



A Practical Guide to Building Strong School–Police Relationships at the School Level

By John Huber

July 2025

This guide offers a realistic, experience-driven framework with three distinct levels of school–police partnerships. It’s designed to help school leaders and law enforcement build effective, respectful relationships rooted in trust, clearly defined roles, and a shared commitment to student safety.

Over the past two decades, the conversation around school safety has shifted from alarm to action. While much of the attention falls on policy, hardware, and protocols, the heart of any effective school safety strategy is still people. The core of our children's safety in schools lies in the partnership between schools and law enforcement. No other collaboration is more important.

Too often, viral incidents, or even tragedy, are perceived as failures by the SRO, when, in reality, the root cause is a weak or poorly defined partnership. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is what defines that partnership. Any SRO or administrator involved should be able to quote from it.

The School Resource Officer (SRO) [Triad model](#) as defined by the [National Association of School Resource Officers \(NASRO\)](#), when implemented properly, offers schools a steady, reassuring presence: law enforcer, educator, and informal counselor or mentor. But unfortunately, it is often misunderstood, misused, or simply mishandled. We've all seen it; good intentions undermined by unclear boundaries, mismatched expectations, or weak communication. Whether it's the SRO overstepping into discipline or the school treating the officer like a disciplinary backup, the damage is real, and avoidable.

This guide lays out a framework I've used and refined over years of working with SROs and police agencies: three distinct levels of partnership. These levels are not a ladder to climb. They're not "bad" to "best." They represent three *valid* models of relationship between schools and law enforcement, shaped by the personnel involved, the context of the school, and, most importantly, the attitudes of administrators toward law enforcement.

Used properly, these levels provide a roadmap for districts, principals, officers, and police leaders to assess where they are, and where they want to go. They're grounded in lessons learned the hard way, on both sides of the partnership.

◆ **Level One: The Secure Sentinel – Clear, Professional Boundaries**

At this foundational level, the SRO's role is limited but essential. This might be a new officer getting acclimated, a fill-in during a leave, or a veteran SRO choosing to maintain a tight boundary. It might also be a situation where school administrators have an unfavorable view of law enforcement. The focus is on collaboration, visibility, physical safety, and law enforcement duties. The officer monitors hallways, entrances, and dismissal, but does *not* get involved in discipline, internal investigations, or behavioral interventions, unless there is a crime.

The SRO is courteous, present, and supportive, but not embedded in the daily life of the school. Informal conversations or class visits may happen, but only by request. This approach implements and respects the triad model laid out by NASRO, particularly the law enforcement role, while acknowledging the fence between education and policing.

There is nothing wrong with this model; it isn't a broken one. In many schools, especially large districts, schools with high turnover, new SRO placements, or an admin team with unfavorable views of law enforcement, it works just fine. But it requires discipline to stick to its limits.

Common mistakes at this level:

Common mistakes include SROs crossing the line simply because they're asked. This might include "escorting" students for non-criminal behavior, sitting in on discipline meetings, or investigating rumors (even when asked by a principal). It can create confusion and liability. These actions, while seemingly minor, create confusion, liability, and a false sense of what the SRO is there to do. At this stage, the best thing an SRO can do is protect the role by protecting the boundaries.

SROs who operate at this level will often encounter resistance when they attempt to step outside their established role; particularly in moments where they try to intervene in student behavior or school matters without first having the relational foundation or formal invitation to do so. This resistance isn't necessarily personal; it's a reflection of trust that hasn't yet been earned or boundaries that haven't been fully clarified. Teachers may be hesitant to involve the SRO in classroom dynamics. Administrators may keep communication strictly transactional, and students may view the officer as a stranger in uniform rather than a trusted adult presence. That's not a failure; it's part of the process.

Trying to fast-track relationships or assume deeper access without building that trust first can backfire quickly. SROs at this level should focus on consistency, visibility, and professionalism—showing up daily, treating everyone with respect, and being patient while credibility builds over time. Trust is earned in the little moments. And in Level One, restraint is a strength.

Again, this level of partnership is not a broken one, and there is nothing wrong with it. It fully implements the Triad model, through a foundational nature, and as such, schools and SROs should understand its limitations and plan for them.

Level 1 Scenario: Observing and Supporting, Not Intervening

During a class change, two students begin yelling at each other near the lockers. A crowd starts to gather. The SRO, stationed nearby, steps closer, not to break it up, but to observe and signal his or her presence. He radios the front office for an administrator. When the AP

and staff arrive, they, along with nearby teachers and staff, separate the students and the administrator deals with the situation. The SRO remains calm and visible, then quietly checks in with the AP afterward:

“I stayed nearby in case it escalated, but it looked like you had it handled. Let me know if you need anything from me.”

Why this scenario is Level 1: The SRO doesn’t take over the situation, and doesn’t get involved. No law is being broken. He supports by presence, ensures safety, and maintains the boundaries of his role. This is the Secure Sentinel in action; engaged, aware, but professionally restrained.

Transition to Level 2:

As trust builds over time, through consistent presence and professionalism, schools may invite SROs into deeper roles. Not because they’re “ready,” but because the relationship itself becomes a foundation for shared work. That brings us to Level 2.

◆ Level Two: The Trusted Collaborator – A Consistent, Consulted Presence

At Level Two, the SRO has become a familiar and respected presence in the building. Relationships are deeper, trust is growing, and communication flows both ways. The officer still focuses primarily on safety and law enforcement but now contributes to school-wide initiatives related to climate and culture. This is where most successful school-police partnerships operate.

The full triad model is now active with more and equal emphasis on the educator and informal counselor/mentor roles. The SRO may be asked to provide informal mentoring, participate in classroom presentations, or assist with safety planning. The officer might be invited to parent meetings (with consent) or asked for input on policy decisions involving student behavior. Their law enforcement perspective is valued but not misused.

At this stage, the SRO often becomes a go-between for patrol, community groups, and other outside stakeholders. When a neighborhood issue spills into school, the SRO becomes an important team member in navigating the gray area between what’s criminal and what’s simply disruptive.

This is the sweet spot where many effective partnerships live. It strikes a healthy balance

between involvement and restraint. It also builds the foundation for deeper collaboration down the line.

At this level, SROs will typically encounter much less resistance when stepping into sensitive situations involving students or staff. Because the SRO has become a familiar and trusted presence on campus, known not just by title, but by their name and character. School personnel are more likely to invite them into conversations that go beyond basic law enforcement. Administrators may loop the SRO into safety-related parent meetings, teachers may request their input on specific student concerns, and even students may initiate casual check-ins or seek advice, knowing the SRO is someone who listens without judgment.

This familiarity does not mean formal boundaries disappear, but it does mean the SRO is no longer viewed as an outsider. SRO presence in shared spaces like the cafeteria or during school events feels natural rather than forced. Trust is not assumed, it's been built, daily, through visible consistency and professional integrity. That trust opens doors to collaboration and input, especially in cases where the SRO's knowledge of students or off-campus dynamics adds valuable context to school-based decision-making.

However, the very comfort that makes Level 2 effective can also become its greatest risk. This is the stage where some SROs start getting *too* comfortable. They may begin to participate in unprofessional faculty lounge chatter, venting about students, gossiping about school dynamics, or complaining about administrators. While it might feel harmless or even cathartic in the moment, these lapses chip away at the SRO's credibility and undermine the respect they've worked to earn. Worse, they send the wrong message to staff: that the SRO is "one of us" in ways that erode the professional separation critical to the role.

Common mistakes at this level:

Common mistakes at this level include schools assuming the officer is "one of them," and the SRO assuming so too. This will sometimes pull the SRO deeper into non-law enforcement matters, such as disciplinary discussions, behavior plans, or even student supervision. And on the flip side, some well-meaning SROs slowly drift into these roles themselves, thinking they're just helping. What starts as an innocent hallway conversation can become a pattern of involvement that confuses boundaries and creates legal or ethical gray areas.

This is why clearly defined roles, and a strong, regularly reviewed MOU are essential, even in the healthiest partnerships. The MOU protects not just the school and the officer, but the

integrity of the entire program. The key at Level 2 is to sustain the trust that's been built, without relaxing the standards that made that trust possible in the first place.

Level 2 Scenario: Supporting Without Overstepping

During lunch, a student known for anxiety and occasional outbursts begins pacing and muttering to himself in the cafeteria. He is using lots of foul language. A staff member becomes concerned and notifies the assistant principal. The AP, who knows the student trusts the SRO, asks the SRO to speak with him, not as a disciplinarian, but as a familiar adult who might help calm things down.

The SRO approaches slowly, in a relaxed posture, and says:

"Hey, you good? Want to take a walk with me for a minute?"

The student hesitates, then nods and follows. They step into the hallway where the SRO listens more than he talks. He doesn't dig into school matters or question the student about grades or behavior. He just offers a calm space, then walks the student to the AP's office once he's ready.

Before leaving, the SRO quietly tells the AP: "He seems okay now—just needed a breather. You should follow up though."

Why it's Level 2: The SRO is involved because of trust, not authority. He steps in as a supportive adult, not a disciplinarian, and steps out as soon as the moment is stable. This is how collaboration works when respect and roles are clear.

Transition to Level 3:

Some schools and SROs go even deeper. When the partnership becomes seamless, strategic, respectful, and built on years of credibility, you reach Level 3. This is rare, but powerful when done right.

◆ Level 3: Embedded Partnership – Strategic Trust and Shared Purpose

Level 3 represents the highest and most integrated form of the school–SRO partnership. It's where collaboration is not just effective—it's fluid. In this rare but powerful model, the SRO is no longer just a presence on campus, but an embedded part of the school community. The officer is included in high-level conversations, crisis response planning, safety protocol

development, and is often viewed as a trusted member of the leadership team. This doesn't happen overnight—it is built through years of professionalism, mutual respect, and a proven ability to understand the school environment and how it differs from the outside.

At this level, the SRO continues to operate within NASRO's triad model (law enforcement officer, informal counselor, and educator), but the execution of these roles becomes deeply personalized. The SRO is frequently consulted on matters that affect school climate and safety, even if they don't involve a clear legal concern. Their involvement may include helping resolve peer conflicts, assisting with classroom disruptions, supporting mental health crisis protocols, or temporarily stepping into gray areas that traditionally fall under administrative authority. In most cases, these actions are initiated by school leadership, who explicitly trust the SRO's judgment and see them as a stabilizing presence in moments of tension.

However, this high-functioning partnership brings with it a new kind of risk—one rooted not in overstepping, but in slowly and subtly blurring boundaries without realizing it.

Common mistakes at this level:

The biggest mistake made at this level is not acknowledging the crossover when it happens. Because the SRO is so embedded and involved, both school staff and the officer may begin to assume that these blurred roles are part of the norm or "how we do things here." Over time, actions that were once considered exceptional or outside the officer's formal scope start to feel routine. The danger is when these blurred boundaries become so commonplace that no one even notices they're being crossed anymore.

When that happens, the SRO's role may quietly shift from law enforcement to unofficial disciplinarian, behavior manager, or administrative fixer. Not only does this violate the MOU and introduce legal and liability concerns—it also sets the stage for a viral incident or community backlash, especially if something goes wrong and the public asks, "Why was a cop handling that?"

Level 3 requires exceptional self-awareness from both the SRO and school leadership. Every time a crossover occurs, it must be acknowledged and agreed upon—not assumed. Once the crossover becomes a problem, an immediate backstep is required. The SRO must be equipped to recognize when their presence or involvement might tip the scale too far into administrative territory and know when to pull back. Likewise, school leaders must be vigilant in ensuring the officer is not becoming an extension of the discipline system. School leaders can become lazy at this level when an SRO is energetic and has strong initiative. The administrator may ask the SRO to deal with situations they know they should handle themselves—and the SRO agrees.

Even at this highest level of trust and collaboration, the MOU remains a critical safeguard. It should be revisited regularly and adjusted to reflect the realities of the working relationship—because relationships evolve. And when they do, clear documentation and open dialogue ensure that professionalism, safety, and role integrity stay front and center.

Scenario: Stepping In, Stepping Back

An assistant principal calls the SRO to a classroom to assist where two students have been arguing loudly and escalating toward a physical confrontation. The teacher has separated them but is struggling to regain control of the class. The administrator has a strong working relationship with the SRO and asks the officer to help “de-escalate the situation.”

The SRO calmly enters, speaks directly to the students by name (both of whom he knows well), and diffuses the tension with quiet authority. He walks with them into the hallway and listens as they vent their frustrations. No law has been broken, but it’s clear the situation needs attention.

The administrator starts to direct the SRO to sit in on the subsequent discipline meeting. Recognizing that this is a school matter, the SRO politely declines, saying:

“I’ve got you this far, but I’ll let you handle the rest. Let me know if anything changes.”

By stepping in when safety was in question and then stepping back when it became a school management issue, the SRO reinforces boundaries while still being a trusted partner. This kind of self-awareness and restraint is what makes a Level 3 partnership work—and last. The SRO recognizes that responding to the classroom in the first place was already stepping into the school’s responsibility and was ready to retreat when needed.

Why is it Level 3?

The officer steps in at the right moment, then steps back once it’s under school authority. The SRO shows restraint, maturity, and a deep understanding of role limits.

But what if the students refuse to leave or don’t listen?

Scenario: Holding the Line When Students Refuse to Leave

An argument breaks out between two students during class. The teacher tries to intervene but quickly realizes the conflict is escalating and calls the front office. The assistant principal is currently on lunch duty and, knowing the students have a rapport with the SRO,

radios him and asks him to respond first, hoping his presence will calm things down before further disruption occurs.

The SRO enters the classroom and finds the two students standing, voices raised, refusing to sit down or listen to the teacher. While the rest of the class watches, the SRO steps between the students, uses calm, direct language, and tells them that this is not the place—then offers to take them outside the classroom and settle the dispute. The students refuse.

The SRO stays composed and doesn't escalate. He gives them space, then turns to the teacher:

“Let's give them a minute, nothing criminal's happening. I'll hang back until admin gets here.”

The assistant principal arrives and, after seeing that the students are still refusing to leave, she looks to the SRO for help. The SRO, maintaining his boundary, quietly says:

“They're not responding to me either, but they haven't done anything illegal. This is your lane right now. I'll support you if it shifts.”

He stays close, serving as a calm presence. If either student were to make a threat or become physically aggressive, he'd be ready to act. But for now, this is a school issue, not a police matter, and he knows the difference. The administrator will then need to follow the disciplinary code and school policies to deal with the situation.

In this situation, the SRO completely understood prior to going into the classroom that he was out of his lane and was ready and willing to back up if needed. He was there as a resource, not as a strong arm of the administration.

 **Know the Role, Build the Trust, Protect the Partnership**

The three levels outlined here aren't a ladder, they're a framework. They reflect what's possible when schools and police communicate, align, and commit to clarity.

Some schools will stay at Level 1, and that's appropriate. Others may grow into Level 2. A few may reach Level 3. None are inherently better than the others, they're just different models based on relationships, culture, and leadership.

What matters most is that everyone knows the role, owns their lane, and respects the partnership.

Because when trust is mutual and roles are clear, the SRO is no longer just a uniform in the hallway, they become a critical part of keeping the school safe, stable, and whole.