispanic student, 5.4% (3 of 56) involved a White student, and the remaining 3.6% (2 of 56) involved a student of mixed race, and one where the race of the student was not reported.

Black students were the only racial group whose percentage of expulsions exceeded their percentage of the school enrollment (32.1% of expulsions vs. 8.5% of school enrollment).

The chart below compares the overall expulsions of the Schools Outside of Lancaster to the racial demographics of the schools analyzed:



Expulsions in Lancaster Schools

In the Lancaster Schools there were a total of 36 expulsions of which 50.0% (18 of 36) involved the expulsion of a Black student, 38.9% (14 of 36) of a Hispanic student, 2.8% (1 of 36) involved a White student, and 8.3% (3 of 36) involved a student of mixed race.

Again, Black students were the only racial group whose expulsion percentage exceeded their percentage of the school enrollment.

The chart below compares the overall expulsions of the Lancaster schools to the racial demographics of the schools analyzed:



Overall, Black students were expelled at disproportionately higher rates when compared to their percentage of the school enrollment from both the Schools Outside of Lancaster and from the Lancaster Schools. Here again, Black students were the only racial group exhibiting this disparity. The expulsion percentages of all other racial groups fell below the percentage of their school enrollment.

SRD CONTRACT REVIEW

Racial disparity of treatment can arise in various ways. In *United States of America v. The County of Los Angeles*, the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department is under court ordered restrictions due to racial disparity in enforcement in publicly supported housing.[24] That case developed in part because of Housing Authority of Los Angeles' requests to the Sheriff's Department for assistance by accompanying Housing Authority personnel on public housing compliance checks and referrals to the Sheriff's Department for investigations of Section 8 housing contract fraud.[25] The complaint by

[24] The settlement agreement overseen by the court includes that Sheriff's Department policies shall "outline factors to be considered when assessing the need for deputy accompaniment [on Section 8 housing compliance checks]. These compliance checks arose out of requests by Housing Authority officials in much the same way that school staff request SRD assistance with students. Much like the requirement that the Sheriff's Department update its policies to outline factors when assessing the need for deputy accompaniment, specificity in SRD contracts should detail when SRDs should respond to school official requests to contact students. See *United States v. The County of Los Angeles Settlement Agreement* at pages 16-17.

[25] See *United States v. The County of Los Angeles Settlement Agreement* at pages 16-17.

the United States Department of Justice alleged that the contacts by deputies resulted in a "pattern or practice of conduct by law enforcement officers that deprive[d] individuals of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution or federal law.[26] Similarly, SRD contacts with Black students are often triggered by school staff referring those Black students to deputies. This leads to the question, what can be done to mitigate the potential effect of school-based bias on SRD referrals?

Tools to effect change at the school level may be found in the terms and conditions of the SRD contracts.

The Office of Inspector General staff conducted a review of the contracts which the school districts entered into with the County for SRD services. The contracts use general boilerplate language to describe the services provided by SRDs. In each contract, under the heading *Scope of Services*, the agreements all contain the same language:

> 1.0 The County agrees, through the Sheriff of the County of Los Angeles, to provide law enforcement services for the [s]chool to the extent and in the manner set forth in this Agreement.
>
> 1.1 Except as otherwise specifically set forth in this Agreement, law enforcement services shall encompass duties and functions of the type coming within the jurisdiction of and customarily rendered by the Sheriff under the Charter of the County and the statutes of the State of California.

The only language that changes between the contracts is the school district's name, the number of contracted SRDs contracted and the cost for such personnel. The current contracts the Sheriff's Department have with the schools provide no specific guidance as to the types of situations for which students should be referred to SRDs, what type of services SRDs must provide when contacted, and/or how SRDs should interact with the school administrators. In addition, the Office of Inspector General was unable to find any Sheriff's Department or school district policies that clearly defined the types of student behavior and/or types of issues requiring the assistance of a SRD, and/or what types of student behavior would be tolerated for a period of time before requiring the SRDs to step-in, and/or what constituted an issue for which a SRD can be consulted, or for that matter any other scope and/or guidance as to a SRD's role should be in a school.

---

[26] See *United States v. The County of Los Angeles Settlement Agreement* at page 2.

Office of Inspector General staff spoke to SRDs from each supervisorial district in an effort to understand the scope of the services SRDs provide in the schools to which they are assigned. While there were slight deviations as to the services each SRD provided based on the schools they served, there was a pattern in the types of services and relationships which they all forged with the schools. The SRDs all reported having a collaborative relationship with the school staff and administrators at the schools at which they were assigned. Per the SRDs, the usual practice was that the school administrators/staff contacted them about a student and/or identified a possible problem. The SRDs usually did not initiate the contact or identify the issue. By the time the student and/or issue came to the SRD's attention, depending on the severity of the issue, the school usually had made attempts to address the issue internally.

For issues such as truancy or bringing a vape pen on to school grounds, school administrators typically begin with progressive discipline using internal school disciplinary methods to alter the student's behavior and/or rectify the issue. If the student repeatedly flouted the rules even after being subjected to the school's internal disciplinary process, then the school administrators may reach out to the SRD for assistance. Even then, the SRDs stated that they and the school administrators discuss how best to resolve the issue short of issuing a citation. Per the SRDs, in recent years, there has been a shift of focus from imposing criminal liabilities on a student to trying to rehabilitate the student using diversion programs. It is now becoming more of the norm to first attempt youth diversion to resolve the issue, before escalating the issue to the criminal justice system. If diversion does not work, the SRDs and the school administrators/staff meet to discuss how best to proceed using the legal and criminal justice avenues. The SRDs reported that once a matter was brought to their attention, they worked with the school administrators to determine how best to handle the situation.

What is remarkable about this level of uniformity in responses from the SRDs is the fact that there are no procedures that clearly define how students should be referred to SRDs. This level of uniformity in responses, combined with a lack of governing policies and/or rules, makes the above data surrounding the disparate consequences a student faces based on racial group even more alarming. If the SRDs and the schools all have the same working relationships and are in practice uniformly conducting the same job duties, then the logical conclusion should be that the students being disciplined must also be the same; however, the data clearly shows that this is not the case, with Black students bearing the brunt of serious consequences from school to school compared to

the percentage in the overall student enrollment. The question becomes whether this very lack of specificity in the rules and policies governing SRDs and their relationships with the schools is playing a part in the observed disproportionality in outcomes.

In recent years, legislators and school boards have expressed apprehension over the role of law enforcement officers at schools. In 2020, the State of California added section (e) to Education Code section 38000, which states:

> It is the intent of the Legislature to evaluate the presence of peace officers and other law enforcement on school campuses and to identify and consider alternative options to ensure pupil safety based on the needs of the local school communities. It is the intent of the Legislature to consider encouraging local educational agencies to use school resources currently allocated to such personnel, including school police departments and contracts with local police or sheriff departments, for pupil support services, such as mental health services and professional development for school employees on cultural competency and restorative justice, as needed, if found to be a more appropriate use of resources based upon the needs of the pupils and campuses that serve them.

With the passage of this amendment, some schools have begun to grapple with ways to implement the spirit of this law into practice. For example, in a November 8, 2021, Lancaster Unified School Board meeting, a Board member cited this very section of the Education Code as to why the Board needed to amend its own policies to require a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Sheriff's Department. Per the ratified board motion, the MOU would define the "roles, responsibilities, and expectations for the district, school site, law enforcement agency, and individual officers."[27] Further the board agreed that such a policy/MOU should have "a requirement for SROs [school resource officers] to use de-escalation techniques to mitigate the use of force in accordance with policy adopted by the law enforcement agency, clarifies that SROs should not handle routine disciplinary matters, requires SROs to complete specialized training, and calls for periodic evaluation of disaggregated data on student interactions with SROs to ensure compliance with nondiscrimination provisions of district policy

[27] Lancaster School Board of Trustees (2021). 'Item 19(b): First Reading of Addition of Board Policy 3515.31 School Resource Officers.' *Minutes of Lancaster Board of Trustees Meeting 19 October 2021,* Regular Meeting of Board of Trustees.

and/or the MOU."[28] Lancaster Unified School District adopted this proposal, and codified it into its school board policies on November 16, 2021.[29]

Not all school districts in Los Angeles County have enacted such policies, but a few schools have codified the same policy into their bylaws.[30] On January 31, 2023, the Office of Inspector General requested copies of any MOUs the Sheriff's Department had with contracted schools. The Sheriff's Department stated that it did not have any MOUs with contract schools. The Office of Inspector General reached out to Lancaster Unified School District to get a copy of the MOU, but as of writing this report, the school district has not provided a response.

The failure to modify the SRD contracts increases the potential that the County will be liable for civil rights violations or other conduct of deputies when contacting the students. Improving the specificity of the terms and conditions in SRD contracts regarding the roles and responsibilities of the SRD and the process of student referral to SRDs is warranted to ensure that the potential bias of school officials is accounted for and to limit the County's liability.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: To help mitigate the negative effects of potential school-based racial bias on SRD referrals, the Office of Inspector General recommends that Sheriff's Department SRD contracts should include the following:

- A clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of the SRD, the school district, and the school site, including a detailed plan outlining a process for student referrals to SRDs;
- The extent to which information will be shared between the school district and Sheriff's Department consistent with state and federal laws;
- Requirements for qualifications and training of SRDs;
- Assigned hours of SRD duty in and around school locations; and

[28] *Ibid.*
[29] *See* Lancaster Unified School District Board Policy 3515. 31, adopted November 16, 2021.
[30] Rowland Unified School District Board Policy 3515.31, adopted August 12, 2021, View Policy 3515.31: School Resource Officers (eboardsolutions.com). (Accessed February 8, 2023).

- A system of SRD performance monitoring that is available to the public.[31]

Further, the SRD's job duties should "not include the handling of student code of conduct violations or routine student disciplinary matters that should be addressed by school administrators or conduct that would be better addressed by mental health professionals."[32] Schools should be required to have a referral policy in place before a student is referred to an SRD for disciplinary matters. Future SRD contracts should also require the schools to periodically report to the Board of Supervisors "disaggregated data on student interactions with SRDs to evaluate the appropriateness of such interactions and ensure compliance with the prohibition against nondiscrimination. Such reports may include the number of arrests and referrals for prosecution, the number of reports provided to the school or district regarding student misconduct, or other actions taken by SRDs with respect to individual students or others on campus."[33]

Recommendation 2: In order to facilitate the preparation of these reports, the Sheriff's Department should publish CAD system statistics on all SRD contacts with students including the data points listed in the Board's June 8, 2021, motion entitled Strengthening Oversight of School Law Enforcement Services. The Sheriff's Department should also track and publish data on how many SRD contacts resulted in uses-of-force on students and the level of force used.[34]

Recommendation 3: Los Angeles County should consider support for the passage of California Assembly Bill 1299 (AB 1299), which is pending before the California State Legislature. AB 1299 would require school resource officers to "report directly to the principal of the school while on the school campus" with certain exceptions. The bill also requires the creation of policies and procedures relating to use of school resource officers, or officers acting in this capacity, and must include the following:

> (i) A prohibition on use of handcuffs on a school campus unless necessary to address a violent situation.
> (ii) A prohibition on the issuance of a vehicle citation to a current pupil any person, including a pupil, operating a vehicle on a school campus.
> (iii) A prohibition on the use of pepper spray on a school campus.

---

[31] *For example see,* Lancaster Unified School District Board Policy 3515. 31, adopted November 16, 2021.
[32] *Ibid.*
[33] *Ibid.*
[34] The Office of Inspector General requested SRD use-of-force data from the Sheriff's Department but was told by the Sheriff's Department that such data is not kept in a readily accessible manner.

(iv) A prohibition on the use of a police officer, school resource officer, or any other law enforcement official acting as a school resource officer for purposes of correcting pupil behavior.

If you have any questions concerning this report, please contact me at (213) 974-6100.

MH:ec

Attachments

c: Robert G. Luna, Sheriff
Fesia Davenport, Chief Executive Officer
Celia Zavala, Executive Officer
Dawyn R. Harrison, County Counsel
Danielle Vappie Butler, Interim Executive Director, Sheriff's Civilian Oversight Commission

Schools and Schools Districts Contracted with LASD

#	School District	School Name	Station	Grouping
1	ABC Unified	Gahr (Richard) High	Cerritos	Outside Lancaster
2	ABC Unified	Artesia High	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
3	ABC Unified	Cerritos High	Cerritos	Outside Lancaster
4	Centinela Valley Union High	Lawndale High	South LA	Outside Lancaster
5	Centinela Valley Union High	Leuzinger High	South LA	Outside Lancaster
6	Centinela Valley Union High	R. K. Lloyde High	South LA	Outside Lancaster
7	El Rancho Unified	El Rancho High	Pico Rivera	Outside Lancaster
8	Glendale Unified	Crescenta Valley High	Crescenta Valley	Outside Lancaster
9	Green Dot Public	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	Century	Outside Lancaster
10	Hacienda La Puente Unified	La Puente High	Industry	Outside Lancaster
11	La Canada Unified	La Canada High	Crescenta Valley	Outside Lancaster
13	Lawndale Elementary	Billy Mitchell Elementary	South LA	Outside Lancaster
17	Lawndale Elementary	F. D. Roosevelt Elementary	South LA	Outside Lancaster
14	Lawndale Elementary	Kit Carson Elementary	South LA	Outside Lancaster
15	Lawndale Elementary	Lucille J. Smith Elementary	South LA	Outside Lancaster
16	Lawndale Elementary	Mark Twain Elementary	South LA	Outside Lancaster
12	Lawndale Elementary	William Anderson Elementary	South LA	Outside Lancaster
18	Lawndale Elementary	William Green Elementary	South LA	Outside Lancaster
22	Lynwood Unified	Cesar Chavez Middle	Century	Outside Lancaster
19	Lynwood Unified	Lynwood High	Century	Outside Lancaster
20	Lynwood Unified	Marco Antonio Firebaugh High	Century	Outside Lancaster
21	Lynwood Unified	Vista High	Century	Outside Lancaster
23	Norwalk / La Mirada Unified	John H. Glenn High	Norwalk	Outside Lancaster
24	Norwalk / La Mirada Unified	La Mirada High	Norwalk	Outside Lancaster
25	Norwalk / La Mirada Unified	Norwalk High	Norwalk	Outside Lancaster
26	Palmdale Elementary	Barrel Springs Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
27	Palmdale Elementary	Buena Vista Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster

Schools and Schools Districts Contracted with LASD

#	School District	School Name	Station	Grouping
28	Palmdale Elementary	Cactus Medical, Health and Technology Magnet Academy	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
29	Palmdale Elementary	Chaparral Prep Academy	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
30	Palmdale Elementary	Cimarron Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
31	Palmdale Elementary	David G. Millen Law and Government Magnet Academy	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
32	Palmdale Elementary	Desert Rose Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
33	Palmdale Elementary	Desert Willow Fine Arts, Science and Technology Magnet Academy	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
34	Palmdale Elementary	Dos Caminos Dual Immersion	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
35	Palmdale Elementary	Golden Poppy Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
36	Palmdale Elementary	Innovations Academy of Palmdale	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
37	Palmdale Elementary	Joshua Hills Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
38	Palmdale Elementary	Los Amigos - Dual Immersion	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
39	Palmdale Elementary	Manzanita Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
40	Palmdale Elementary	Mesquite Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
41	Palmdale Elementary	Oak Tree Community Day	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
42	Palmdale Elementary	Ocotillo Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
43	Palmdale Elementary	Palm Tree Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
44	Palmdale Elementary	Palmdale Academy Charter	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
45	Palmdale Elementary	Palmdale Discovery Center	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
46	Palmdale Elementary	Palmdale Learning Plaza	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
47	Palmdale Elementary	Quail Valley Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
49	Palmdale Elementary	Shadow Hills Engineering and Design Magnet Academy	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
48	Palmdale Elementary	Site 18 (Head Start)	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
50	Palmdale Elementary	Space Aeronautics Gateway to Exploration Magnet Academy	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
51	Palmdale Elementary	Summerwind Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
52	Palmdale Elementary	Tamarisk Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
53	Palmdale Elementary	Tumbleweed Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster

Schools and Schools Districts Contracted with LASD

#	School District	School Name	Station	Grouping
54	Palmdale Elementary	Yellen Learning Center	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
55	Palmdale Elementary	Yucca Elementary	Palmdale	Outside Lancaster
56	Paramount Unified	Paramount High	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
57	Paramount Unified	Alondra Middle	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
58	Paramount Unified	Buena Vista High	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
59	Paramount Unified	Frank J. Zamboni	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
60	Paramount Unified	Hollydale	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
61	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
62	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
63	Paramount Unified	Paramount Unified Community Day	Lakewood	Outside Lancaster
64	Rowland Unified	John A. Rowland High	Walnut/Diamond Bar	Outside Lancaster
65	Rowland Unified	Nogales High	Industry	Outside Lancaster
66	Whittier Union High	California High	Norwalk	Outside Lancaster
67	Whittier Union High	Pioneer High	Pico Rivera	Outside Lancaster
68	William S Hart Union High	Placerita Junior High	Santa Clarita	Outside Lancaster
69	William S Hart Union High	William S. Hart High	Santa Clarita	Outside Lancaster
70	William S Hart Union High	Canyon High	Santa Clarita Valley	Outside Lancaster
71	William S Hart Union High	Golden Valley High	Santa Clarita Valley	Outside Lancaster
72	William S Hart Union High	La Mesa Junior High	Santa Clarita Valley	Outside Lancaster
73	William S Hart Union High	Rio Norte Junior High	Santa Clarita Valley	Outside Lancaster
74	William S Hart Union High	Sequoia	Santa Clarita Valley	Outside Lancaster
75	William S Hart Union High	Sierra Vista Junior High	Santa Clarita Valley	Outside Lancaster
76	William S Hart Union High	Valencia High	Santa Clarita Valley	Outside Lancaster
77	Antelope Valley Union High	Antelope Valley Adult/Independent Study	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
78	Antelope Valley Union High	Antelope Valley High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
79	Antelope Valley Union High	Desert Winds Continuation High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
80	Antelope Valley Union High	Eastside High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
81	Antelope Valley Union High	Highland High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
82	Antelope Valley Union High	Lancaster High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
83	Antelope Valley Union High	Littlerock High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
84	Antelope Valley Union High	Palmdale High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools

Schools and Schools Districts Contracted with LASD

#	School District	School Name	Station	Grouping
85	Antelope Valley Union High	Phoenix High Community Day	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
86	Antelope Valley Union High	Quartz Hill High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
87	Antelope Valley Union High	R. Rex Parris High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
88	Antelope Valley Union High	SOAR High (Students On Academic Rise)	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
89	Antelope Valley Union High	William J. (Pete) Knight High	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
90	Eastside Union Elementary	Columbia Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
91	Eastside Union Elementary	Eastside Academy	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
92	Eastside Union Elementary	Eastside Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
93	Eastside Union Elementary	Enterprise Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
94	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
95	Eastside Union Elementary	Tierra Bonita Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
96	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
97	Lancaster Elementary	Desert View Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
98	Lancaster Elementary	Discovery	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
99	Lancaster Elementary	El Dorado Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
100	Lancaster Elementary	Endeavour Middle	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
101	Lancaster Elementary	Fulton and Alsbury Academy of Arts and Engineering	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
102	Lancaster Elementary	Jack Northrop Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
103	Lancaster Elementary	John and Jacquelyn Miller Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
104	Lancaster Elementary	Joshua Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
105	Lancaster Elementary	Lincoln Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
106	Lancaster Elementary	Linda Verde Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
107	Lancaster Elementary	Mariposa Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
108	Lancaster Elementary	Monte Vista Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
109	Lancaster Elementary	Nancy Cory Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
110	Lancaster Elementary	New Vista Middle	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
111	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
112	Lancaster Elementary	Promise Academy	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
113	Lancaster Elementary	Sierra Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
114	Lancaster Elementary	Sunnydale Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools

Schools and Schools Districts Contracted with LASD

#	School District	School Name	Station	Grouping
115	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools
116	Lancaster Elementary	West Wind Elementary	Lancaster	Lancaster Schools

SRD CONTACTS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Attachment 2

The following chart lists the school district, school name, station, clearance codes of how the SRD resolved the matter, sex, race, and age of the elementary school student the SRD contacted and whether the contact yielded in an arrest or citation. The age ranges for this group ranged from ages 5 through 11. Of the total 21 contacts, 17 (or 81.0%) were Black students and 4 (or 19.0%) were Hispanic students. None of the students contacted resulted in an arrest or citation.

#	Grouping	School District	School name	Station	Clearance Code	Sex	Race	Arrest or Citation
1	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Discovery	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	F	B	No
2	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	456-SUICIDE AND ATTEMPT: Attempt Suicide, Juvenile	M	H	No
3	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Sierra Elementary	Lancaster	456-SUICIDE AND ATTEMPT: Attempt Suicide, Juvenile	M	B	No
4	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	M	B	No
5	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	462-Person(s) Mentally Ill - Escape	M	B	No
6	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Enterprise Elementary	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	M	B	No
7	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Enterprise Elementary	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	M	B	No
8	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Enterprise Elementary	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	M	B	No
9	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Sunnydale Elementary	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	F	B	No
10	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Columbia Elementary	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	M	H	No
11	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Eastside Academy	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	H	No
12	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Enterprise Elementary	Lancaster	441-NON-CRIMINAL: Special Investigations	M	B	No

SRD CONTACTS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Attachment 2

13	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Sunnydale Elementary	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	F	B	No
14	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Linda Verde Elementary	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	M	B	No
15	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	F	B	No
16	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Discovery	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	F	H	No
17	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Joshua Elementary	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	No
18	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Sunnydale Elementary	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	M	B	No
19	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Monte Vista Elementary	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	No
20	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Monte Vista Elementary	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	No
21	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Monte Vista Elementary	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	F	B	No

The “Clearance Codes” listed above are a three-digit statistical code numbers used by the Sheriff’s Department to classify the type of crime or incident that is being reported. School resource deputies enter these statistical codes to “clear” calls for service or observations by entering one or more of the codes into the CAD system. Clearance Codes only give an indication on what may have precipitated the student contacts set forth above. This review was limited to information that was entered into the CAD data system. Consequently, the Office of Inspector General is unaware of the full circumstances that led to these student contacts and we are therefore unable to opine on the reasonableness of these contacts.

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

The following chart lists the school district, school name, station, clearance codes, sex, race, and age of the middle school student contacted and whether there was an arrest or citation. The age range for this chart ranged from ages 11 through 15[1]. Of the total 166 contacts, there were 91 contacts (or 54.8%) with Hispanic students, 66 contacts (or 39.8%) with Black students and 7 contacts (or 4.2%) with White students. The remaining 2 contacts (or 1.2%) involved one Asian student and one student classified as "Other" race. Out of the 166 contacts, 27 (or 16.3%) resulted in an arrest of the student, 104 (or 62.7%) resulted in the student being issued a citation and 35 (or 21.0%) resulted in neither an arrest nor citation of the student.

#	Grouping	District	School name	Station	Clearance Code	Sex	Race	Arrest or Citation
1	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	Rio Norte Junior High	Santa Clarita	800-Directed Patrol Time	M	B	No
2	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	La Mesa Junior High	Santa Clarita	777-Assist Citizen	M	H	No
3	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
4	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	Rio Norte Junior High	Santa Clarita	800-Directed Patrol Time	F	W	Arrest
5	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	Sierra Vista Junior High	Santa Clarita	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	M	H	Arrest
6	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	La Mesa Junior High	Santa Clarita	777-Assist Citizen	M	H	No
7	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	H	Citation
8	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	M	H	Citation
9	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
10	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation

[1] There was one record in this group where the age was entered as "0" which appears to be an input error based on this student being contacted at a Middle School. Another contact at Rio Norte Junior High was made at a nearby park where the person contacted was 18 years of age.

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

11	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	M	H	Citation
12	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	M	H	Citation
13	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	M	H	Citation
14	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	H	Citation
15	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	H	Citation
16	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Hollydale	Lakewood	777-Assist Citizen	M	H	Citation
17	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Hollydale	Lakewood	777-Assist Citizen	M	H	Citation
18	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Hollydale	Lakewood	751-STATION SERVICE: Administrative	M	H	Citation
19	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Hollydale	Lakewood	751-STATION SERVICE: Administrative	M	H	Citation
20	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	M	B	Citation
21	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
22	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
23	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
24	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

25	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	M	H	Citation
26	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
27	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	H	Citation
28	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Alondra Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
29	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	F	B	Citation
30	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	F	H	Citation
31	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	F	B	Citation
32	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	M	B	Citation
33	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
34	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
35	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
36	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
37	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	F	B	Citation

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

38	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
39	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	M	H	Citation
40	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	M	H	Citation
41	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	720-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Hazardous Citation	M	H	Citation
42	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	720-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Hazardous Citation	M	H	Citation
43	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	F	B	Citation
44	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
45	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
46	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	721-VEHICLE/BOATING LAWS, CITATIONS: Non-Hazardous Citation	F	B	Citation
47	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
48	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	La Mesa Junior High	Santa Clarita	217-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Telephone Annoyance	F	H	Arrest
49	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	Sierra Vista Junior High	Santa Clarita	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	F	H	Arrest
50	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	La Mesa Junior High	Santa Clarita	217-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Telephone Annoyance	F	H	Arrest
51	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	La Mesa Junior High	Santa Clarita	217-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Telephone Annoyance	F	H	Arrest

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

52	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
53	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Alondra Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	B	Citation
54	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	B	Citation
55	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	F	H	Citation
56	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
57	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	725-JUVENILE CITATION, Alcohol-Related	F	H	Citation
58	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	H	Citation
59	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	B	Citation
60	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	B	Citation
61	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	B	Citation
62	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
63	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
64	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	O	Citation
65	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
66	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
67	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	H	Citation

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

68	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
69	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	H	Citation
70	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
71	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
72	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
73	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
74	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Frank J Zamboni Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	H	Citation
75	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	B	Citation
76	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
77	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	W	Citation
78	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
79	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	W	Citation
80	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
81	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
82	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
83	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

84	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
85	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Paramount Park Middle	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
86	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	B	Citation
87	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
88	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	F	B	Citation
89	Outside Lancaster	Paramount Unified	Leona Jackson	Lakewood	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	B	Citation
90	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	Rio Norte Junior High	Santa Clarita	441-NON-CRIMINAL: Special Investigations	M	A	No
91	Outside Lancaster	Lynwood Unified	Cesar Chavez Middle	Century	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	H	Arrest
92	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	F	B	Arrest
93	Outside Lancaster	William S. Hart Union	Placerita Junior High	Santa Clarita	399-MISDEMEANORS, MISCELLANEOUS: All Other Misdemeanors	M	B	Arrest
94	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	147-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Threat Public/School Official	F	B	Arrest
95	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest
96	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	M	B	Arrest
97	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest
98	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	054-ASSAULT, FELONY: ADW - Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest
99	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

100	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest
101	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	399-MISDEMEANORS, MISCELLANEOUS: All Other Misdemeanors	M	H	Arrest
102	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest
103	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	147-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Threat Public/School Official	F	H	Arrest
104	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	F	B	Citation
105	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	M	H	Citation
106	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	F	B	Citation
107	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	M	B	Citation
108	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	F	B	Citation
109	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	724-JUVENILE CITATION, Infraction	M	H	Citation
110	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	H	Citation
111	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	F	B	Citation
112	Outside Lancaster	Palmdale Elementary	Cactus Medical, Health and Technology Magnet Academy	Palmdale	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	M	B	Citation
113	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	M	H	No
114	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	800-Directed Patrol Time	M	H	No

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

115	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	800-Directed Patrol Time	M	H	No
116	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	M	H	No
117	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	M	H	No
118	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	461-Person(s) Mentally Ill - 5150 Hold Placed	F	W	No
119	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	M	B	No
120	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Endeavour Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	No
121	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	B	Arrest
122	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest
123	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	W	Arrest
124	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest
125	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	151-WEAPON LAWS: Felony	M	B	Arrest
126	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	B	Arrest
127	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest
128	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	M	B	Citation
129	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	M	B	Citation

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

130	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	F	H	Citation
131	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	M	H	Citation
132	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	F	H	Citation
133	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	F	H	Citation
134	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	802-School Resource Deputies (SRD) Non-Criminal	M	H	Citation
135	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	415-JUVENILE, NON-CRIMINAL: Juv School Laws, Habitual Truancy (WIC 601B)	F	H	Citation
136	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	M	H	Citation
137	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	261-VANDALISM: Vandalism, Misdemeanor	M	H	No
138	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	M	H	No
139	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	M	H	No
140	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	212-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Disturbing The Peace/Court Disturbances	F	B	No
141	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	No
142	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	M	H	No
143	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	M	H	No

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

144	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	M	B	No
145	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	New Vista Middle	Lancaster	152-WEAPON LAWS: Misdemeanor	M	H	No
146	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	New Vista Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	B	No
147	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	New Vista Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	B	No
148	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	M	B	No
149	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	H	No
150	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Gifford C. Cole Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	M	H	No
151	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	441-NON-CRIMINAL: Special Investigations	M	B	No
152	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Eastside Academy	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	H	No
153	Lancaster Schools	Eastside Union Elementary	Eastside Academy	Lancaster	441-NON-CRIMINAL: Special Investigations	M	H	No
154	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	B	Arrest
155	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	M	H	Citation
156	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	729-JUVENILE CITATION, Truancy	F	H	Citation
157	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	415-JUVENILE, NON-CRIMINAL: Juv School Laws, Habitual Truancy (WIC 601B)	M	H	Citation
158	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Piute Middle	Lancaster	415-JUVENILE, NON-CRIMINAL: Juv School Laws, Habitual Truancy (WIC 601B)	M	H	Citation

SRD CONTACTS IN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Attachment 3

159	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	415-JUVENILE, NON-CRIMINAL: Juv School Laws, Habitual Truancy (WIC 601B)	M	H	Citation
160	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	The Leadership Academy	Lancaster	189-Marijuana Infraction (Possession of no more than 28.5 grams)	M	H	Citation
161	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	H	No
162	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	W	No
163	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	H	No
164	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Endeavour Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	F	B	No
165	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Amargosa Creek Middle	Lancaster	210-DISORDERLY CONDUCT: Interfering W/School Activities	F	H	No
166	Lancaster Schools	Lancaster Elementary	Endeavour Middle	Lancaster	144-ASSAULT, MISDEMEANOR: Hands, Feet, Fist, Etc.	M	W	No

The “Clearance Codes” listed above are a three-digit statistical code numbers used by the Sheriff’s Department to classify the type of crime or incident that is being reported. School resource deputies enter these statistical codes to “clear” calls for service or observations by entering one or more of the codes into the CAD system. Clearance Codes only give an indication on what may have precipitated the student contacts set forth above. This review was limited to information that was entered into the CAD data system. Consequently, the Office of Inspector General is unaware of the full circumstances that led to these student contacts and we are therefore unable to opine on the reasonableness of these contacts.