



Governor's School and Campus Safety Task Force



School and Campus Safety Taskforce Public Safety Workgroup

East Reading Room
Patrick Henry Building
January 17, 2013
10:00 am–12:00 pm

AGENDA

- Introduction of Members

- Opening and Charge of Work Group

- Status report on school and campus safety in Virginia

- DCJS Research Center presentation on school surveys and relevant reports

- Roundtable discussion

- Next steps
 - Due date for Workgroup member assignments and recommendations—January 22, 2013

Next Meeting: January 24th 1:00 pm–5:00 pm

East Reading Room, Patrick Henry Building

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

Executive Order No. 56 (2012)

Governor's Taskforce on School and Campus Safety

Importance of the Initiative

In the aftermath of the heartbreaking tragedy that devastated Newtown, Connecticut, and the nation, Virginians stand united behind the families and friends of those affected by the loss of so many innocent lives. Indeed, the similarities between this horrific attack and the tragic 2007 shootings at Virginia Tech have left many in the Commonwealth searching for understanding, solutions, and ideas on how to prevent such violence in our country.

The impact of this recent event is not confined to Connecticut. Nor is the grief and outrage confined to Colorado, Arizona, Virginia, or to any other state that shares the burden of grieving for innocent victims lost at the hands of a depraved gunman or group that inexplicably chooses to take human lives en masse in a school, on a campus, or in a public forum.

Public safety is a primary responsibility of government - whether it is at the federal, state, or local level. In the aftermath of the shocking and senseless shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School, I have asked all local and state leaders that play a role in school or campus safety to review the procedures, plans, policies, and resources dedicated to the safety of students, faculty, and the public. We owe it to our children and young people to provide safe and secure learning environments, and the recent tragedy highlights the timeliness of conducting another comprehensive review. Accordingly, this past Monday, I announced the formation of a plan to review school safety at all levels, and to identify gaps and critical resource needs at the state, local, school division, and college/university levels to ensure that we are doing everything humanly possible to keep our children, young people, educators, and administrators safe while they are in the classroom and on our campuses.

Virginia has already put into place many significant measures to combat violence in schools and to promote a safe learning environment. Sections 22.1-279.8 and 9.1-184 of the *Code of Virginia* establish the Virginia Center for School Safety (VCSS) and set forth specific requirements for

training, crisis management, emergency response, and other preventative measures for situations that pose a threat of harm to students or school personnel. VCSS annually collects, analyzes, and publishes school safety data, including information from annual school safety audits. Moreover, the Department of Education regularly monitors data on violence and criminal acts in schools to identify those schools needing assistance to improve safety. Templates are provided for development of plans and technical assistance is available at the state level. We have also conducted extensive reviews of campus safety and our mental health system in 2007 and 2008 in the wake of the Virginia Tech shootings, resulting in legislative reforms, administrative changes, and additional mental health funding. As Attorney General, I worked with Governor Kaine to develop these needed reforms.

We have seen the devastating effects that an individual with criminal intent or mental health problems can have on our citizens. Though the majority of individuals with mental illness are more likely to be victims of violence than the perpetrators, we must improve our ability to minimize any risk of harm to oneself or others resulting from serious mental illness and utilize mental health services to prevent violence before danger arises. This is an area that cannot be overlooked when addressing school and campus safety.

We have an obligation to all students, parents, educators, administrators, support staff, and every citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia to provide the safest possible learning environment.

To accomplish this, in accordance with the authority vested in me by Article V of the Constitution of Virginia and by § 2.2-134 of the *Code of Virginia*, I hereby create the Governor's Task Force on School and Campus Safety.

Governor's Task Force on School and Campus Safety

The Task Force's responsibilities shall include the following:

1. Evaluate school safety audits that have already been conducted and identify best practices that schools or divisions have implemented that would be helpful to all and review any audit findings that have not been addressed.
2. Recommend improvements to K-12 school safety protocols and procedures to ensure an even safer learning environment.
3. Identify ways to improve and expand the use of School Resource Officers and School Security Officers in Virginia's public schools.
4. Recommend a mechanism for schools and localities to identify and share the best practices for improved school safety on an ongoing and continuing basis.
5. Suggest additional resources, programs, or tools that the Virginia Center for School Safety or the Department of Education could make available to Virginia's local school divisions and schools.

6. Identify any needed improvements to the school safety audit program to allow for better information gathering and sharing.
7. Recommend needed improvements to campus safety policies or procedures at Virginia's public and private colleges, community colleges, and universities.
8. Coordinate with the Mental Health Workgroup of the Task Force, described below, and review the Workgroup's recommendations.
9. Examine current laws and regulations to identify gaps relating to school and campus safety and provide timely recommendations for legislative or budget amendments.
10. Review the recommendations set forth in previous state and national reports and studies and provide strategies for implementation of relevant, realistic recommendations that would enhance school or campus safety.

Task Force Membership

The Task Force will be co-chaired by the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Public Safety, and the Secretary of Health and Human Resources. The membership will include representatives from state agencies, law enforcement, other public safety professionals, public and private education leaders, health care leaders, and the private sector to collaborate on how to best provide a safer learning environment for our students. Members shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Governor.

Membership shall include the following individuals or their designees:

- Superintendent of Public Instruction;
- Director of the Virginia Center for School Safety;
- Superintendent of the Virginia Department of State Police;
- Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services;
- Director of the Department of Juvenile Justice;
- Director of the Department of Emergency Management;
- The Attorney General of Virginia;
- The Commissioner of the Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services;
- The Commissioner of the Department of Health;
- Director of the State Council on Higher Education;
- At least six representatives of law enforcement or other first responders, to include a representative of School Resource Officers;
- A member of the Secure Commonwealth Panel;
- At least six representatives of elementary, secondary, and higher education, representing administrators, educators, counselors, and security personnel;
- One high school student at a Virginia school;
- One student attending a Virginia college or university;
- Two parents with at least one child currently in a Virginia school; and
- Two members of the House of Delegates and the Senate of Virginia.

The Governor may appoint other members as he deems necessary.

Mental Health Workgroup

I direct the Secretary of Health and Human Resources to convene a Mental Health Workgroup to evaluate Virginia's mental health system to recommend improvements for identification, intervention, and treatment of behavioral and mental disabilities with a focus on ways to prevent acts of violence. Given the significant medical and legal complexities associated with this law, the Attorney General of Virginia and the Secretary of Health and Human Resources shall co-chair this workgroup. Members of the workgroup shall be named by the Secretary of Health and Human Resources, bringing together experts from the mental health community. The work plan shall be devised by the Secretary of Health and Human Resources and presented at its first meeting. The workgroup shall make recommendations to the Task Force and present a copy of its recommendations to the Governor.

Task Force Staffing and Funding

Necessary staff support for the Task Force's work during its existence shall be furnished by the Office of the Governor, the Office of the Attorney General, and the Offices of the Secretary of Public Safety, Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of Health and Human Resources, as well as such other agencies and offices as designated by the Governor. An estimated 250 hours of staff time will be required to support the work of the Interagency Task Force.

Necessary funding to support the Commission and its staff shall be provided from federal funds, private contributions, and state funds appropriated for the same purposes as the Task Force, as authorized by Section 2.2-135 of the *Code of Virginia*, as well as any other private sources of funding that may be identified. Estimated direct costs for this Commission are \$1,000.00 per year.

The Task Force shall commence its work promptly and send initial recommendations no later than January 31, 2013. The Task Force shall make additional recommendations on an ongoing basis and shall provide a final report to the Governor no later than June 30, 2013. The Task Force shall issue such other reports and recommendations as necessary or as requested by the Governor. Due to the complex nature of the charge and the need for significant analysis, the Mental Health Workgroup, along with any other Workgroups of the Task Force, shall provide their recommendations no later than June 30, 2013.

Effective Date of the Executive Order

This Executive Order shall be effective upon its signing and pursuant to § 2.2-135 of the *Code of Virginia* shall remain in force and effect for one year from its signing unless amended or rescinded by further executive order.

Given under my hand and under the Seal of the Commonwealth of Virginia, this twentieth day of December, 2012.

/s/ **Robert F. McDonnell, Governor**

Attest:

/s/ Secretary of the Commonwealth



Commonwealth of Virginia
Office of Governor Bob McDonnell

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

January 9, 2013

Contact: Jeff Caldwell

Phone: (804) 225-4260

Email: Jeff.Caldwell@Governor.Virginia.Gov

**Governor Announces Membership of School
Safety Task Force**

Group to Hold First Meeting Monday, January 14th in Richmond

RICHMOND – Governor Bob McDonnell today announced the membership of his newly-created Task Force of School and Campus Safety. The membership includes educators, public safety experts, local leaders, mental health practitioners, legislators, parents, and students. The group will review school safety, including established policies and procedures, crisis and emergency management plans, threat assessment protocols, as well as share best practices and identify resource challenges. This task force will also provide legislative and budget proposals to the governor to address any critical gaps or needs associated with safety and security in our schools and on our campuses.

Speaking about the membership, Governor McDonnell said, “I am thankful that this dedicated group of leaders and experts has agreed to work on the important issue of keeping our schools safe. As a Commonwealth, we must evaluate safety in our schools and ensure that we are providing our young people with the best opportunity to learn. I am confident this group will develop thoughtful recommendations that will ensure a safe learning environment for our students.”

On Monday, December 20, Governor McDonnell issued [Executive Order 56](#) establishing a multidisciplinary task force to review school and campus safety in light of the horrific and senseless murders that took place at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut. He has also established a separate mental health workgroup chaired by Attorney General Ken

Cuccinelli and Secretary of Health and Human Resources Dr. Bill Hazel. The task force will send initial recommendations no later than January 31, 2013. It will make additional recommendations on an ongoing basis and provide a final report on all aspects of the executive order to the governor no later than June 30, 2013, so that recommended actions can be implemented before the new school year begins.

The Task Force will hold its first meeting on January 14th, at 1:00 PM, in the Patrick Henry Building in Richmond.

Governor's Task Force on School and Campus Safety

Co-Chairs

The Honorable Marla Decker, Secretary of Public Safety

The Honorable Laura Fornash, Secretary of Education

The Honorable Bill Hazel, M.D., Secretary of Health and Human Resources

Members

The Honorable Ken Cuccinelli, Attorney General of Virginia

The Honorable Joseph Yost, Virginia House of Delegates

The Honorable Margaret B. Ransone, Virginia House of Delegates

The Honorable Patrick Hope, Virginia House of Delegates

The Honorable Tom Garrett, Senate of Virginia

The Honorable Richard Stuart, Senate of Virginia

The Honorable George Barker, Senate of Virginia

Patricia Wright, Ed.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction

Donna Michaelis, Director of the Virginia Center for School Safety

Colonel W. Steven Flaherty, Superintendent of the Virginia Department of State Police

Garth Wheeler, Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services

Mark Gooch, Director of the Department of Juvenile Justice

Michael Cline, State Coordinator of the Department of Emergency Management

James W. Stewart, III, The Commissioner of the Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services

Maureen Dempsey, MD, FAAP, Acting State Health Commissioner

Peter Blake, Director of the State Council on Higher Education

Sarah Gross, PTA Legislative Liaison

Michelle Wescott, Nurse, Rena B. Wright Primary School; PTA Health and Safety Chair

Vincent Darby, Principal, G. H. Reid Elementary School, Richmond

Keith Perrigan, Principal, Patrick Henry High School, Washington; President, Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals

Dr. Deborah Pettit, Superintendent, Louisa County Schools

Dianne Smith, Member of Chesterfield School Board; Retired Principal

Leonard Steward, Lexington City School Board

Regina Blackwell Brown, Educational Specialist for School Counseling, Henrico County Public Schools

Meg Gruber, Teacher, Forest Park High School, Prince William; VEA President

Judi M. Lynch, Ph.D., Principal, Saint Gertrude High School

Dr. Sandy Ward, Director of the School Psychology program, College of William & Mary

Dewey Cornell, Professor of Education, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia; Director, Virginia Youth Violence Project

Charles J Klink, Assistant Vice Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs, Virginia Commonwealth University

Sheriff Brian Heatt, Tazewell County

Sheriff Mike Chapman, Loudoun County

Chief Jim Williams, Chief of Police, City of Staunton

Chief Don Challis, Chief of Police, College of William and Mary

Joel Branscom, Commonwealth's Attorney, Botetourt County

Chief Steve Cover, Fire Chief, City of Virginia Beach

Edward "Bubby" Bish, Virginia Association of Volunteer Rescue Squads

Captain Steve Carey, Stafford County Sheriff's Department (former School Resource Officer)

Gene Deisinger, Deputy Chief and Director of Threat Management, Virginia Tech

Charles Werner, Charlottesville Fire Chief (Member of Secure Commonwealth Panel)

Allen Hill, Father of Rachel Hill, Victim of Virginia Tech Shooting

Alexa Rennie, Student, James River High School

Jillian McGarrity, Student, Lynchburg College

###





School and Campus Safety Taskforce

WORKGROUP MEMBERS

The Honorable Marla Decker

Secretary of Public Safety

Amy Atkinson

Executive Director, Virginia Commission on Youth

Weet Baldwin

Coordinator Pre-Hospital Emergency Services

Craig L. Branch

Chief of Police, Germanna Community College

Matthew Brannock

Director of Operations, Martinsville Speedway

Kathy Butler

Tuckahoe Volunteer Rescue Squad

Captain Steve Carey

*Stafford County Sheriff's Department
(former School Resource Officer)*

Chief Jim Cervera

City of Virginia Beach Police Department

John Childrey

Deputy Attorney General

Dewey Cornell, Ph.D.

*Professor of Education, Curry School of Education,
University of Virginia; Director, Virginia Youth Violence Project*

Vincent Darby

Principal, G. H. Reid Elementary School, Richmond

Lee Day

*Deputy Public Safety Director, Amherst County and
Volunteer in Bedford*

Gene Deisinger, Ph.D.

Deputy Chief and Director of Threat Management, Virginia Tech

Sheriff Danny Diggs

York County

Fred Ellis

*Director, Office of Safety and Security,
Fairfax County Public Schools*

Colonel W. Steven Flaherty

Superintendent of the Virginia Department of State Police

Robert H. Foresman

Rockbridge County, Office of Emergency Management

Mark Gooch

Director of the Department of Juvenile Justice

John Lindstrom, Ph.D.

*Director of Administration & Access, Emergency Medical
Services, Richmond Behavioral Health Authority*

Chief Dave McCoy

University of Richmond Police Department

Jillian McGarrity

Student, Lynchburg College

Donna Michaelis

*Director of the Virginia Center for School Safety,
Department of Criminal Justice Services*

Chief Doug Middleton

Henrico County Police Department

Chief Chris Perkins

City of Roanoke Police Department

Dr. Deborah Pettit

Superintendent, Louisa County Schools

The Honorable Margaret Ransone

Virginia House of Delegates

Michael T. Reilly

*Deputy Fire Chief
Deputy Fire Marshal, Fairfax County Office of the Fire
Marshal, Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department*

The Honorable Richard Stuart

Senate of Virginia

Shannon Taylor

Commonwealth's Attorney, County of Henrico

Garth Wheeler

Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services

Chief Jim Williams

Chief of Police, City of Staunton



Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

Virginia Schools and Campus Safety: Snapshot of Current Data in Preparation for Future Challenges



Presented to the Governor's School Safety Task Force

January 2013




Introduction and Overview



- *K-12 Education:*
 - School Safety in Virginia
 - Related Laws and Requirements
 - School Resource Officer Data
 - School Security Officer Data
 - School Safety Audit Summary

- *Higher Education:*
 - Threat Assessment Teams
 - Lessons Learned Regarding Threat Assessments






K-12 Public Education



School Safety in Virginia

DCJS
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
www.dcps.virginia.gov



Snapshot of K-12 Public Education

- Definition of a “school” by DCJS different from DOE’s definition
- Number of public school divisions
 - 132 Public school divisions
 - “other schools” contains governor’s schools, DCE, and specialty centers
- Number of public “schools” in Virginia
 - 1981

DCJS
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
www.dcps.virginia.gov



Snapshot of K-12 Public Education

Breakdown by type

Type of school (N=1981)	Number	Percent
Elementary schools	1152	58%
Middle schools	339	17%
High schools	373	19%
Other schools	117	6%
Total	1981	100%



School Safety Relative to Other Crime

Of the homicides reported in Virginia from CY 2005 through 2011:

- Only three-tenths of one percent of homicide incidents occurred at a school or college.
- Over 50% of homicide incidents occurred in the home.
- One quarter of homicide incidents occurred on a roadway.





School Related Laws and Requirements

The Virginia Center for School Safety is responsible for:

§ 9.1-184
Virginia
Center for
School
Safety

- Providing **training** for stakeholders
- Serving as a **resource and referral center** and **providing technical assistance** for Virginia school divisions
- Facilitating the annual **school safety audit** pursuant to § [22.1-279.8](#)
- Encouraging development of **partnerships** to promote school safety in Virginia;



School Safety Audits and Crisis and Emergency Response Plans

§ 22.1-279.8.
School safety audits and school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plans required.

- **School Safety Audits:**
 - School safety audits conducted online annually
 - The Virginia Center for School Safety facilitates process and aids in completion
 - Results published annually
- **School Crisis and Emergency Plans:**
 - States what plans must include
 - School divisions must certify plans annually





§ 22.1-279.8.
School safety
audits and
school crisis,
emergency
management,
and medical
emergency
response
plans
required.



Crisis and Emergency Plans

- 100% of Virginia Public Schools have complied with the requirement to conduct an annual school safety audit.
- 100% of Virginia Public School Divisions developed a written school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plan.
- 97% of schools practiced their crisis management plan this year (2012).



§ 22.1-279.8.
School safety
audits and
school crisis,
emergency
management,
and medical
emergency
response
plans
required.



Crisis and Emergency Plans

- *Only 28% of schools had to activate their crisis management plan for any reason at all.*
- Of the 28% of schools that activated their crisis management plans (548 schools), 65% of the activations were for reasons of non-violent, non-criminal events.
(to include weather-related events, accidents/health-related events, power outages, smoke/fumes/fire, false alarm, hazardous chemical, etc.)



Lockdown Drills

8VAC20-131-260.
School facilities and safety

...at least one simulated lock-down and crisis emergency evacuation activity should be conducted early in the school year.

94% of schools* reported they have practiced their lockdown drill at least once per year



School Resource Officers

By Code, (§ 9.1-101), a “school resource officer” is defined as a certified law-enforcement officer hired by the local law-enforcement agency to provide law-enforcement and security services to Virginia public elementary and secondary schools.





School Resource Officers

The following schools reported that they have **School Resource Officers (SROs)** working at least part time in their school.

Elementary 271 (of 1152 schools) = **24%**
 Middle 289 (of 339 schools) = **85%**
 High 323 (of 332 schools) = **87%**



School Resource Officers

Number and Percent of schools with full time SRO(s) from 2008 - 2011

Survey year	# schools with full time SRO	# schools total	% schools with full time SRO
2011	513	1980	26%
2010	512	2002	26%
2009	554	2006	28%
2008	577	2002	29%

Number and Percent of schools with at least a part time SRO(s) from 2012

Survey year	# schools with at least part time SRO	# schools total	% schools with at least part time SRO
2012	935	1981	47%





School Security Officers

By Code, (§ 9.1-101), a “school security officer” is defined as an individual who is employed by the local school board for the singular purpose of maintaining order and discipline, preventing crime, investigating violations of school board policies, and detaining students violating the law or school board policies on school property or at school-sponsored events and who is responsible solely for ensuring the safety, security, and welfare of all students, faculty, staff, and visitors in the assigned school.



School Security Officers

Number and Percent of schools with full time SSO(s) from 2008 – 2011

Survey year	# schools with full time SSO	# schools total	% schools with full time SSO
2011	340	1980	17%
2010	356	2002	18%
2009	344	2006	17%
2008	370	2002	18%

Number and Percent of schools with at least a part time SSO(s) from 2012

Survey year	# schools with at least part time SSO	# schools total	% schools with at least part time SSO
2012	330	1981	17%





Access Control Systems and Other Security Strategies

- 53% of all schools reported that they had a **controlled access system** in place.
- 59% of all elementary schools have a controlled access system in place.
- 51% of all middle schools have a controlled access system in place.
- 37% of all high schools have a controlled access system in place.



Access Control Systems and Other Security Strategies

- 73% of all schools report that **all exterior entrances are locked** during school hours.
- 78% of all elementary schools report that all exterior entrances are locked during school hours.
- 74% of all middle schools report that all exterior entrances are locked during school hours.





Access Control Systems and Other Security Strategies

- 61 % of all high schools report that all exterior entrances are locked during school hours.
- **46% of all schools** reported that **someone is stationed at the front entrance** of the school at all times during school hours to ensure that visitors report to the main office for visitor check-in.



Access Control Systems and Other Security Strategies

- 43% of all elementary schools reported that someone is stationed at the front entrance.
- 46% of all middle schools reported that someone is stationed at the front entrance.
- 56% of all high schools reported that someone is stationed at the front entrance.





Higher Education in Virginia



DCJS
Virginia Department of
Criminal Justice Services
www.dcps.virginia.gov



Campus Security Officer Regulations and Training Program

§ 9.1-102

- Establish minimum standards for (i) employment, (ii) job-entry and in-service training curricula, and (iii) certification requirements for campus security officers.
- Provides technical support related to:
 - investigatory procedures, judicial referrals, the establishment and management of databases for campus safety and security information sharing, and development of uniform record keeping for disciplinary records and statistics, such as campus crime logs, judicial referrals and Clery Act statistics.

DCJS
Virginia Department of
Criminal Justice Services
www.dcps.virginia.gov



§ 9.1-102

Campus Security Officer Regulations and Training Program

- Governor passed proposed regulations on May 31, 2012
- CJSB approved final regulations on December 6, 2012
- 1,100 CSOs trained to date
- 83 CSO instructors
- 160 classes instructed to date



§ 23-9.2:10.
Violence prevention committee; threat assessment team

Violence Prevention Committee and Threat Assessment Teams

Each public college or university shall have in place policies and procedures for the prevention of violence on campus, including assessment and intervention with individuals whose behavior poses a threat to the safety of the campus community.





§ 23-9.2:10.
Violence
prevention
committee;
threat
assessment
team



Violence Prevention Committee and Threat Assessment Teams

...shall determine a committee structure on campus of individuals charged with education and prevention of violence on campus.



§ 23-9.2:10.
Violence
prevention
committee;
threat
assessment
team



Violence Prevention Committee and Threat Assessment Teams

- Each committee shall be charged with:
 - providing guidance to students, faculty, and staff regarding recognition of threatening or aberrant behavior that may represent a threat to the community;
 - identification of members of the campus community to whom threatening behavior should be reported; and
 - policies and procedures for the assessment of individuals whose behavior may present a threat as well as appropriate intervention and action.



§ 23-9.2:10.

Violence prevention committee; threat assessment team



Violence Prevention Committee and Threat Assessment Teams

- Each committees shall establish a specific threat assessment team.
- Each threat assessment team shall establish relationships or utilize existing relationships with local and state law-enforcement agencies as well as mental health agencies to expedite assessment and intervention with individuals whose behavior may present a threat to safety.



§ 23-9.2:10.

Violence prevention committee; threat assessment team



Violence Prevention Committee and Threat Assessment Teams

DCJS took lead in assisting colleges and universities with the implementation of this legislation:

- 2008 Threat Assessment Forum
- 2009 Forum on Threat Assessment in a Higher Education Setting: A Virginia Tech Demonstration Project
- 2010 Symposium on Campus Threat Assessment Teams – Advancing the Field
- Violence Prevention and Safety on Campus : Law and Policy Issues



§ 23-9.2:10.
Violence prevention committee; threat assessment team



Violence Prevention Committee and Threat Assessment Teams

- Basic Campus Threat Assessment Team Training
- Advanced Threat Assessment Training for Higher Education: Issues and Practices
- Campus Threat Assessment Team Train the Trainer Program
- National Forum on Campus Sexual Assault
- Virginia Campus Safety Forum: Addressing Sexual Assault on Campus
- Virginia Campus Safety Forum: Addressing Safety Threats on Campus



Thank you!



Questions?



Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

School Surveys and Relevant Reports

- Background on how the Virginia School Safety surveys are developed and implemented
- Highlights from the report on the Preliminary Findings from the 2012 Virginia School Safety Audit Survey
- Highlights from the report on Studies on the Effectiveness of School Resource Officers



School Safety Survey Background

Annual school safety survey process began in 2005

Survey Resources (annually)

- One-third of a full-time researcher (DCJS)
- Contract with UVA faculty to manage DCV data
- Time contributed by our survey research partners during the survey development
- Survey software updates/maintenance costs



School Safety Survey Calendar

March – April

- Survey questions developed and analyzed

May – June

- Survey constructed and tested

Early July

- In-house pilot

Late July

- Outside pilot



Virginia Department of
Criminal Justice Services
www.dcps.virginia.gov



School Safety Survey Calendar

(continued)

■ August – September

Survey implementation

■ October – November

Data cleaning and analysis

■ December

Report writing



Virginia Department of
Criminal Justice Services
www.dcps.virginia.gov



Highlights from the Preliminary 2012 Findings

Analyzed by School Types (P. 2 – 3)

- Elementary 58%
- Middle 17%
- High 19%
- Other 6%



Crisis Management Plan (CMP)

(P. 4 - 6)

Virginia Code § 22.1-279.8 describes school crisis and emergency management plans

In 2012, 97% schools practiced CMP

Of these, most frequent practice methods:

- 95% - trained administration, faculty, staff
- 72% - provided students with training or awareness sessions





Crisis Management Plan (CMP)

(P. 4 - 6)

In 2012, 28% of schools activated CMP

Of these, the most common reasons for activation were:

- Weather-related emergencies (39% of all reasons cited)
- Potentially violent situations on school property/bus (16% of all reasons cited)



Emergency Notification Systems

(P. 8 - 9)

Emergency Notification Systems (ENS)

- used to identify parents/guardians of an emergency affecting the school

2005	33%	2009	85%
2006	33%	2010	89%
2007	46%	2011	91%
2008	73%	2012	94%





Emergency Notification Systems

(P. 8 – 9)

In 2012, 17% of schools activated ENS

Of these, most common reasons for activation were:

- Weather-related emergencies (48% of all reasons cited)
- Potentially violent situations on school property/bus (18% of all reasons cited)



Virginia Department of
Criminal Justice Services
www.dcps.virginia.gov



Lockdown Drills

(p. 9)

In 2012,

- 93% of schools practiced lockdown drills at least once during the school year
- 47% practiced more than once



Virginia Department of
Criminal Justice Services
www.dcps.virginia.gov



Threat Assessments

(p. 6 – 8)

Threat Assessments

- 80% of schools indicated use of a formal threat assessment to respond to student threats of violence
- 86% of middle schools

Of the 80% of schools that use a formal process, 72% follow the threat assessment guidelines developed by UVA



School Safety Programs

(P. 10 – 11)

Schools were asked if they had a formal program in place and if they found it effective (from list of 13 safety-related programs)

3 programs with highest “very effective” ratings
(percent of schools that rated each as very effective)

- Counseling services for students 63%
- Character education 51%
- Mentoring 49%





Security Strategies

(p. 15)

School were asked if they had strategies in place in 2012 and if they found it effective (from list of 8 frequently employed security strategies)

Cameras – overall 68%

- Elem 58%
- Middle 80%
- High 88%



Security Strategies

(continued)

Controlled access – overall 53%

- Elem 59%
- Middle 51%
- High 37%

Person at front entrance – overall 46%

- Elem 43%
- Middle 46%
- High 56%





Safety/Security Personnel

(P. 16 – 17)

Any safety/security personnel (at least part time) – overall 56%

- Elem 71%
- Middle 94%
- High 94%



Safety/Security Personnel

(continued)

Of the 56% (1102 schools) that have safety/security personnel at least part time:

SRO – 85% (935 schools) (*represents 47% of ALL schools*)

- Elem 71% (*24% of ALL elem*)
- Middle 94% (*85% of ALL middle*)
- High 94% (*87% of ALL high*)





Safety/Security Personnel

(continued)

Of the 56% (1102 schools) that have safety/security personnel at least part time:

SSO – 30% (333 schools) (*represents 17% of ALL schools*)

- Elem 19% (*6% of ALL elem*)
- Middle 28% (*25% of ALL middle*)
- High 41% (*38% of ALL high*)



Safety/Security Personnel

(continued)

Of the 56% (1102 schools) that have safety/security personnel at least part time:

Other security – 9% (103 schools)
(*represents 5% of ALL schools*)

- Elem 15% (*5% of ALL elem*)
- Middle 7% (*6% of ALL middle*)
- High 5% (*5% of ALL high*)

(Other includes: DARE officers, safety/security specialists and assistants, child safety officers, STEPP officers, and security residents)





Safety/Security Personnel

(continued)

Trend data

Any safety/security personnel (*at all times during the regular school day*)

2006	32%	2010	34%
2007	36%	2011	36%
2008	39%	2012	56%
2009	36%		

(2012 includes part time)



Safety/Security Personnel

(continued)

Trend data

SROs (*at all times during the regular school day*)

2007	29%	2010	26%
2008	29%	2011	26%
2009	28%	2012	47%

(2012 includes part time)





Safety/Security Personnel

(continued)

Trend data

SSOs (*at all times during the regular school day*)

2007	17%	2010	18%
2008	18%	2011	17%
2009	17%	2012	17%

(2012 includes part time)



Safety/Security Personnel

(continued)

Trend data

Other Safety/Security Staff (*at all times during the regular school day*)

2007	<1%	2010	3%
2008	<1%	2011	4%
2009	3%	2012	5%

(2007/8 asked about "private security";
2009-12 asked about "other safety/security personnel")
(2012 includes part time)





Safety/Security Personnel

(continued)

Use of Private Security

In 2012, 2% of schools (31) said that they employed private security officers

- 23 schools said they were used to maintain order and safety at special events
- 5 schools used them to perform duties very similar to those of SSOs during school hours
- 5 schools used them to provide building security after school hours



Highlights from the Studies on the Effectiveness of School Resource Officers

School Resource Officers - Findings on What Works and Doesn't Work

Studies that have asked students, school faculty/administrators, parents and SROs themselves about the benefits of having SROs in schools have reported the following:





Benefits of SROs

- General feeling of a more safe and orderly school environment
- Reductions in aggressive behavior
- Fewer calls to street officers to deal with school-based problems
- Decreases in gang-related activities
- Decreases in use of weapons
- Decreases in thefts
- Increases in reporting of by crime victims
- Increases in students' understanding of legal and illegal activities



What reduces SRO effectiveness

Experiences reported in these studies indicate that the following can reduce the effectiveness of SROs in schools:

- Lack of clear definitions and protocols on the roles of SROs, and lack of agreement between law enforcement and school administrators on what these roles are
- Lack of cooperation between school administrators, faculty and parents and SROs



What reduces SRO effectiveness

(continued)

- Inappropriate uses of SROs, including dealing with classroom management issues
- Failure to integrate SROs into broader school and community safety initiatives
- Lack of office space, equipment and other resources for SROs
- Involuntary assignment of officers to SRO duties, SRO duties being seen as detrimental to a law enforcement career



What improves SRO effectiveness

(continued)

Experiences reported in these studies indicate that the following can improve the effectiveness of SROs in schools:

- Develop clear definitions of SROs roles in schools, and written protocols for how these roles will be performed
- Develop and encourage effective communications between SROs and students, school faculty/administrators, and parents
- Select SROs with the personality and motivation to engage with school students and faculty



What improves SRO effectiveness

(continued)

- SROs should be officers who volunteer for SRO duty
- The longer an SRO is assigned to a single school, the more likely the SRO will develop trusting relationships with students/faculty
- Maintain regular contact between SROs and their law enforcement agency and supervisors
- Integrate /involve SROs within broader school and community safety programs and initiatives
- Provide SROs with adequate resource to do their jobs.



Governor's School Safety Task Force
Public Safety Workgroup
January 2013



www.dcjs.virginia.gov

Table of Contents

K-12 Public School Safety in Virginia

I. School Safety Relative to Other Crime	3
II. Virginia Center for School Safety Center Legislation.....	3
III. Safety Audit and Crisis Management Plan Legislation	5
A. Use of School Safety Audit Survey to Improve Best Practices	7
B. Preliminary Data from the 2012 School Safety Audit Survey	8
C. Trend Data from School Safety Audits (2005-2012)	9
IV. School Resource Officer Legislation	17
V. School Security Officer Legislation	18

Campus Safety in Virginia

I. Background on Campus Safety In Virginia.....	19
II. Campus Security Officer Legislation.....	19
III. Threat Assessment Team Legislation	19

K-12 PUBLIC SCHOOL SAFETY IN VIRGINIA

As many experts in the field are reporting all across the nation, schools continue to be one of the safest places for our children. This was not a school shooting. This was a calculated massacre that occurred at school. Just as incidents in malls, cinemas, and workplaces are not referenced as “mall shootings, cinema shootings or workplace shootings” we should be cognizant of the facts that schools and colleges remain statistically one of the safest places to be.

I. School Safety Relative to Other Crime

Of the homicides reported in Virginia from CY 2005 through 2011:

- Only three-tenths of one percent of homicide incidents occurred at a school or college.
- Over 50% of homicide incidents occurred in the home.
- One quarter of homicide incidents occurred on a roadway

II. Virginia Center for School Safety Legislation

§ 9.1-184. Virginia Center for School Safety (2000)

From such funds as may be appropriated, the Virginia Center for School Safety (the Center) is hereby established within the Department. The Center shall:

1. Provide training for Virginia public school personnel in school safety, on evidence-based anti-bullying tactics, and in the effective identification of students who may be at risk for violent behavior and in need of special services or assistance;

(Examples of topics and trainings covered)

Suicide

- Suicide Prevention Training: SafeTALK
- Suicide Prevention Training: Question, Persuade, and Respond (QPR)
- Applied Suicide Intervention Skills Training (ASIST)

Bullying

- Bullying in our Schools
- Bullying Prevention in the Promotion of a Positive School Climate

Legal

- Advanced Legal Issues for SROs and School Administrators
- Interview Skills for SROs and School Administrators
- Legal 1: The Rights of School and Police Personnel: Managing Your School Environment
- Legal 2: Beyond the Basics: How to Expand your Rights and Power within the School Zone
- Search and Seizure for SROs and School Administrators

Communication/Conflict Resolution

- Communicating and Intervening with At-Risk Youth
- Communicating with Demanding Parents and Difficult Students
- Working with Volatile People: Assessing and De-Stressing

School-Police Partnerships

- Public Schools and Public Safety Partnerships: A Conversation to Address the Impact of Community Violence on Schools
- School Resource Officer Basic Training
- School Security Officer Basic Training
- Advanced Training for School Resource Officers and School Principals
- Virginia School Safety Training Forums (Annually for 12 years)
- Virginia Rules: A Law Related Education Training
- Autism Awareness for Law Enforcement Officers

Gang and Drug Prevention

- Virginia Community and Law Enforcement Gang Training
- Drug Training for Educational Professionals (DTEP)
- Preventing and Addressing Gangs in Schools

Crisis Management in Schools

- Crisis Management in Schools: Readiness, Response, and Recovery
- The Crisis Management and School Safety Technology Institute
- The Crisis Management Institute
- Threat Assessment Training for Schools

Homeland Security

- Homeland Security in Schools

- 2. Serve as a resource and referral center for Virginia school divisions by conducting research, sponsoring workshops, and providing information regarding current school safety concerns, such as conflict management and peer mediation, bullying, school facility design and technology, current state and federal statutory and regulatory school safety requirements, and legal and constitutional issues regarding school safety and individual rights;**

(examples of resources)

- Street Drug Identification Guide
- Juvenile Law Handbook For School Administrators
- Virginia Rules Law Related Education Program
- Incident Command System (computer simulated table top scenarios)
- Critical Incident: What To Do in the First Twenty Minutes (Video of how to survive and respond to a school shooting BEFORE the police arrive)
- School Safety Plan Generator (electronic version)
- School Crime Operations Package (School COP)
- Big Lie: Unmasking the Truth (video)
- Wrong Family (video)

- 3. Maintain and disseminate information to local school divisions on effective school safety initiatives in Virginia and across the nation;**

- Annually publish School Safety Audit Report

4. **Collect, analyze, and disseminate various Virginia school safety data, including school safety audit information submitted to it pursuant to § 22.1-279.8, collected by the Department;**
 - Complete report on annual survey of all principals and division superintendents
5. **Encourage the development of partnerships between the public and private sectors to promote school safety in Virginia;**
 - Virginia Department of Education
 - Virginia Department of Health
 - Virginia Office of the Attorney General
 - Governor’s Office of Substance Abuse Prevention
 - Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services
 - Virginia Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control
6. **Provide technical assistance to Virginia school divisions in the development and implementation of initiatives promoting school safety;**
 - All local school divisions
 - All local law enforcement agencies
7. **Develop a memorandum of understanding between the Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services and the Superintendent of Public Instruction to ensure collaboration and coordination of roles and responsibilities in areas of mutual concern, such as school safety audits and crime prevention; and**
8. **Provide training for and certification of school security officers, as defined in § 9.1-101 and consistent with § 9.1-110.**

All agencies of the Commonwealth shall cooperate with the Center and, upon request, assist the Center in the performance of its duties and responsibilities.

III. Safety Audit and Crisis Management Plan Legislation

- The School Safety Audit Program originated in 1997 and was assigned to the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE).
- Per legislation, a "school safety audit" means a written assessment of the safety conditions in each public school to (i) identify and, if necessary, develop solutions for physical safety concerns, including building security issues and (ii) identify and evaluate any patterns of student safety concerns occurring on school property or at school-sponsored events. Solutions and responses shall include recommendations for structural adjustments, changes in school safety procedures, and revisions to the school board's standards for student conduct.
- The VDOE developed a "School Safety Audit Protocol" which was a series of checklists for a school safety team to use in the conduct of their audit. These checklists were kept on file at the school and the Superintendent certified in writing to the VDOE once every three years that all schools in the division had conducted an audit at least once in that time period.
- No report was collected or disseminated on the aggregated information as the Superintendents were not required to submit the audits to the VDOE.

- In 2001, the duties of the school safety audit were transferred to the Virginia Center for School Safety at the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS). Other specifics were added to the legislation in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2009. These changes included:
 - Directing the Virginia Center for School Safety to develop a list of items to be reviewed and evaluated in the school safety audits required by this section. Such items shall include those incidents reported to school authorities pursuant to § [22.1-279.3:1](#).
 - Requiring the audit to be conducted annually and available for electronic submission,
 - Providing for FOIA protection for security and surveillance parts of the audit and crisis plans,
 - Developing and revising a model school crisis and emergency management plan for the purpose of assisting the public schools in Virginia in developing viable, effective crisis and emergency management plans. Such model shall set forth recommended effective procedures and means by which parents can contact the relevant school or school division regarding the location and safety of their school children and by which school officials may contact parents, with parental approval, during a critical event or emergency.
- The Virginia Center for School Safety at DCJS, in partnership with the VDOE, determined that a survey of all school principals and their school safety team was the most efficient and salient means of collecting information in regards to the definition of the audit and for use by the General Assembly and the constituents of the Commonwealth.
- The Center worked in cooperation with VDOE and a School Safety Audit Task Force to develop survey topics and questions that addressed best practices and captured schools' current safety practices and recommendations.
- The School Safety Survey does not ask questions about compliance with school safety laws and regulatory requirements. Since the survey is a "self report" by school principals, it is assumed all schools are complying with legislation. Instead, the survey is used to guide schools and school divisions into utilizing best practices in the conduct and operation of their schools by asking questions about such. Several examples of questions that have demonstrated an increased move toward best practices are cited below (Section III a). Some questions are no longer asked on the survey because the respondent rate was in the 90% or higher range.
- The legislation carries no penalty for non-compliance with the school safety audit requirements.

Legislative Requirements of the School Safety Audit Program

§ 9.1-184. Virginia Center for School Safety created; duties.

- Collect, analyze, and disseminate various Virginia school safety data, including school safety audit information submitted to it pursuant to § [22.1-279.8](#), collected by the Department;

§ 22.1-279.8. School safety audits and school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plans required.

Safety Audits

- The Virginia Center for School Safety shall develop a list of items to be reviewed and evaluated in the school safety audits required by this section. Such items shall include those incidents reported to school authorities pursuant to § [22.1-279.3:1](#).
- The Virginia Center for School Safety shall prescribe a standardized report format for school safety audits, additional reporting criteria, and procedures for report submission, which may include instructions for electronic submission.
- Each local school board shall require all schools under its supervisory control to annually conduct school safety audits as defined in this section and consistent with such list.
- Each school shall submit a copy of its school safety audit to the relevant school division superintendent. The division superintendent shall collate and submit all such school safety audits, in the prescribed format and manner of submission, to the Virginia Center for School Safety.

Result

- 100% of Virginia Public Schools have complied with the requirement to conduct an annual school safety audit.
- 97% of schools practiced their crisis management plan this year (2012).
- Only 28% of schools had to activate their crisis management plan for any reason at all.
- Of the 28% of schools that activated their crisis management plans (548 schools), 65% of the activations were for reasons of non-violent, non-criminal events. (to include weather-related events, accidents/health-related events, power outages, smoke/fumes/fire, false alarm, hazardous chemical, etc.)

Crisis Management Plans

- Each school board shall ensure that every school that it supervises shall develop a written school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plan, consistent with the definition provided in this section.
- The local school division superintendent shall certify this review in writing to the Virginia Center on School Safety no later than August 31 of each year.

Result

- 100% of Virginia Public School Divisions have complied with the requirement to have every school that it supervises develop a written school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plan, consistent with the definition provided in this section and has certified this review in writing to the Virginia Center on School Safety annually (by August 31, 2012)

A. Use of School Safety Audit Survey to Improve Best Practices

The use of the school safety survey tool is guide school administrators and division superintendents in the best practices and evidence based processes in the field of school safety while capturing an accurate snapshot of current practices. Questions are asked in several categories to include:

- School Identification and Demographic Information
- Crisis Management and Emergency Management and Response Plan
- Safety Concerns of Students and Staff
- Perceptions of School Climate
- School Security and Surveillance
- Gangs

Below are some examples of questions about best practices which demonstrate improved compliance over a series of years.

Examples of Questions Demonstrating Improved Compliance with Best Practices

1. Does your school have an electronic notification system for notifying parents/guardians of an emergency at your school?

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Yes	33%	46%	73%	85%	89%	91%	94%
No	67%	54%	27%	15%	11%	9%	6%

2. Does your school use a [formal threat assessment](#) process to respond to student threats of violence?

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Yes	55%	61%	76%	80%	78%	80%	78%	80%
No formal process	35%	39%	24%	20%	22%	20%	22%	20%

3. Is the main entrance to your school building/campus secured by a controlled access system during school hours?

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Yes	26%	40%	46%	48%	52%	53%
No	74%	60%	54%	52%	48%	47%

4. When checking in visitors, including parents/guardians, does office staff check names against the sex offender registry bulletins?

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Yes	29%	38%	46%	42%
No	71%	62%	54%	58%

5. Does your school label all exterior entrances/exits of your building(s) with exterior signs or markings visible from a distance of 200 feet to assist emergency responders at your school?

	2006	2007	2008
Yes	25%	64%	65%
No	75%	36%	35%

B. Preliminary Data from the 2012 School Safety Audit Survey

Lockdown Drills

- 8VAC20-131-260. School facilities and safety: Each school shall maintain records of regular safety, health, and fire inspections that have been conducted and certified by local health and fire departments. The frequency of such inspections shall be determined by the local school board in consultation with the local health and fire departments. In addition, the school administration shall:
 - Conduct fire drills at least once a week during the first month of school and at least once each month for the remainder of the school term. Evacuation routes for students shall be posted in each room.
Additionally, at least one simulated lock-down and crisis emergency evacuation activity should be conducted early in the school year.
- 94% of schools* reported they have practiced their lockdown drill at least once per year (*Note: for purposes of the school safety survey, some buildings are determined to be “schools” for DCJS reporting but do not fit the definition of schools as determined by the Virginia Department of Education. Therefore, some of these separate “buildings” are not required to conduct a lockdown drill per this code section.

Access Control Systems and Other Security Strategies

- 53% of all schools reported that they had a controlled access system in place.
 - 59% of all elementary schools have a controlled access system in place.
 - 51% of all middle schools have a controlled access system in place.
 - 37% of all high schools have a controlled access system in place.
- 73% of all schools report that all exterior entrances are locked during school hours
 - 78% of all elementary schools report that all exterior entrances are locked during school hours
 - 74% of all middle schools report that all exterior entrances are locked during school hours
 - 61 % of all high schools report that all exterior entrances are locked during school hours
- **46% of all schools** reported that **someone is stationed at the front entrance** of the school at all times during school hours to ensure that visitors report to the main office for visitor check-in.
 - 43% of all elementary schools reported that someone is stationed at the front entrance
 - 46% of all middle schools reported that someone is stationed at the front entrance
 - 56% of all high schools reported that someone is stationed at the front entrance

C. Trend Data from School Safety Audits (2005-2012)

Due to the fact that questions are often repeated over time in the school safety survey, DCJS is able to gather trend data on particular questions to ascertain trends due to funding changes or practices. The following are some examples of trend data gathered from 2005-2012.

Number of school responses

Report Year	# Responses	Response Rate
2005	1452	n/a
2006	1988	94%
2007	1974	99%
2008	2002	100%
2009	2006	100%
2010	2002	100%
2011	1980	100%
2012	1981	100%

Crisis Management Plan/Emergency Management Plan (CMP/EMP)

Did you have to activate any portion of your CMP/EMP during the ___ school year due to an actual [emergency](#) or crisis? (Note: all years except 2012 asked respondents not to include weather-related incidents)

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses	
2007	456	23%	
2008	447	22%	
2009	394	20%	
2010	376	19%	
2011	366	19%	
2012	548	28%	2012 data included 211 "yes" due to weather-related incidents. Further, for 114 schools it was their only reason for activation.

Emergency Notification System

Does your school have an [electronic notification system](#) for notifying parents/guardians of an [emergency](#) at your school?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2005	472	33%
2006	656	33%
2007	910	46%
2008	1453	73%
2009	1706	85%
2010	1777	89%
2011	1798	91%
2012	1855	94%

Did your school activate its [electronic notification system](#) this year for an actual [emergency](#)? (*wording of question varied in different years of surveys*)

Report Year	# Yes Responses	
2007	457	Have you ever had to use your school's automated electronic notification system ?
2008	776	Did you use your school's electronic notification system during the 2007-2008 school year?
2009	610	Under what emergency circumstances did you activate your school's electronic notification system (Note: Do not include weather or schedule changes) (check all that apply) – Did not activate was an option.
2010	169	Did your school activate its electronic notification system this year for an actual emergency ? (Note: Do not include weather or schedule changes)
2011	193	Did your school activate its electronic notification system this year for an actual emergency ?
2012	323	Did your school activate its electronic notification system this year for an actual emergency ?

Formal Threat Assessments

Does your school use a [formal threat assessment](#) process to respond to student threats of violence?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2005	783	54%
2006	1217	61%
2007	1496	76%
2008	1597	80%
2009	1571	78%
2010	1596	80%
2011	1552	78%
2012	1589	80%

How many of the threats were viable? (2006 – 2008)

Range of viable threats	2008	2007	2006
0	437	343	353
1 – 5	281	235	195
6 – 20	27	20	26
Over 20	4	1	4
<i>Total</i>	<i>749</i>	<i>599</i>	<i>578</i>

In 2009 and 2010, the survey asked if any threats were assessed and if so were any viable:

- In 2009, 547 said yes threats were assessed, and 163 said yes threats were viable.
- In 2010, 626 said yes threats were assessed, and 164 said yes threats were viable.

In 2011 and 2012, the survey asked for number of transient and substantiated threats.

Number Substantive/Serious Threats	2011	2012
0	1270	1297
1-2	191	208
3-10	78	69
11-20	7	9
21-30	2	3
31-50+	4	3
<i>Total</i>	<i>1552</i>	<i>1589</i>

For your formal threat assessment process, do you follow the guidelines developed by UVA?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2007	374	19%
2008	603	30%
2009	1127	56%
2010	1194	60%
2011	1068	54%
2012	1141	58%

Lockdown Drills

How often were lockdown drills practiced at your school during the 2011–2012 school year? (*select one*)

Lockdown Drill Frequency	2012		2011		2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
More than once	922	47%	1005	51%	962	48%
Once	928	47%	887	45%	889	44%
Not practiced	125	6%	47	2%	50	3%
Other	6	<1%	41	2%	101	5%

Anonymous Threat Report System for Students

(2007 – 2008) Structured [anonymous reporting systems](#) allow students to report potential dangers without giving names or speaking directly with school staff. Does your school have such a procedure? (*NOTE: This does not include confidential verbal reports.*)

(2005 – 2006) Does your school have a reporting program that permits students to anonymously report crimes, threats, or potential dangers?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2005	952	68%
2006	1301	65%
2007	994	50%
2008	1011	50%

If yes, approximately how many anonymous reports were submitted by students in the ____ school year?

Report range	2008		2005	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	347	34%	296	31%
1 – 5	283	28%	349	37%
6 – 10	97	10%	94	10%
11 – 20	68	7%	51	5%
21 – 40	26	3%	29	3%
41 – 60	11	1%	10	1%
61 – 100	2	<1%	3	<1%
over 100	5	<1%	5	1%
don't know	168	17%	110	12%
<i>Total</i>	<i>1007</i>		<i>947</i>	

Which of the following describes your anonymous reporting system(s)? (*select all that apply*)

Description	2008		2007		2006		2005	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Law enforcement-based program (i.e., Crime Stoppers, Crime Solvers)	292	15%	346	18%	346	17%	214	15%
Online submission	105	5%	74	4%	125	6%	135	10%
Telephone hotline	354	18%	325	16%	438	22%	321	23%
Written submission (example: via dropbox)	616	31%	631	32%	943	47%	646	46%

Safety and Security Personnel (Combination of school security officers and school resource officers and others such as DARE officers, child safety officers, etc.)

34% (673 schools) of all schools report that they have safety and security personnel present at all times during the regular school day.	
Elementary	10%
Middle	64%
High	77%

The following schools reported that they have safety/security personnel (school security officers and/or school resource officers) working in their schools at least part time:	
Elementary	33%
Middle	91%
High	92%

Number of schools that have SRO, SSO or other type of safety/security personnel working at least part time (to include: private security, Child Safety Officer, DARE Officer, safety/security specialist, safety/security assistant, STEPP officer, security resident, and others)	
SRO	935 schools
SSO	333 schools
Other	103 schools

(2005 – 2011) Does your school have safety/security personnel present **at all times** during the regular school day?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2005	<i>Data not available at this time</i>	<i>Data not available at this time</i>
2006	644	32%
2007	710	36%
2008	772	39%
2009	712	36%
2010	685	34%
2011	703	36%

(2012) Did you have safety/security personnel such as School Resource Officers (SROs), School Security Officers (SSOs), or other types of such personnel working at your school **at least part time** during the 2011 – 2012 school year?

2012	1102	56%
------	------	-----

(2005 – 2011) What type(s) of safety/security personnel are present at your school **at all times** during the regular school day?

(2012) Did you have safety/security personnel such as School Resource Officers (SROs), School Security Officers (SSOs), or other types of such personnel working at your school at least part time during the 2011 – 2012 school year? (The SRO/SSO question was changed for the 2012 school safety survey and so the data are not comparable to the previous years' data.)

Private Security/Other safety/security staff data

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses	
2005			<i>Data not available at this time</i>
2006			<i>Data not available at this time</i>
2007	3	<1%	<i>Asked about "private security"</i>
2008	2	<1%	<i>Asked about "private security"</i>
2009	63	3%	<i>Asked about "other safety/security personnel"</i>
2010	52	3%	<i>Asked about "other safety/security personnel"</i>
2011	86	4%	<i>Asked about "other safety/security personnel"</i>
2012	103*	%	"at least part time"

*Description of the other safety/security personnel included: DARE officer (15), safety/security specialist or assistant (10), security assistant (15), child safety officer (4), STEPP officer (4), security resident (4), other (51).

Floor plans/first responders

Did first responders (including police, fire and EMS) have electronic/internet-based access to current floor plans for your school in case they needed to respond to a large scale security incident at your facility?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2011	1076	54%
2012	1064	54%

Terrorism protocols

Do you have defined protocols for immediately reporting suspicious activity commonly associated with terrorism to state or local law enforcement?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2011	1343	68%
2012	1533	77%

Exterior entrance/exit identification

Does your school label all exterior entrances/exits of your building(s) with exterior signs or markings visible from a distance of 200 feet to assist emergency responders at your school?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2006	507	26%
2007	1259	64%
2008	1296	65%

Parking lot monitoring

Do you monitor your school parking lot(s) during school hours?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2005	932	66%
2006	816	41%
2007	1415	72%
2008	1439	72%

How do you monitor your school parking lot(s) during school hours? *(Check all that apply)*

Monitoring methods	2006		2007		2008	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Randomly patrolled by security personnel (including SROs, SSOs, or private security)	643	32%	624	32%	614	31%
Randomly patrolled by school staff/faculty	670	34%	781	40%	881	44%
Security camera (monitored live in real time)	398	20%	466	24%	434	22%
Security camera (taped, not monitored in real time)	297	15%	303	15%	381	19%

Exterior entrances locked (not including main entrance)

Other than the main entrance, are all exterior entrances to your school building/campus locked during school hours?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses	
2007	1533	78%	
2008	1628	81%	
2009	1735	86%	
2010	1737	87%	
2011	1733	88%	
2012	1447	73%	<i>question was asked in a slightly different manner in 2012</i>

Classrooms lock

(2007 – 2012) Can all classrooms in your school be locked from both the inside & the outside of the classroom?

(2005 – 2006) Can all classrooms in your school be locked, even when not in use? **cannot compare 05-06 data to 07-012 data because of differences in questions*

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2005	1344	93%
2006	1857	93%
2007	817	41%
2008	894	45%
2009	939	47%
2010	984	49%
2011	996	50%
2012	1036	52%

Main entrance – monitored

Is someone stationed at the front entrance of your school at all times during school hours to ensure that visitors report to the main office/visitor check-in?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2008	977	49%
2009	1043	52%
2010	1031	52%
2011	1039	53%
2012	918	46%

Main entrance – controlled access system

Is the main entrance to your school building/campus secured by a [controlled access system](#) during school hours?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2007	516	26%
2008	807	40%
2009	919	46%
2010	956	48%
2011	1035	52%
2012	1052	53%

Gang-Related

Did your school have any gang-related problems or incidents during the ____ school year?

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses
2007	262	13%
2008	257	13%
2009	182	9%
2010	137	7%
2011	159	8%
2012	118	6%

Did the number of gang-related problems or incidents increase, decrease, or stay about the same when compared with the previous school year?

Change	2009		2008		2007	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Increased	32	2%	50	2%	64	3%
Decreased	218	11%	200	10%	168	9%
Stayed the same	1681	84%	1638	82%	1577	80%

Change	2012		2011		2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Increased	7	<1%	25	1%	16	1%
Decreased	166	8%	253	13%	246	12%
Stayed the same	1808	91%	1702	86%	1740	87%

Gang – overall threat rating

Rate the overall threat of gang activity by street gangs in your school during the ____ school year. *(select one)*

Threat rating	2012		2011		2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 (high threat)	610	31%	482	24%	677	34%
2	66	3%	80	4%	157	8%
3 (medium threat)	33	2%	41	2%	63	3%
4	1	<1%	5	<1%	7	<1%
5 (low threat)	3	<1%	3	<1%	1	<1%
no threat	1268	64%	1369	69%	1097	55%

IV. School Resource Officer Legislation

By Code, (§ 9.1-101), a “school resource officer” is defined a certified law-enforcement officer hired by the local law-enforcement agency to provide law-enforcement and security services to Virginia public elementary and secondary schools.”

- The following schools reported that they have **School Resource Officers (SROs)** working at least part time in their school. (2012)
 - Elementary 271 (of 1152 schools) = 24%
 - Middle 289 (of 339 schools) = 85%
 - High 323 (of 332 schools) = 87%
- Overall, schools reporting at least a part time presence of school resource officers in their schools in 2012 is 47%
- The number of **fulltime** school resource officers assigned to all schools since 2008 has remained relatively consistent dropping only 3 % from 2008 to 2011 in spite of economic hardships on the localities (29% to 26% respectively)
- Local law enforcement agencies and school divisions pay for the salaries of these personnel.

SROs – How they’re funded (asked in 2009 only)

- The 554 schools who said they had SROs working at their schools at all times during the school day, were asked:

Who employs your SRO(s)? (“Employ” means which agency ultimately supervises your school’s SRO; check one)

Employing Agency	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools With SRO
County Sheriff’s office	203	36%
City Police	188	34%
County Police	150	27%
Combination of school and LE	13	2%
Don’t know	3	1%

How are your SRO(s) funded? (“Fund” means from which agency does the funding for the SRO position originate; check one)

Funding Agency	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools With SRO
Through a law enforcement (LE) agency	316	57%
Combination of school and LE	140	25%
Through the school division	42	8%
Other	17	3%
Don’t know	43	8%

Number and Percent of schools with full time SRO(s) from 2008–2011			
Survey year	# schools with full time SRO	# schools total	% schools with full time SRO
2011	513	1980	26%
2010	512	2002	26%
2009	554	2006	28%
2008	577	2002	29%

Number and Percent of schools with at least a part time SRO(s) from 2012			
Survey year	# schools with at least part time SRO	# schools total	% schools with at least part time SRO
2012	935	1981	47%

V. School Security Officer Legislation

By Code, (§ 9.1-101), a “school security officer” is defined as an individual who is employed by the local school board for the singular purpose of maintaining order and discipline, preventing crime, investigating violations of school board policies, and detaining students violating the law or school board policies on school property or at school-sponsored events and who is responsible solely for ensuring the safety, security, and welfare of all students, faculty, staff, and visitors in the assigned school.

- There are currently 900 school security officers certified and working within 30 school divisions within the Commonwealth.
- 17 % of schools reported in 2012 to have school security officers in schools at least part time. (330 schools)
- The number of school security officers working full time in public schools has remained fairly consistent since 2008 dropping only one percent from 2008 to 2011 (18% to 17%).

SSO data

Report Year	# Yes Responses	% Yes Responses	
2005	<i>Data not available at this time</i>	<i>Data not available at this time</i>	
2006	<i>Data not available at this time</i>	<i>Data not available at this time</i>	
2007	340	17%	
2008	370	18%	
2009	344	17%	
2010	356	18%	
2011	340	17%	
2012	330	17%	“at least part time”

CAMPUS SAFETY IN VIRGINIA

I. Background on Campus Safety in Virginia

Oversight of colleges and universities is not handled by one specific state agency.

- The State Council of Higher Education (SCHEV) provides makes higher education public policy recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly in such areas as capital and operating budget planning, enrollment projections, institutional technology needs, and student financial aid.
- SCHEV administers a variety of educational programs that benefit students, faculty, parents, and taxpayers. SCHEV serves as a catalyst to promote greater access, quality, affordability, and accountability throughout the system. SCHEV also helps policymakers, college administrators, and other concerned leaders work cooperatively and constructively to advance educational excellence.
- The Virginia Community College System (VCCS) provides oversight and guidance to the community colleges in Virginia to comply with policy, training and certification requirements of the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) and other legislative mandates. Additionally, VCCS also encourage and support colleges in developing and maintaining violence prevention and safety programs.
- The Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) mandates training and certification requirements for campus security officers and campus police officers.

II. Campus Security Officers Legislation

- In 2006, after the completion of a 2004 Crime Commission Study (HJR 122- Study on Campus Safety), the General Assembly passed legislation mandating DCJS to create minimum standards for campus security officers.
- § 9.1-102. Powers and duties of the Board and the Department include:
 - Establishing minimum standards for (i) employment, (ii) job-entry and in-service training curricula, and (iii) certification requirements for campus security officers.
 - Providing technical support related to investigatory procedures, judicial referrals, the establishment and management of databases for campus safety and security information sharing, and development of uniform record keeping for disciplinary records and statistics, such as campus crime logs, judicial referrals and Clery Act statistics
- Governor passed proposed regulations on May 31, 2012
- CJSB approved final regulations on December 6, 2012 – awaiting signature of Governor
- 1,100 CSOs trained to date
- 83 CSO instructors trained to date
- 160 classes instructed to date
- Online CSO curriculum available by end of 2013

III. Threat Assessment Teams

- In 2008, the General Assembly mandated the creation of violence prevention committees and threat assessment teams.(§ 23-9.2:10)
 - Each public college or university shall have in place policies and procedures for the prevention of violence on campus, including assessment and intervention with individuals whose behavior poses a threat to the safety of the campus community.
 - ...shall determine a committee structure on campus of individuals charged with education and prevention of violence on campus.
 - Each committee shall be charged with:

- providing guidance to students, faculty, and staff regarding recognition of threatening or aberrant behavior that may represent a threat to the community;
- identification of members of the campus community to whom threatening behavior should be reported; and
- policies and procedures for the assessment of individuals whose behavior may present a threat as well as appropriate intervention and action.
- Each committee shall establish a specific threat assessment team.
- Each threat assessment team shall establish relationships or utilize existing relationships with local and state law-enforcement agencies as well as mental health agencies to expedite assessment and intervention with individuals whose behavior may present a threat to safety.
- DCJS took lead in assisting colleges and universities with the implementation of this legislation:
 - 2008 Threat Assessment Forum
 - 2009 Forum on Threat Assessment in a Higher Education Setting: A Virginia Tech Demonstration Project
 - 2010 Symposium on Campus Threat Assessment Teams – Advancing the Field
 - Violence Prevention and Safety on Campus: Law and Policy Issues
 - Basic Campus Threat Assessment Team Training
 - Advanced Threat Assessment Training for Higher Education: Issues and Practices
 - Campus Threat Assessment Team Train the Trainer Program
 - National Forum on Campus Sexual Assault
 - Virginia Campus Safety Forum: Addressing Sexual Assault on Campus
 - Virginia Campus Safety Forum: Addressing Safety Threats on Campus

Preliminary Findings from the 2012
Virginia School Safety Audit Survey

December 28, 2012

GOVERNOR'S CONFIDENTIAL WORKING PAPERS

Preliminary Findings from the 2012 Virginia School Safety Audit Survey

INTRODUCTION

Legislation enacted in 2005 designated the Virginia Center for School Safety (VCSS) of the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) to prescribe the safety audit content and reporting process for the School Safety Audit program. Accordingly, the VCSS and DCJS Research Center conduct an annual on-line school safety survey that allows schools and school divisions to meet the Code of Virginia mandate to report safety audit data. Annual reports can be found on the DCJS website at <http://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/vcss/audit/index.cfm>.

This report consists of the preliminary findings from the 2012 Virginia School Safety Audit Survey. It reflects the conditions during the 2011 – 2012 school year as reported by all public schools. The 2012 Virginia School Safety Audit Survey report is currently being written so there may be slight changes in data results before the report is finalized in early 2013. In this preliminary report, some background information and definitions are provided and the questions used in the survey to collect the information from the schools are supplied (and are designated with a Q) to provide context.

The Virginia School Safety Audit Survey consists of 4 sections: School Identification and Demographic Information; Assessment, Planning, and Communication; Student Safety Concerns; and School Security/Surveillance. The School Security/Surveillance section is exempted from FOIA requests due to the sensitive nature of the security information provided by the schools.

If you have questions about the Virginia School Safety Audit Survey process, contact Donna Michaelis at The Virginia School Safety Center at DCJS (donna.michaelis@dcjs.virginia.gov). If you have questions about the findings in this report, contact Sherri Johnson at the DCJS Research Center (sherri.johnson@dcjs.virginia.gov).

I. SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

School Types

For the purposes of this report, schools were coded as an Elementary school, Middle school, High school or Other school based on the following criteria:

Elementary	consists of grades pre-K up to and including grade 6 (typically K – 5) <i>Includes schools identified as charter schools, combined schools, elementary, magnet, primary and other.</i>
Middle	consists of grade 5 up to and including grade 8 (typically 6 – 8) <i>Includes schools identified as alternative, middle, and other.</i>
High	consists of grade 8 up to and including grade 12 (typically 9 – 12) <i>Includes schools identified as alternative, combined, governor's, high, magnet, special education and vocational-technical.</i>
Other	consists of all of the schools that didn't fit into one of the above categories <i>Includes schools identified as combined schools with a very wide grade range, primary schools that only included pre-K and grade 1, correctional education schools, adult education schools, pre-K programs, and school for the deaf and blind.</i>

Q. Which of the following best describes your school? (*select one*) – list of 16 options was provided

Q. What grades were taught at your school during 2011 – 2012? (*select all that apply*) – list of 14 grade levels, pre-K through grade 12 was provided

Type of school (N = 1981)	Number	Percent
Elementary schools	1152	58%
Middle schools	339	17%
High schools	373	19%
Other schools	117	6%
Total	1981	100%

Enrollment

Schools were asked to provide their enrollment number for the school year 2011 – 2012. The enrollment number is represented by the number of students enrolled in a give school on the last day of September.

Q. What was your fall membership enrollment number on September 30, 2011?

Enrollment (number of students) (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
0	0	0	1% (2)	1% (1)	<1% (3)
1 – 50	<1% (1)	1% (4)	1% (3)	14% (16)	1% (24)
51 – 200	5% (57)	2% (6)	5% (18)	44% (51)	7% (132)
201 – 500	43% (496)	21% (70)	21% (76)	18% (21)	34% (663)
501 – 1000	51% (583)	53% (180)	26% (98)	18% (21)	45% (882)
1001 – 1500	1% (15)	22% (74)	21% (78)	2% (2)	9% (169)
1501 – 2000	0	2% (5)	17% (64)	0	4% (69)
2001 +	0	0	9% (34)	4% (5)	2% (39)
Total	1152	339	373	117	1981

Region

Schools were asked to indicate the type of region in which most of their students live. They were given the following information to help them identify the type of region.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) defines metropolitan areas using the *Office of Management and Budget's 'Standards for Defining Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas' (2000)*.

Urban: According to Census criteria, urban refers to a principal city in an area. In Virginia this includes: Alexandria, Arlington, Blacksburg, Bristol, Charlottesville, Christiansburg, Danville, Hampton, Harrisonburg, Lynchburg, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Reston, Richmond, Roanoke, Virginia Beach, Waynesboro, and Winchester.

Suburban: Territory outside a principal city (see list of principal cities above) but inside a settled area that contains at least 50,000 people and has an overall population density of 1,000 people per square mile or higher.

Town: Territory outside a principal city or suburb, but within a settled area containing at least 2,500 people and with an overall population density of 1,000 people per square mile or higher.

Rural: Territory outside of principal cities, suburbs, and towns. Some examples of rural areas in Virginia are Monterey and Middleburg.

Q. Which of the following best describes the region where most of your students live? (select one)

Type of Region (where most students live) (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Urban	26% (304)	25% (83)	21% (79)	43% (50)	26% (516)
Suburban	37% (429)	35% (118)	31% (116)	23% (27)	35% (690)
Town	6% (65)	7% (25)	7% (25)	9% (10)	6% (125)
Rural	31% (354)	33% (113)	41% (153)	26% (30)	33% (650)
Total	1152	339	373	117	1981

II. ASSESSMENT, PLANNING, AND COMMUNICATION

This section of the survey asks schools about their Crisis Management Plans/Emergency Management Plans (CMP/EMP), how they were practiced, if they were activated this year and why; use of formal threat assessments to respond to student treats of violence; use of electronic notification systems for notifying parents/guardians of an emergency; and frequency of lockdown drills.

Crisis Management Plan/Emergency Management Plan

Virginia Code § 22.1-279.8 describes school crisis and emergency management plans. It also states that "each school board shall ensure that every school that it supervises shall develop a written school crisis, emergency management, and medical response plan."

Q. Did your school practice its Crisis Management Plan/Emergency Management Plan (CMP/EMP) during the 2011 – 2012 school year? (Practice does not include an actual emergency. You will be asked about those events in an upcoming question.)

Practiced CMP/EMP (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	97% (1118)	96% (324)	96% (357)	96% (112)	97% (1911)
No	3% (34)	4% (15)	4% (16)	4% (5)	4% (70)

Q. If yes, how was your school's CMP/EMP practiced during the school year? (select all that apply) – list provided is shown in the table below.

CMP/EMP Practice Methods (N=1911)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Administration/faculty/staff training	96% (1071)	94% (305)	93% (331)	90% (101)	95% (1808)
Student training/awareness sessions	74% (825)	76% (245)	69% (245)	60% (67)	72% (1382)
Parent training/awareness sessions	12% (132)	10% (31)	9% (31)	8% (9)	11% (203)
First responder coordination (EMS, fire, police, hazmat, etc.)	20% (220)	31% (101)	35% (126)	21% (23)	25% (470)
Table top exercises with crisis team members	28% (315)	29% (94)	33% (117)	29% (32)	29% (558)
Full scale drill with or without crisis team and public safety partners	18% (202)	23% (74)	27% (97)	15% (17)	20% (390)

Q. Did you have to activate any portion of your school's crisis management plan during the 2011 – 2012 school year due to an actual emergency or crisis?

Activate CMP/EMP (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	26% (303)	36% (121)	28% (103)	18% (21)	28% (548)
No	74% (849)	64% (218)	72% (270)	82% (96)	72% (1433)

Governor's Confidential Working Papers

Q. If yes, why did you activate your crisis plan? (choose the category that best fits each incident; select all that apply) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Items considered a possible violent threat to students/staff are shown in bold type in the table below. A more detailed table of those specific items follows.

Reasons CMP/EMP Was Activated (N = 548)	Number	Percent
Naturally-occurring hazard such as earthquake, ... weather conditions	211	39%
Incident related to violence/crime, ...occurring OFF school property	100	18%
Student or staff accident, health-related ...ON school property	92	17%
Power outage or utility malfunction ... did <u>not</u> result in smoke, fumes, or fire	62	11%
Smoke, fumes, or fire on school property	62	11%
Student or staff accident, emergency... OFF school property	51	9%
Unfounded incident/faulty or false alarm	47	9%
Suspicious person/intruder on school property	42	8%
School bus-related incidents	41	8%
Bomb threat to school	33	6%
Incident at another school that affected your school	29	5%
Student reported as missing	26	5%
Incident related to violence/crime, ... occurring ON school property	14	3%
Hazardous chemical incident on school property	12	2%

Reasons CMP/EMP Was Activated (N = 548)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Suspicious person/intruder on school property	10% (30)	6% (7)	3% (3)	10% (2)	8% (42)
School bus-related incidents	8% (24)	7% (8)	6% (6)	14% (3)	8% (41)
Bomb threat to school	<1% (1)	12% (15)	17% (17)	0	6% (33)
Incident related to violence/crime, ... occurring ON school property	2% (7)	3% (3)	3% (3)	5% (1)	3% (14)

Q. Does your school's CMP/EMP address incidents involving school buses?

CMP/EMP addresses school buses (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	74% (848)	76% (259)	79% (294)	69% (81)	75% (1482)
No	26% (304)	24% (80)	21% (79)	31% (36)	25% (499)

Q. If yes, have your school bus drivers received training on the specific areas of the CMP/EMP that pertain to them?

CMP/EMP training for bus drivers (N=1482)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	93% (785)	91% (236)	93% (272)	95% (77)	92% (1370)
No	7% (63)	9% (23)	8% (22)	5% (4)	8% (112)

Threat Assessments

Q. Does your school use a formal threat assessment process to respond to student threats of violence (both violence against others and/or against oneself)?

Formal Threat Assessment (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	78% (900)	86% (292)	83% (309)	75% (88)	80% (1589)
No	22% 252()	14% (47)	17% (64)	25% (29)	20% (392)

Q. For your formal threat assessment process, did you follow the guidelines developed by the University of Virginia (UVA), *Guidelines for Responding to Student Threats of Violence*?

UVA Guidelines (N=1589)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	73% (657)	73% (214)	67% (208)	71% (62)	72% (1141)
No	27% (243)	27% (78)	33% (101)	30% (26)	28% (448)

Q. During the 2011 – 2012 school year, approximately how many student threats of violence were assessed and found to be transient (not serious) threats?

Range = 0 - 150

Number Transient/Not Serious Threats (N = 1589)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
0	51% (457)	21% (62)	32% (98)	51% (45)	42% (662)
1 – 5	40% (359)	54% (158)	50% (154)	32% (28)	44% (699)
6 – 10	5% (48)	13% (39)	7% (23)	7% (6)	7% (116)
11 – 15	3% (23)	6% (16)	5% (14)	1% (1)	3% (54)
16 – 20	1% (10)	3% (7)	3% (9)	3% (3)	2% (29)
21 – 25	<1% (2)	2% (5)	2% (5)	0% (0)	1% (12)
26 – 30	0% (0)	1% (3)	1% (3)	3% (3)	1% (9)
31 – 50	0% (0)	<1% (1)	1% (2)	0% (0)	<1% (3)
51 – 70	<1% (1)	<1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<1% (2)
71 +	0% (0)	0% (0)	<1% (1)	2% (2)	<1% (3)
Total	100% (900)	100% (292)	100% (309)	100% (88)	100% (1589)

Q. During the 2011 – 2012 school year, approximately how many student threats of violence were assessed and found to be substantive (serious) threats?

Range 0 – 50

Number Substantive/Serious Threats (N = 1589)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
0	88% (793)	73% (213)	72% (223)	77% (68)	82% (1297)
1 – 2	10% (86)	18% (52)	19% (59)	13% (11)	13% (208)
3 – 4	1% (13)	6% (16)	5% (14)	2% (2)	3% (45)
5 – 6	1% (5)	2% (6)	2% (6)	3% (3)	1% (20)
7 – 8	0% (0)	<1% (1)	<1% (1)	0% (0)	<1% (2)
9 – 10	<1% (1)	0% (0)	<1% (1)	0% (0)	<1% (2)
11 – 20	<1% (2)	1% (3)	1% (3)	1% (1)	1% (9)
21 – 30	0% (0)	<1% (1)	<1% (1)	1% (1)	<1% (3)
31 – 40	0% (0)	0% (0)	<1% (1)	1% (1)	<1% (2)
41 +	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	<1% (1)
Total	100% (900)	100% (292)	100% (309)	100% (88)	100% (1589)

Electronic Notification Systems

Q. Does your school have an electronic notification system (ENS) for notifying parents/guardians of an emergency at your school?

Have ENS (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	96% (1101)	96% (325)	91% (339)	77% (90)	94% (1855)
No	4% (51)	4% (14)	9% (34)	23% (27)	6% (126)

Q. If yes, did your school activate its electronic notification system this year for an actual emergency?

Activated ENS (N=1855)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	16% (177)	22% (72)	20% (68)	7% (6)	17% (323)
No	84% (924)	78% (253)	80% (271)	93% (84)	83% (1532)

Q. If yes, under what emergency circumstances did you activate your school's electronic notification system? (choose the category that best fits each incident; select all that apply) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Items considered a possible violent threat to students/staff are shown in bold type in the table below. A more detailed table of those specific items follows.

Reason for Activating ENS (N=323)	Number	Percent
Naturally-occurring hazard such as earthquake, ... weather conditions	154	48%
Incident related to violence/crime, ...occurring OFF school property	47	15%
Power outage or utility malfunction ... did <u>not</u> result in smoke, fumes, or fire	42	13%
Smoke, fumes, or fire on school property	36	11%
School bus-related incidents	29	9%
Bomb threat to school	27	8%
Incident at another school that affected your school	19	6%
Unfounded incident/faulty or false alarm	18	6%
Student or staff accident, emergency... OFF school property	15	5%
Suspicious person/intruder on school property	13	4%
Student or staff accident, health-related ...ON school property	12	4%
Incident related to violence/crime, ... occurring ON school property	10	3%
Hazardous chemical incident on school property	10	3%
Student reported as missing	4	1%

Reason for Activating ENS (N = 323)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Suspicious person/intruder on school property	6% (10)	0	3% (2)	17% (1)	4% (13)
School bus-related incidents	9% (15)	11% (8)	7% (5)	17% (1)	9% (29)
Bomb threat to school	2% (3)	13% (9)	21% (14)	17% (1)	8% (27)
Incident related to violence/crime, ... occurring ON school property	2% (4)	1% (1)	6% (4)	17% (1)	3% (10)

Lockdown Drills

Q. How often were lockdown drills practiced at your school during the 2011 - 2012 school year?
(select one)

Lockdown Drill Frequency (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
More than once	44% (502)	53% (178)	52% (193)	42% (49)	47% (922)
Once	50% (577)	42% (141)	43% (159)	44% (51)	47% (928)
Not practiced	6% (69)	6% (20)	5% (20)	14% (16)	6% (125)
Other	<1% (4)	0	<1% (1)	1% (1)	<1% (6)
Total	100% (1152)	100% (339)	100% (373)	100% (117)	100% (1981)

III. STUDENT SAFETY CONCERNS

This section of the survey asks for information about student surveys used to assess student safety concerns, school safety and bullying prevention programs and their perceived effectiveness, incidents of cyber bullying and general school climate conditions related to safety.

Student Questionnaires

Q. Did your school distribute a questionnaire to students during the 2011 – 2012 school year to assess the students' school safety concerns?

Student Questionnaire (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	38%	53	41	27	41
No	62	47	60	73	60

Q. What student survey(s) did your school use? (select all that apply)

Type of Student Questionnaire/Survey (N=803)	Number	Percent
Division or school- developed survey	533	66%
Olweus Bullying Questionnaire	153	19%
CDC Youth Risk Behavior Survey	34	4%
Pride Survey	26	3%
Communities That Care Youth Survey	18	2%
UVA Bullying School Climate Survey	33	2%
Virginia Department of Education (DOE)-developed survey	13	2%

School Safety Programs

Q. Review the following list of school safety programs and select those for which there was a formal program in place at your school during the 2011 – 2012 school year. (select all that apply) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Formal Program Type	Number of Schools	Percent
Counseling services for students	1674	85
Individualized behavior plans for disruptive students	1624	82
Bullying prevention/intervention	1493	75
Character education	1345	68
Mentoring	1212	61
Problem solving or social skills curriculum	1003	51
Classroom management in-service training and workshops for teachers	963	49
Truancy prevention	909	46
Method to report a safety concern anonymously	874	44
Conflict resolution	838	42
Substance abuse prevention	732	37
Anger management	633	32
Peer mediation	550	28
None of the above	25	1

Q. Listed below are the programs that you selected indicating that your school had a formal program during 2011 – 2012. For each, please indicate how effective the program was in maintaining discipline and promoting safety at your school.

Formal Program Type	Percent (Number) of Schools that Rated Program As:			
	<i>Very effective</i>	<i>Moderately effective</i>	<i>Slightly effective</i>	<i>No effect</i>
Anger management (N = 633)	33% (206)	61% (387)	6% (38)	<1% (2)
Bullying prevention/intervention (N = 1493)	43% (636)	52% (776)	5% (79)	<1% (2)
Character education (N = 1345)	51% (682)	44% (598)	5% (63)	<1% (2)
Classroom management in-service training and workshops for teachers (N = 963)	45% (431)	52% (498)	3% (30)	<1% (4)
Conflict resolution (N = 838)	41% (347)	54% (456)	4% (34)	<1% (1)
Counseling services for students (N = 1674)	63% (1050)	35% (579)	3% (43)	<1% (2)
Individualized behavior plans for disruptive students (N = 1624)	41% (672)	52% (846)	6% (101)	<1% (5)
Mentoring (N = 1212)	49% (597)	44% (538)	6% (72)	<1% (5)
Method to report a safety concern anonymously (N = 874)	47% (415)	40% (350)	10% (85)	3% (24)
Peer mediation (N = 550)	39% (214)	49% (272)	11% (58)	1% (6)
Problem solving or social skills curriculum (N = 1003)	42% (418)	52% (526)	6% (57)	<1% (2)
Substance abuse prevention (N = 732)	46% (335)	45% (332)	8% (58)	1% (7)
Truancy prevention (N = 909)	31% (279)	55% (496)	14% (126)	1% (8)

Bullying

Q. Review the following list of anti-bullying/bullying prevention programs and practices and select those that were in place at your school during the 2011 – 2012 school year. (select all that apply) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Bullying Prevention Programs/Practices (N = 1981)	Number	Percent
Programs		
Effective School-wide Discipline	624	32%
Bullying Prevention within Positive Behavioral Supports (BP-PBS)	360	18%
Olweus Bullying Prevention Program	337	17%
AI's Pals	138	7%
Rachel's Challenge	131	7%
Second Step curriculum	128	7%
Bullyproofing Your School	84	4%
Steps to Respect	56	3%
Community of Caring	55	3%
Peaceful School Bus	41	2%
None of the above	490	25%
Practices		
Individual counseling with students identified as bullying others	1606	81%
Individual counseling with students identified as victims of bullying	1572	79%
Rules or policy on bullying communicated to all students school-wide	1413	71%
Counselor-facilitated program	1344	68%
Classroom meetings about bullying	1317	67%
Specific disciplinary consequences for bullying	1212	61%
Increased supervision in areas where bullying occurs	1169	59%
Conference or assembly on bullying (school-wide)	1009	51%
Teacher/staff training on bullying	980	50%
Curriculum on bullying taught to all students	750	38%
Videos for students about bullying	606	31%
Hotline/complaint box (anonymous report)	491	25%
Parent education or outreach program regarding bullying	422	21%
Restorative discipline practices for bullying	412	21%
Bus driver training on bullying	346	18%
None of the above	36	2%

Q. Listed below are the programs and practices that you selected indicating that your school offered these during 2011 – 2012. For each, please indicate how effective the program and/or practice was in preventing or reducing bullying in your school.

Bullying Prevention Programs/Practices	Percent (Number) of Schools that Rated Program/Practice As:			
	<i>Very effective</i>	<i>Moderately effective</i>	<i>Slightly effective</i>	<i>No effect</i>
Programs				
Al's Pals (N = 138)	42% (58)	45% (62)	13% (18)	0
Bullying Prevention within Positive Behavioral Supports (BP-PBS) (N = 360)	46% (164)	50% (179)	4% (15)	1% (2)
Bullyproofing Your School (N = 84)	37% (31)	57% (48)	6% (5)	0
Community of Caring (N = 55)	49% (27)	47% (26)	2% (1)	2% (1)
Effective School-wide Discipline (N = 624)	54% (338)	42% (262)	4% (22)	<1% (2)
Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (N = 337)	41% (137)	50% (168)	9% (30)	1% (2)
Peaceful School Bus (N = 41)	27% (11)	56% (23)	15% (6)	2% (1)
Rachel's Challenge (N = 131)	30% (39)	57% (75)	11% (15)	2% (2)
Second Step curriculum (N = 128)	34% (44)	48% (61)	15% (19)	3% (4)
Steps to Respect (N = 56)	43% (24)	48% (27)	7% (4)	2% (1)
Practices				
Bus driver training on bullying (N = 346)	17% (60)	69% (240)	12% (42)	1% (4)
Classroom meetings about bullying (N = 1317)	43% (567)	53% (693)	4% (56)	<1% (1)
Conference or assembly on bullying (school-wide) (N = 1009)	39% (389)	52% (526)	9% (91)	<1% (3)
Counselor-facilitated program (N = 1344)	50% (670)	47% (625)	3% (47)	<1% (2)
Curriculum on bullying taught to all students (N = 750)	46% (344)	49% (364)	6% (42)	0
Hotline/complaint box (anonymous report) (N = 491)	31% (151)	45% (220)	20% (100)	4% (20)
Increased supervision in areas where bullying occurs (N = 1169)	62% (726)	37% (428)	1% (15)	0
Individual counseling with students identified as bullying others (N = 1606)	50% (806)	46% (735)	4% (64)	<1% (1)
Individual counseling with students identified as victims of bullying (N = 1572)	55% (872)	42% (660)	2% (39)	<1% (1)
Parent education or outreach program regarding bullying (N = 422)	27% (112)	57% (240)	15% (65)	1% (5)
Restorative discipline practices for bullying (N = 412)	43% (179)	55% (226)	2% (7)	0
Rules or policy on bullying communicated to all students school-wide (N = 1413)	46% (657)	48% (676)	6% (80)	0
Specific disciplinary consequences for bullying (N = 1212)	50% (612)	45% (542)	5% (57)	<1% (1)
Teacher/staff training on bullying (N = 980)	46% (450)	51% (498)	3% (31)	<1% (1)
Videos for students about bullying (N = 606)	34% (204)	56% (338)	10% (60)	1% (4)

Cyberbullying

Cyberbullying involves the use of information and communication technologies to deliberately threaten and/or harass someone with the intent of harming and/or embarrassing them. Text or images used in incidents of cyberbullying may be sent or posted using text messaging, email, instant messaging, social websites, blog posts, chat rooms, etc.

Q. How many known incidents of cyberbullying occurred at your school during 2011 – 2012?
Include incidents that were sent or received/viewed on school property or at school-related functions. Also include incidents where students passed around printouts of online activity such as chats or photos in school. (select one) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Number of Cyberbullying Incidents (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
No known incidents	77% (890)	18% (600)	19% (69)	62% (73)	55% (1092)
1 – 2 incidents	19% (213)	23% (78)	26% (97)	18% (21)	21% (409)
3 – 10 incidents	4% (46)	44% (150)	40% (148)	16% (19)	18% (363)
11 – 20 incidents	<1% (3)	12% (42)	11% (40)	3% (3)	4% (88)
21 – 50 incidents	0	3% (9)	5% (17)	1% (1)	1% (27)
51 – 100 incidents	0	0	1% (2)	0	<1% (2)
Total	1152	339	373	117	1981

School climate

Q. The following scales are used to measure aspects of school climate that are related to school safety conditions. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements pertaining to the climate at your school during the 2011 – 2012 school year. (select one for each statement) – list provided is shown in the table below.

School Climate Statement (N = 1981)	Percent of schools that agree or disagree with each statement			
	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Students are encouraged to report bullying and aggression.	91%	9%	<1%	<1%
Students know who to go to for help if they have been treated badly by another student.	85%	14%	3%	<1%
Teachers take action to solve the problem when students report bullying.	72%	26%	2%	<1%
Students feel free to ask for help from teachers if there is a problem with a student.	65%	33%	2%	<1%
Students report it when one student hits another.	57%	37%	6%	<1%
Schools cannot afford to tolerate students who disrupt the learning environment.	54%	36%	8%	2%
Zero tolerance sends a clear message to disruptive students about appropriate behaviors in school.	39%	39%	14%	8%
Zero tolerance makes a significant contribution to maintaining order at this school.	35%	39%	17%	9%
Teachers know when students are being picked on or being bullied.	29%	65%	6%	<1%
Suspension is a necessary tool for maintaining school order.	24%	46%	21%	9%
Out-of-school suspension is unnecessary if we provide a positive school climate and challenging instruction.	17%	38%	35%	11%
Suspension makes students less likely to misbehave in the future.	9%	42%	37%	13%
Students here often get teased about their clothing or physical appearance.	3%	20%	42%	35%
Bullying is a problem at this school.	2%	31%	38%	28%
Students here often get put down because of their race or ethnicity.	1%	8%	33%	58%
Students here often get put down because of their perceived sexual orientation.	1%	7%	22%	70%
There is a lot of teasing about sexual topics at this school.	1%	8%	27%	64%

IV. SCHOOL SECURITY/SURVEILLANCE

The School Security/Surveillance section is protected from FOIA requests and its findings are only reported in aggregate, no detailed data from a specific school or school division are distributed.

Security Strategies

Q. Review the following list of security strategies and select those that were in place at your school during the 2011 – 2012 school year. (select all that apply) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Security Strategies (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
All exterior entrances to the school building or campus are locked during school hours	78% (895)	74% (250)	61% (226)	65% (76)	73% (1447)
Security cameras are used to monitor school property (e.g., parking lots, corridors, playground, entrances)	58% (663)	80% (271)	88% (329)	73% (85)	68% (1348)
Main entrance of the school building or campus is secured by a controlled access system during school hours	59% (681)	51% (173)	37% (136)	53% (62)	53% (1052)
All classrooms in the school can be locked from both the inside and the outside of the classroom	51% (590)	51% (172)	54% (202)	62% (72)	52% (1036)
Safety Patrols are conducted by teachers and/or staff	47% (537)	47% (160)	66% (247)	45% (53)	50% (997)
Someone is stationed at the front entrance of the school at all times during school hours to ensure that visitors report to the main office for visitor check-in	43% (499)	46 (157)	56% (207)	47% (55)	46% (918)
Safety/security personnel are present at all times during the regular school day	10% (117)	64% (217)	77% (286)	45% (53)	34% (673)
Metal detectors are used at the school's main entrance(s)	<1% (3)	4% (12)	4% (14)	19% (22)	3% (51)
None of the above	2% (19)	1% (3)	1% (2)	4% (5)	2% (29)

Q. Listed below are the security strategies that you indicated were in place at your school during 2011 – 2012. For each, please indicate how effective the strategy was in maintaining safety and security at your school.

Security Strategies	Percent of Schools that Rated Strategy As:			
	<i>Very effective</i>	<i>Moderately effective</i>	<i>Slightly effective</i>	<i>No effect</i>
Main entrance of the school building or campus is secured by a controlled access system during school hours (N = 1052)	87%	12%	1%	0%
All exterior entrances to the school building or campus are locked during school hours (N = 1447)	86%	13%	1%	0%
Safety/security personnel are present at all times during the regular school day (N = 673)	86%	13%	1%	0%
Someone is stationed at the front entrance of the school at all times during school hours to ensure that visitors report to the main office for visitor check-in (N = 918)	85%	14%	0%	0%
All classrooms in the school can be locked from both the inside and the outside of the classroom (N = 1036)	76%	22%	1%	1%
Metal detectors are used at the school's main entrance(s) (N = 51)	76%	16%	6%	2%
Safety Patrols are conducted by teachers and/or staff (N = 997)	66%	30%	3%	0%
Security cameras are used to monitor school property (e.g., parking lots, corridors, playground, entrances) (N = 1348)	62%	32%	6%	0%

School Safety/Security Personnel

Q. Did you have safety/security personnel such as School Resource Officers (SROs), School Security Officers (SSOs), or other types of such personnel working at your school at least part time during the 2011 – 2012 school year?

Safety/Security Personnel at school at least part time (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	33% (383)	91% (307)	92% (342)	60% (70)	56% (1102)
No	67% (769)	9% (32)	8% (31)	40% (47)	44% (879)

Q. If yes, what type(s) of safety/security personnel were working at your school? (select all that apply)

Type of Safety/Security Personnel at school at least part time (N = 1102)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem (N = 383)	Middle (N = 307)	High (N = 342)	Other (N = 70)	Total (N = 1102)
SRO	71% (271)	94% (289)	94% (323)	74% (52)	85% (935)
SSO	19% (71)	28% (86)	41% (141)	50% (35)	30% (333)
Other *	15% (59)	7% (21)	5% (18)	7% (5)	9% (103)

* Other detail:	Frequency	Percent
DARE officer	15	15%
Security assistant	15	15%
Safety/security specialist/assistant	10	10%
Child safety officer	4	4%
STEPP officer	4	4%
Security resident	4	4%
Other	51	50%
Total	103	100%

Q. Did you employ private security officers at your school during 2011- 2012?

Employ Private Security Officers (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	<1% (3)	2% (5)	6% (22)	1% (1)	2% (31)
No	99.7% (1149)	98.5% (334)	94% (351)	99% (116)	98% (1950)

Q. If yes, in what capacity were private security officers employed at your school? (select all that apply) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Capacity of Private Security Officers (N=31)	Number	Percent
They perform duties very similar to those of SSOs during school hours	5	16%
Maintain order and safety at special events	23	72%
Provide building security after school hours	5	16%

Coordination with First Responders

Q. Did first responders (including police, fire and EMS) have electronic/internet-based access to current floor plans for your school in case they needed to respond to a large scale security incident at your facility?

First Responders Have Access to Floor Plans (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	53% (607)	55% (185)	56% (209)	54% (63)	54% (1064)
No	15% (175)	17% (56)	23% (85)	17% (20)	17% (336)
Don't know	32% (370)	29% (98)	21% (78)	29% (34)	29% (580)

Q. Do you have defined protocols for immediately reporting suspicious activity commonly associated with terrorism to state or local law enforcement?

Protocols for Reporting Suspicious Activity Associated with Terrorism (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	77% (891)	72% (243)	81% (302)	83% (97)	77% (1533)
No	7% (80)	10% (35)	8% (31)	7% (8)	8% (154)
Don't know	16% (181)	18% (61)	11% (39)	10% (12)	15% (293)

Bus Safety

Q. Which methods were used to monitor safety on and/or maintain communication with school buses when they were in use? (For each of the listed methods, please select either "not used, used on some buses, or used on all buses.") – list provided is shown in the table below.

Bus Safety Monitoring Methods	Percent of Schools		
	Used on all buses	Used on some buses	Not used
Communication maintained through division's transportation department	92%	3%	5%
Two way radio	81%	7%	13%
Security cameras	55%	38%	7%
GPS Tracking System	24%	15%	61%
Randomly patrolled by school faculty/staff	16%	34%	50%
Cell phone	15%	36%	49%
Randomly patrolled by security personnel (including SROs, SSOs, or private security)	9%	16%	75%
Bus aide/monitor	3%	78%	19%

Gang-Related Activity

Virginia Code definition: §18.2-46.1 Criminal street gang means “any ongoing organization, association, or group of three or more persons, whether formal or informal, (i) which has as one of its primary objectives or activities the commission of one or more criminal activities, (ii) which has an identifiable name or identifying sign or symbol, and (iii) whose members individually or collectively have engaged in the commission of, attempt to commit, conspiracy to commit, or solicitation of two or more predicate criminal acts, at least one of which is an act of violence, provided such acts were not part of a common act or transaction.”

Q. Using the definition above, did your school have any gang-related problems or incidents during the 2011 – 2012 school year?

Gang-Related Problems (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	1% (13)	8% (26)	17% (62)	15% (17)	6% (118)
No	99% (1139)	92% (313)	83% (311)	86% (100)	94% (1863)

Q. If yes, did the number of gang-related problems or incidents increase, decrease, or stay about the same when compared with the previous school year? (select one)

Change in Gang-Related Problems (N=118)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Increased	15% (2)	12% (3)	0	12% (2)	6% (7)
Decreased	8% (1)	58% (15)	48% (30)	24% (4)	42% (50)
Stayed the same	77% (10)	31% (8)	52% (32)	65% (11)	52% (61)

Q. If no, does this reflect a decrease in gang-related problems or incidents from the previous school year or were both school years free of gang-related problems and incidents? (select one)

No Gang-Related Problems Means... (N=1863)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Reflects a decrease	2% (24)	12% (37)	16% (49)	6% (6)	6% (116)
Same as in 2010 - 2011 (no gang-related problems or incidents either year)	98% (1115)	88% (276)	84% (262)	94% (94)	94% (1747)

Q. Did the community surrounding your school have any gang-related problems or incidents during the 2011 – 2012 school year?

Community near school has gang-related problems (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
Yes	14% (158)	31% (106)	32% (118)	17% (20)	20% (402)
No	44% (501)	33% (112)	34% (127)	33% (39)	39% (779)
Don't Know	43% (493)	36% (121)	34% (128)	50% (58)	40% (800)

Q. Which of the following indicators of gang activity was observed in your school during the 2011 – 2012 school year? (For each of the listed indicators, please select either “none, 1 or 2 incidents, or 3 or more incidents”) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Gang Activity Indicators Observed (N = 1981)	Percent of Schools		
	No incidents	1 or 2 incidents	3 or more incidents
School staff identified gang-related graffiti on school property	86%	11%	3%
Gang signs or symbols were identified on students' clothing or other belongings	87%	9%	3%
School staff reported observing students using gang-related hand signals	92%	7%	2%
Gang-related fights occurred during school hours on the school campus	98%	2%	<1%

Q. Rate the overall threat of gang activity by street gangs in your school during the 2011 – 2012 school year. (select one)

Overall Threat of Gang Activity (N = 1981)	Percent (number) of Schools by Type				
	Elem	Middle	High	Other	Total
5 (high)	<1% (1)	0	0	2% (2)	<1% (3)
4	0	0	<1% (1)	0	<1% (1)
3 (medium)	1% (10)	2% (6)	3% (12)	4% (5)	2% (33)
2	1% (16)	4% (15)	7% (27)	7% (8)	3% (66)
1 (low)	22% (249)	45% (151)	47% (175)	30% (35)	31% (610)
None	76% (876)	49% (167)	42% (158)	57% (67)	64% (1268)

Gang Prevention

Q. Indicate which of the following were part of your school's routine tasks in regard to gang graffiti and its prevention/eradication in 2011-2012. (select all that apply) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Anti-Graffiti Routine Tasks (N = 1981)	Number	Percent
We had no gang graffiti on school property during the 2011 – 2012 school year	1444	73%
Maintenance and/or janitorial staff routinely looked for gang graffiti in restrooms, locker rooms, trash cans, etc.	858	43%
When/if graffiti was found, it was immediately removed	705	36%
When/if graffiti was found, photo documentation was made and shared with local law enforcement	603	30%
Staff were trained to look for/identify gang-related graffiti.	566	29%
None of the above	98	5%

Q. Which of the following gang prevention measures were in place at your school during the 2011 – 2012 school year? (select all that apply) – list provided is shown in the table below.

Gang Prevention Measures At Schools (N = 1981)	Number	Percent
Formal student policy regarding gang-related behavior	962	49%
Students advised about restrictions on gang-related behavior	692	35%
Cooperative effort with law enforcement to identify gang-related crime	628	32%
Counseling services provided to discourage gang-related behavior	438	22%
Students suspended from school for gang-related behavior	333	17%
Gang awareness in-service training and workshops for teachers/staff	261	13%
Speaker for students on gangs	146	7%
Speaker for parents on gangs	69	4%
Use of a program other than G.R.E.A.T. to discourage gang involvement	69	4%
Use of G.R.E.A.T. (Gang Resistance Education and Training) program	35	2%
None of the above	698	35%

Q. Listed below are the gang prevention measures that you indicated were in place at your school during 2011 - 2012. For each, please indicate how effective the measure was in preventing gang activity/gang-related behavior at your school.

Gang Prevention Measures At Schools	Percent of Schools that Rated Measure As:			
	<i>Very effective</i>	<i>Moderately effective</i>	<i>Slightly effective</i>	<i>No effect</i>
Cooperative effort with law enforcement to identify gang-related crime (N = 628)	74%	22%	2%	2%
Formal student policy regarding gang-related behavior (N = 962)	62%	30%	3%	4%
Students advised about restrictions on gang-related behavior (N = 692)	62%	32%	3%	2%
Counseling services provided to discourage gang-related behavior (N = 438)	62%	32%	5%	1%
Speaker for students on gangs (N = 146)	60%	32%	5%	2%
Speaker for parents on gangs (N = 69)	59%	30%	7%	3%
Students suspended from school for gang-related behavior (N = 333)	54%	36%	6%	5%
Gang awareness in-service training and workshops for teachers/staff (N = 261)	52%	42%	4%	1%
Use of G.R.E.A.T. (Gang Resistance Education and Training) program (N = 35)	51%	43%	6%	0%
Use of a program other than G.R.E.A.T. to discourage gang involvement (N = 69)	38%	54%	6%	3%



Studies on the Effectiveness of
School Resource Officers
January 2013



www.dcjs.virginia.gov

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Most studies examining the effectiveness of SROs in schools are based on perceptions of SRO effectiveness, rather than on actual measures of crime and violence at schools.

Most studies indicate that SROs are seen as effective and beneficial. Studies indicating that SROs are perceived as effective cite the following:

- Students, school faculty/administrators, and parents generally report that they feel safer when SROs are present, and that there is a more orderly school environment.
- Benefits reported (but often without supporting figures) include:
 - Reductions in aggressive behavior (fighting, assaults, threats and bullying)
 - Fewer calls to street officers to deal with school-based problems
 - Decreases in gang-related activities
 - Decreases in use of weapons (handguns, knives and other objects)
 - Decreases in thefts
 - Increases in reporting by crime victims
 - Increases in students' understanding of legal and illegal activities

Challenges identified to the successful use of SROs in schools include the following:

- Lack of clear definitions and protocols on the roles of SROs, and lack of agreement between law enforcement and school administrators on what these roles are
- Lack of cooperation between school administrators, faculty and parents and SROs
- Inappropriate uses of SROs, including dealing with classroom management issues
- Failure to integrate SROs into broader school and community safety initiatives
- Lack of office space, equipment and other resources for SROs
- Involuntary assignment of officers to SRO duties, SRO duties being seen as detrimental to a law enforcement career

Suggestions for improving the effectiveness of SROs in schools include the following:

- Developing clear definitions of SRO roles in schools, and effective communications between SROs and students, school faculty/administrators, and parents
- Selecting SROs with the personality and motivation to engage with students
- Maintaining regular contact between SROs and law enforcement agency and supervisor
- Integrating SROs within broader school and community safety programs and initiatives

STUDIES ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS

There are few studies that provide hard evidence about whether or not school resource officers (SROs) reduce crime or violence in schools. Most studies of SRO effectiveness do not use levels of crime or violence as their measure of effectiveness; instead, most use surveys or questionnaires to gather perceptions of SRO effectiveness from students, school faculty and administrators, parents, and SROs themselves. Some studies note that reductions in crime and violence are reported, but do not provide figures to support these reports.

It appears that few studies have used levels of crime and violence because: a) many schools do not maintain empirical, consistent measures of crime and violence, and b) levels of crime and violence in schools tend to be so low that it is hard to detect meaningful changes in them even when there are changes.

Therefore, most of the studies summarized in this report rely on reports of perceptions and opinions about how SROs affect crime, violence and safety. This report does not provide in-depth review of the methodologies used in these studies, or extensive discussion of the conclusions they reached. Instead, it focuses on excerpting portions of the reports that:

- a) indicate beneficial effects of SROs in schools
- b) indicate challenges to successful use of SROs in schools
- c) provide suggestions for improving the performance of SROs in schools

Two of the studies cited were conducted in Canada and in the United Kingdom. Although the educational and law enforcement structures differ slightly from those in the U.S., and some of terms used in the reports differ from those used in the U.S., the school resource officer concept is similar in all three countries.

Copies of all of the studies cited in the report are available from DCJS.

STUDIES INDICATING BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF SROS IN SCHOOLS

All of the studies reviewed identified some type of beneficial effects of SROs in schools. As noted previously, most of the benefits cited are based on survey data.

Assigning Police Officers to Schools. April 2010. Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice.

“Many school administrators and parents express satisfaction with their SRO programs, even in instances where there was initial resistance to the idea of placing police officers in schools.”

“There is research that suggests that although SRO programs do not significantly impact youth criminality, the presence of an officer nonetheless can enhance school safety. For example, the presence of SROs may deter aggressive behaviors including student fighting, threats, and bullying, and may make it easier for school administrators to maintain order in the school, address disorderly behavior in a timely fashion, and limit the time spent on disciplinary matters.”

FACT SHEET #5: School Resource Officers (SROs). November, 2008. Consortium to Prevent School Violence.

“The body of research as a whole suggests that SROs are viewed favorably by school personnel and parents. Students also tend to view SROs favorably, but less consistently so.”

Effective Responses: School Community Resource Officers. What Works in Preventing School Violence. January, 2002. Indiana University.

“Several related benefits were identified, including more rapid response time to calls, better traffic enforcement around the schools, fewer calls to street officers to deal with school-based difficulties, fewer fights, and a generally more orderly environment in the school.”

“Law enforcement agencies that have SROs have indicated that the program has provided valuable crime prevention information which would not otherwise have been available.”

Effectiveness of School Resource Officer Programs. Magdalena A. Denham, Sam Houston State University.

This report reviewed several studies on the effectiveness of SROs and cited the following studies reporting beneficial effects.

Johnson, I. (1999). School violence: The effectiveness of a school resource officer program in a southern city. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 173–192.

- Most SROs declared that gang-related activities decreased during their assignment. They attributed that decrease to increased identification of gang leaders, mediation, and daily communications with all students.
- Even though school officials perceived weapons to be a major persisting problem at their schools, the majority (70.6%) agreed that the use of handguns had decreased since the inception of the SRO program.
- Johnson reported similar findings among school officials’ perception on the use of knives, objects to inflict injury, and on fighting.
- All school officials stated that students were very supportive of their SROs. Most of the school officials (70.6%) believed the SROs were doing an excellent job.
- Students did not view the officers as invasion to their privacy; in fact, most students concurred that the presence of SROs in their school deterred certain delinquent behavior.

- When comparing incident records, the Johnson found that the number of reported offenses decreased after the placement of the SRO program (i.e., 4,049 in school year 1994–1995 vs. 3,760 in school year 1995–1996).

May, D. C., Fessel, S. D., & Means, S. (2004). Predictors of principals' perceptions of school resource officer effectiveness in Kentucky. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29, 75-93.

- Principals felt that the SRO program had the greatest impact on fighting (62.6%).
- Almost one half of the principals agreed that marijuana problems and theft decreased in their schools as result of SROs' presence.
- 87.5% of principals considered that their SROs were effective overall.

Brown, B., & Benedict, W. R. (2005). Classroom cops, what do the students think? A case study of student perceptions of school police and security officers conducted in an Hispanic community. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 7, 264-285.

- Students' evaluations of both SROs and security officers were positive.
- Students indicated that officers helped keep the school safe and their presence on school premises was reassuring to students' feelings of safety.

School Resource Officer Program 2008/2009 Evaluation. October 2009. Toronto District School Board.

Based on how SROs are perceived by students, teachers/administrators, parents and SROs, the following beneficial effects were cited:

- The evaluation found that most students felt safe at school and in the neighborhood around the school before (October 2008) and after (May 2009) the SRO program.
- There was an increase in reporting by students who had been a victim of crime, but no similar increase in reporting to police when students had witnessed a crime.
- The perceived relationships between students and police improved during the school year.
- The proportion of students who felt the relationship between police and students was good or excellent, increased from 56% to 67%; those who thought the relationship was excellent almost doubled over the school year.
- The proportion of administrators/teachers who believed that the relationship between police and students in their school was good or excellent increased during the school year; those who believed the relationship between police and students was excellent almost doubled.
- Parents' perception of their child's safety at school improved over the year. Parents at the beginning and end of the school year felt positively about having an SRO assigned to their child's school; over 90% in October 2008 and May 2009 said it was a very good or okay idea, while only 2% said it was a bad idea.
- In 2008/09 there were decreases in reported offences both on school grounds and within 200 meters of the school, over all the times that were examined.
- Overall, the evaluation finds that the School Resource Officer program demonstrated a number of positive effects on schools and students, particularly those students who had interacted with the SROs. The SRO program has the potential to be increasingly beneficial to crime prevention, crime reporting and relationship building, in the schools and in surrounding neighborhoods.

Mainstreaming Safer School Partnerships. 2006. Department of Education and Skills, United Kingdom.

“There is evidence that offending behaviour has reduced and that the [Safe School Partnerships] programme has sought ways of identifying and working with children and young people at risk of becoming victims or offenders. It has achieved the objective of reducing truancy rates and total absences. Its most significant impact has been in providing safer school environments and safer routes to and from school. Pupils and staff report that they feel safer since the programme was introduced. “

Examples of evidence cited in the report includes the following:

Essex Police SSP Survey

- 58.5% of 822 pupils either agreed or strongly agreed that they felt safer due to the presence of a police officer in school
- 84% of parents report that they think that their child is safer in school due to the presence of police officer
- 59% of staff stated that they felt safer in the presence of a police officer in the school

Sheffield – Walthef School Pupils

- 79% felt safer with a police officer in the school
- 87% said it was good having a police officer in the school

City of Westminster

- 29% reduction in youth street crime in the vicinity of SSP schools and a 20% reduction in exclusions (expulsions).

Second Annual Evaluation of DCJS-Funded SRO Programs: Fiscal Year 1999-2000. December, 2001. Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services.

“99% of staff and 91% of students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “I support having a SRO assigned to my school.” Compared with staff, students were less likely to “strongly agree” (84% vs. 48%). Agreement among both groups increased as interaction with SROs increased.”

“Most staff and a substantial majority of students said that SROs increased student knowledge of the legal system, increased student understanding of what’s legal and illegal, reduced fear of crime among staff and students, and reduced student fighting. Furthermore, the great majority of staff reported that SROs reduced threats and bullying among students, made it easier to maintain order in school and improved educator-law enforcement collaboration.”

“One other indicator of SRO program effectiveness came from the comments on LFF [Lessons from the Field] reports and QAR [Quarterly Activity Reports]. Of the 99 SROs who provided these comments, 35 (35%) claimed a reduction of criminal behavior as one of their program’s accomplishments or noted that such had been the conclusion of staff who observed this phenomenon. Twenty-nine (29%) reported that there had been a reduction in the number of fights or violent assaults since their arrival at school.”

CHALLENGES TO SUCCESSFUL USE OF SROS IN SCHOOLS

Many of the SRO effectiveness studies that were reviewed included information gathered on factors that challenges or inhibited the effectiveness of SROs in schools.

FACT SHEET #5: School Resource Officers (SROs). November, 2008. Consortium to Prevent School Violence.

“Several studies have suggested that SRO effectiveness is hampered by a lack of clarity in their roles and responsibilities in relation to school administrators, particularly in decision making and authority in situations that involve borderline illegal or potentially dangerous activity.”

School Resource Officer Program 2008/2009 Evaluation. October 2009. Toronto District School Board.

“The SROs identified a number of challenges to performing their duties (e.g. unwelcoming or isolated office space, lack of information, and issues related to transportation).”

Mainstreaming Safer School Partnerships. 2006. Department of Education and Skills, United Kingdom.

“Where there have been no clear protocols between the police and the school there has been a lack of clarity over the role of the police officer within the school, poor communication and inadequate sharing of information. This led to instances of police officers being used inappropriately to deal with minor issues, that is, to compensate for ongoing problems of poor school discipline rather than assisting in overcoming them. In some cases schools and/or individual teachers failed to co-operate with the police by either refusing to share information or by actively dissuading parents or pupils from reporting incidents to the police officer.”

“As a stand-alone programme the Safer School Partnership cannot reach its full potential or be as successful as when it is fully integrated into school policies, such as school behaviour policies, or into other school-based initiatives such as BEST. Since its inception some schools insufficiently integrated the work of the Safer School Partnership into the mainstream working of the school. In some cases officers were not always aware of what relevant services were available within the school, how to access them or whether they would be able to seek their co-operation. On some occasions other partners working within the school failed to involve the officer when appropriate.”

“Failure to integrate the Safer School Partnership programme has resulted in an overlap of provision or at worst, gaps in provision, which have remained unidentified.”

“Having the wrong people in post or having them leave just as they have started to build up necessary relationships to work effectively can be counter-productive. A significant reason for the difficulty of recruiting police officers into this role related to a prevailing police culture, with little value attributed to the role of an officer working within a school setting, and the impact that this would have on further career development and promotion within the service.”

Effective Responses: School Community Resource Officers. What Works in Preventing School Violence. January, 2002. Indiana University.

“Where the program has been less successful, sending students to the SRO has been used as a classroom management consequence or school discipline enforcement device. This has permitted school officials to evade their responsibilities and interfered with the officer developing a positive relationship with students. The program has also been less successful where officers are involuntarily assigned, are assigned to too many schools, or are assigned to other non-school based duties that interfere with the ability of the officer to have daily regular contact and familiarity with students in one or two schools.”

Factors that SROs cited as hindering their law enforcement roles in schools included:

- Overly protective or uncooperative staff (46%)
- No private officer, phone, radios, etc. (25%)
- Workload, multiple schools, court time, etc. (11%)
- Unsupportive school board, superintendent (5%)
- Parental defensiveness (3%)
- Other factors (10%)

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING SRO PERFORMANCE IN SCHOOLS

Many of the studies that examined the effectiveness of SROs cited various lessons learned about what things might be done to improve the effectiveness of SROs.

Effective Responses: School Community Resource Officers. What Works in Preventing School Violence. January, 2002. Indiana University.

“Schools have reported that much of the success of the SRO program hinges on the development of relationships, communication, and trust between the officer and students. Some states require specialized training for SROs.”

“While the close proximity and opportunities for interaction promote the development of this relationship, it also depends on the personality and motivation of the officer to engage and find ways to relate to students. When the program works well, the officer serves as a mentor and role model for students and as a law-related educator of students, as well as a deterrent to crime in the school.”

School Resource Officer Evaluation: Phase One. September, 2005. Center for Schools and Communities and Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

“Parent and teachers reported more favorably of SRO programs that had a program brochure or flyer. Teachers and parents reported more favorably of SROs that were over the age of 30 and had over eight years of law enforcement experience. In addition, parents and teachers responded more positively about SROs that reported conducting counselor/mentoring duties the majority of the time and that were assigned at least part time to summer school or programming when school was out of session. SRO programs reported more favorably maintained consistent contact with their law enforcement supervisor, and the law enforcement supervisor visited the school site periodically if not more regularly. Students, teachers, and parents all reported more favorably of programs where the SRO was only assigned to one building and that the SRO volunteered for the position.”

Key Components of Success Identified

- SRO should be an experienced law enforcement officer
- Existence of a Memorandum of Understanding
- Availability of a brochure or flyer for parents and/or teachers outlining the program
- SRO’s summer responsibilities to include at least a part-time role in school or community related programming (summer school, recreational programming)
- SRO assigned to one building
- SRO maintaining an “open door policy” with students
- Regular communication between the SRO and law enforcement supervisor
- Law enforcement supervisor visiting the school site periodically at the very least
- SRO refraining from involvement in Student Assistance Programs
- SRO having the ability to ensure immediacy of citation and conduct investigation when necessary

School Resource Officer Evaluation: Phase Two. September, 2005. Center for Schools and Communities and Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

The promising practices identified during Phase Two included the following:

- Law enforcement officers having daily contact with the SRO
- The supervisor indicated having daily contact with the SRO
- The supervisor having contact as needed with school administrators
- The supervisor having visited the SRO on school grounds between 6–12 times within the past 12 months
- The SRO supervisor having over 25 years of experience and having supervised the SRO for a minimum of four years
- The SRO supervisor being involved in the formulation of the memorandum of understanding between the law enforcement agency and school district

Mainstreaming Safer School Partnerships. 2006. Department of Education and Skills, United Kingdom.

Success factors identified in the United Kingdom study included the following:

- Establishing a Strategic Steering Group and a separate Management Steering Group
- Establishing protocols between the police, school and other agencies
- The work of the Safer School Partnership is embedded into overall school behaviour policies
- Full integration with other prevention initiatives and included in wider local prevention agenda
- Effective recruitment, training, development, promotion and retention of police officers
- Motivated police staff with the appropriate skills and abilities
- Clear objectives and targets and mechanisms for measurement of outcomes
- Assessing school need and policing priorities
- Overcoming the lack of co-terminosity of agency boundaries
- Integrating SSPs with Neighbourhood Policing
- Effective information sharing
- Focused interventions targeted by the Police National Intelligence Model

“Schools are in many instances the ‘hub’ of local neighbourhoods, so incorporating Safer School Partnerships within Neighbourhood Policing is an important way of strengthening a holistic approach to local policing. It will offer an opportunity to identify and address the priorities and needs of school students and staff and to address the priorities of the wider community where these relate to the school population and environment.”

Factors that SROs cited as helping their law enforcement roles in schools included:

- Having the trust and support of students and staff (61%)
- Adequate resources and equipment (12%)
- Willingness of staff to include/inform SRO (7%)
- Longevity, assignment to one school (5%)
- Changes in administrative procedures (3%)
- Help from truant or other security officers (3%)
- Other factors (9%)

“A substantial number of SROs linked their effectiveness to their role as hub of their school’s crime information network. Such a network forms spontaneously as the SRO gains the trust and acceptance of students and staff. Gradually, the SROs are seen as a person to which suspicious behavior can be reported or questions asked as to whether particular behaviors would constitute criminal activity. In time, the network works to inform the SRO about crimes committed and crimes that might be committed. For example, 29 SROs reported that as the length of their tenure at a school increased, so did the willingness of the students and staff to approach them and discuss criminal matters. Fourteen (14) described instances where they learned about crimes already committed and were able to arrest or bring about the arrest of the perpetrators. Three (3) others described tips about upcoming fights or about parties where criminal behavior was anticipated.”

REFERENCES

- A Guide to Developing, Maintaining and Succeeding With Your School Resource Officer Program. Practices From the Field for Law Enforcement and School Administration.* 2003. Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Assigning Police Officers to Schools.* April, 2010. Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Case Studies of 19 School Resource Officer (SRO) Programs.* February, 2005. Abt Associates, Inc.
- Comparison of Program Activities and Lessons Learned among 19 School Resource Officer (SRO) Programs.* March, 2005. Abt Associates, Inc.
- Effective Responses: School Community Resource Officers. What Works in Preventing School Violence.* January, 2002. Indiana University.
- Effectiveness of School Resource Officer Programs.* 2009. Magdalena A. Denham, Sam Houston State University.
- Mainstreaming Safer School Partnerships.* 2006. Department of Education and Skills, United Kingdom.
- National Assessment of School Resource Officer Programs: Survey of Students in Three Large New SRO Programs.* March, 2005. Northeastern University.
- School Security Officers Manual.* July, 2012. Recovery School District, New Orleans, LA.
- School Resource Officer Evaluation: Phase One.* September, 2005. Center for Schools and Communities and Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.
- School Resource Officer Evaluation: Phase Two.* September, 2005. Center for Schools and Communities and Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.
- School Resource Officer Program 2008/2009 Evaluation.* October, 2009. Toronto District School Board.
- Second Annual Evaluation of DCJS Funded School Resource Officer Programs: Fiscal Year 1999-2000.* December, 2001. Department of Criminal Justice Services.

Reference Materials from State School Safety Centers

California

[Office of Safe Schools](#)

California Department of Education,
Office of Learning Support
Louise Chiatovich, Safe Schools and Violence Prevention
P.O. Box 944272
Sacramento, CA 94244-2720
Phone: 916-323-2183

Colorado

[Colorado School Safety Resource Center](#)

700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
Phone: 303-239-4435
Fax: 303-239-4510

Connecticut

[Safe Schools and Communities Coalition](#)

The Governor's Prevention Partnership
John Daviau, Director of School,
Campus & Community Programs
30 Arbor Street
Hartford, CT 06106
Phone: 860-523-8042

Florida

[Office of Safe Schools](#)

Florida Department of Education
Lorraine Allen, Senior Educational Program Director
325 W. Gaines Street, Room 301
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Phone: 850-245-0416

Georgia

[School Safety Project](#)

Georgia Emergency Management Agency
Steve Harris, Manager
PO Box 18055
Atlanta, GA 30316
Phone: 404-635-7000

Indiana

[Indiana School Safety Specialist Academy](#)

Department of Education
Clarissa Snapp, Director
Office of Student Services
Room 229 State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Phone: 317-234-0326

Kentucky

[Kentucky Center for School Safety](#)

Eastern Kentucky University
Jon Akers, Director
521 Lancaster Drive
105 Stratton Building
Richmond, KY 40475
Toll-free Phone: 877-805-4277

Mississippi

[Division of Safe and Orderly Schools](#)

Mississippi Department of Education
Robert Laird, Director, Division of School Safety
PO Box 771
359 North West Street
Jackson, MS 39205
Phone: 601-359-1028

Missouri

[Missouri Center for Safe Schools](#)

University of Missouri - Kansas City
Dr. Glenn Berry, Director
School of Education, Suite 24
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO 64110
Phone: 816-235-5656

Nebraska

[Nebraska School Safety Center](#)

Nebraska Department of Education
Lela Lowry, School Safety Program Specialist
301 Centennial Mall South
PO Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509-4987
Phone: 402-471-1925

New York

[New York State Center for School Safety](#)

Mary Grenz Jalloh, Executive Director
175 Route 32 North
New Paltz, NY 12561
Phone: 845-255-8989

North Carolina

[Center for the Prevention of School Violence](#)

Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
Prevention
Joanne McDaniel, Director
1801 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699
Toll-free Phone: 800-299-6054

Ohio[Ohio Resource Network for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities](#)

(eBasedPrevention.org)
University of Cincinnati
Bonnie Hedrick, Director
PO Box 210109
Cincinnati, OH 45221
Toll-free Phone: 800-788-7254

Oregon[Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior](#)

University of Oregon
Jeff Sprague, Director
1265 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1265
Phone: 541-346-3591

Pennsylvania[Center for Safe Schools](#)

Lynn Cromley, Director
275 Grandview Avenue, Suite 200
Camp Hill, PA 17011
Phone: 717-763-1661

South Carolina[South Carolina Center for Safe Schools](#)

Department of Education
Susan Alexander, Director
1429 Senate Street, Room 706
Columbia, SC 29201
Toll-free Phone: 866-300-9326

Tennessee[Tennessee School Safety Center](#)

Department of Education
Mike Herrmann, Director
Andrew Johnson Tower – 7th Floor
Nashville, TN 37243
Phone: 615-741-3248

Texas[Texas School Safety Center](#)

Texas State University – San Marcos
Dr. Victoria L. Calder
350 N. Guadalupe, Suite 140, PMB 164
San Marcos, TX 78666
Phone: 512-245-3036

Virginia[Virginia Center for School Safety](#)

Department of Criminal Justice Services
Donna Bowman, Director
1100 Bank Street
Richmond, VA 23219
Phone: 804-371-6506

Washington[Washington State School Safety Center](#)

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Denise Fitch, Administrator
PO Box 47200
Old Capital Building
Olympia, WA 98504
Phone: 360-725-6059

Cover photo credit: Lindsey Foray

Governor's Taskforce on School and Campus Safety
2013 Recommendation Format

Public Safety Workgroup

Summary: *Explain the legal, program and policy changes proposed. Describe actions involved and elaborate why the proposal is critical to your agency.*

Background: *Explain the history, including legislative history, behind the issue or problem.*

Need: *Explain the problem or issue your agency/stakeholder group is experiencing and how the proposed legislation will solve the problem. Describe the anticipated results and objectives that your Agency expects to accomplish.*

Anticipated Pros and Cons to Implementation of Recommendation(s): *Can you explain counter arguments to the recommendations? What are some of the challenges in implementing the recommendation(s) What groups are likely to support or oppose the recommendations and why?*

Proposed Amendment: *Provide a draft of the proposed changes to the Code of Virginia in the legislative bill format. Strike through language to be deleted and underline new language.*

Fiscal Impact: *Does this proposal require financial or personnel resources? Will it generate revenue? Will a Budget Amendment be necessary?*

Governor's School Safety Task Force Legislative Information

§ 9.1-184. Virginia Center for School Safety

- A. From such funds as may be appropriated, the Virginia Center for School Safety (the Center) is hereby established within the Department. The Center shall:
1. Provide training for Virginia public school personnel in school safety, on evidence-based antibullying tactics, and in the effective identification of students who may be at risk for violent behavior and in need of special services or assistance;
 2. Serve as a resource and referral center for Virginia school divisions by conducting research, sponsoring workshops, and providing information regarding current school safety concerns, such as conflict management and peer mediation, bullying, school facility design and technology, current state and federal statutory and regulatory school safety requirements, and legal and constitutional issues regarding school safety and individual rights;
 3. Maintain and disseminate information to local school divisions on effective school safety initiatives in Virginia and across the nation;
 4. Collect, analyze, and disseminate various Virginia school safety data, including school safety audit information submitted to it pursuant to § [22.1-279.8](#), collected by the Department;
 5. Encourage the development of partnerships between the public and private sectors to promote school safety in Virginia;
 6. Provide technical assistance to Virginia school divisions in the development and implementation of initiatives promoting school safety;
 7. Develop a memorandum of understanding between the Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services and the Superintendent of Public Instruction to ensure collaboration and coordination of roles and responsibilities in areas of mutual concern, such as school safety audits and crime prevention; and
 8. Provide training for and certification of school security officers, as defined in § [9.1-101](#) and consistent with § [9.1-110](#).
- B. All agencies of the Commonwealth shall cooperate with the Center and, upon request, assist the Center in the performance of its duties and responsibilities.
-

Governor's School Safety Task Force Legislative Information

§ 22.1-279.8. School safety audits and school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plans required.

- A. For the purposes of this section, unless the context requires otherwise:

"School crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plan" means the essential procedures, operations, and assignments required to prevent, manage, and respond to a critical event or emergency, including natural disasters involving fire, flood, tornadoes, or other severe weather; loss or disruption of power, water, communications or shelter; bus or other accidents; medical emergencies, including cardiac arrest and other life-threatening medical emergencies; student or staff member deaths; explosions; bomb threats; gun, knife or other weapons threats; spills or exposures to hazardous substances; the presence of unauthorized persons or trespassers; the loss, disappearance or kidnapping of a student; hostage situations; violence on school property or at school activities; incidents involving acts of terrorism; and other incidents posing a serious threat of harm to students, personnel, or facilities. The plan shall include a provision that the Department of Criminal Justice Services and the Virginia Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund shall be contacted immediately to deploy assistance in the event of an emergency as defined in the emergency response plan when there are victims as defined in § [19.2-11.01](#). The Department of Criminal Justice Services and the Virginia Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund shall be the lead coordinating agencies for those individuals determined to be victims, and the plan shall also contain current contact information for both agencies.

"School safety audit" means a written assessment of the safety conditions in each public school to (i) identify and, if necessary, develop solutions for physical safety concerns, including building security issues and (ii) identify and evaluate any patterns of student safety concerns occurring on school property or at school-sponsored events. Solutions and responses shall include recommendations for structural adjustments, changes in school safety procedures, and revisions to the school board's standards for student conduct.

- B. The Virginia Center for School Safety shall develop a list of items to be reviewed and evaluated in the school safety audits required by this section. Such items shall include those incidents reported to school authorities pursuant to § [22.1-279.3:1](#).

The Virginia Center for School Safety shall prescribe a standardized report format for school safety audits, additional reporting criteria, and procedures for report submission, which may include instructions for electronic submission.

Each local school board shall require all schools under its supervisory control to annually conduct school safety audits as defined in this section and consistent with such list.

The results of such school safety audits shall be made public within 90 days of completion. The local school board shall retain authority to withhold or limit the release of any security plans and specific vulnerability assessment components as provided in subdivision 7 of § [2.2-3705.2](#). Each school shall maintain a copy of the school safety audit, which may exclude such security plans and vulnerability assessment components, within the office of the school principal and shall make a copy of such report available for review upon written request.

Each school shall submit a copy of its school safety audit to the relevant school division superintendent. The division superintendent shall collate and submit all such school safety audits, in the prescribed format and manner of submission, to the Virginia Center for School Safety.

- C. The school board may establish a school safety audit committee to consist of representatives of parents, teachers, local law-enforcement agencies, judicial and public safety personnel, and the community at large. The school safety audit committee shall evaluate, in accordance with the directions of the local school board, the safety of each school and submit a plan for improving school safety at a public meeting of the local school board.
- D. Each school board shall ensure that every school that it supervises shall develop a written school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plan, consistent with the definition provided in this section. The Department of Education and the Virginia Center for School Safety shall provide technical assistance to the school divisions of the Commonwealth in the development of the school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plans that describe the components of a medical emergency response plan developed in coordination with local emergency medical services providers, the training of school personnel and students to respond to a life-threatening emergency, and the equipment required for this emergency response. The local school board shall annually review the written school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plans. The local school board shall have the authority to withhold or limit the review of any security plans and specific vulnerability assessment components as provided in subdivision 7 of § [2.2-3705.2](#). The local school division superintendent shall certify this review in writing to the Virginia Center on School Safety no later than August 31 of each year.

Upon consultation with local school boards, division superintendents, the Virginia Center for School Safety, and the Coordinator of Emergency Management, the Board of Education shall develop, and may revise as it deems necessary, a model school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plan for the purpose of assisting the public schools in Virginia in developing viable, effective crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plans. Such model shall set forth recommended effective procedures and means by which parents can contact the relevant school or school division regarding the location and safety of their school children and by which school officials may contact parents, with parental approval, during a critical event or emergency.

(1997, c. [593](#); 1999, cc. [475](#), [516](#), § 22.1-278.1; 2001, cc. [436](#), [440](#), [688](#), [820](#), [841](#); 2002, cc. [166](#), [221](#), [229](#), [235](#); 2003, c. [801](#); 2004, c. [690](#); 2005, c. [904](#); 2006, c. [43](#); 2007, c. [44](#); 2009, cc. [222](#), [269](#); 2012, c. [418](#).)

Governor's School Safety Task Force Legislative Information

§ [22.1-279.3:1](#). Reports of certain acts to school authorities.

- A. Reports shall be made to the division superintendent and to the principal or his designee on all incidents involving (i) the assault or assault and battery, without bodily injury, of any person on a school bus, on school property, or at a school-sponsored activity; (ii) the assault and battery that results in bodily injury, sexual assault, death, shooting, stabbing, cutting, or wounding of any person, or stalking of any person as described in § [18.2-60.3](#), on a school bus, on school property, or at a school-sponsored activity; (iii) any conduct involving alcohol, marijuana, synthetic cannabinoids as defined in § [18.2-248.1:1](#), a controlled substance, imitation controlled substance, or an anabolic steroid on a school bus, on school property, or at a school-sponsored activity, including the theft or attempted theft of student prescription medications; (iv) any threats against school personnel while on a school bus, on school property or at a school-sponsored activity; (v) the illegal carrying of a firearm, as defined in § [22.1-277.07](#), onto school property; (vi) any illegal conduct involving firebombs, explosive materials or devices, or hoax explosive devices, as defined in § [18.2-85](#), or explosive or incendiary devices, as defined in § [18.2-433.1](#), or chemical bombs, as described in § [18.2-87.1](#), on a school bus, on school property, or at a school-sponsored activity; (vii) any threats or false threats to bomb, as described in § [18.2-83](#), made against school personnel or involving school property or school buses; or (viii) the arrest of any student for an incident occurring on a school bus, on school property, or at a school-sponsored activity, including the charge therefore.
- B. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 12 (§ [16.1-299](#) et seq.) of Chapter 11 of Title 16.1, local law-enforcement authorities shall report, and the principal or his designee and the division superintendent shall receive such reports, on offenses, wherever committed, by students enrolled at the school if the offense would be a felony if committed by an adult or would be a violation of the Drug Control Act (§ [54.1-3400](#) et seq.) and occurred on a school bus, on school property, or at a school-sponsored activity, or would be an adult misdemeanor involving any incidents described in clauses (i) through (viii) of subsection A, and whether the student is released to the custody of his parent or, if 18 years of age or more, is released on bond. As part of any report concerning an offense that would be an adult misdemeanor involving an incident described in clauses (i) through (viii) of subsection A, local law-enforcement authorities and attorneys for the Commonwealth shall be authorized to disclose information regarding terms of release from detention, court dates, and terms of any disposition orders entered by the court, to the superintendent of such student's school division, upon request by the superintendent, if, in the determination of the law-enforcement authority or attorney for the Commonwealth, such disclosure would not jeopardize the investigation or prosecution of the case. No disclosures shall be made pursuant to this section in violation of the confidentiality provisions of subsection A of § [16.1-300](#) or the record retention and redisclosure provisions of § [22.1-288.2](#). Further, any school superintendent who receives notification that a juvenile has committed an act that would be a crime if committed by an adult pursuant to subsection G of § [16.1-260](#) shall report such information to the principal of the school in which the juvenile is enrolled.
- C. The principal or his designee shall submit a report of all incidents required to be reported pursuant to this section to the superintendent of the school division. The division superintendent shall annually report all such incidents to the Department of Education for the purpose of recording the frequency of such incidents on forms that shall be provided by the Department and shall make such information available to the public.

In submitting reports of such incidents, principals and division superintendents shall accurately indicate any offenses, arrests, or charges as recorded by law-enforcement authorities and required to be reported by such authorities pursuant to subsection B.

A division superintendent who knowingly fails to comply or secure compliance with the reporting requirements of this subsection shall be subject to the sanctions authorized in § [22.1-65](#). A principal who knowingly fails to comply or secure compliance with the reporting requirements of this section shall be subject to sanctions prescribed by the local school board, which may include, but need not be limited to, demotion or dismissal.

The principal or his designee shall also notify the parent of any student involved in an incident required pursuant to this section to be reported, regardless of whether disciplinary action is taken against such student or the nature of the disciplinary action. Such notice shall relate to only the relevant student's involvement and shall not include information concerning other students. Whenever any student commits any reportable incident as set forth in this section, such student shall be required to participate in such prevention and intervention activities as deemed appropriate by the superintendent or his designee. Prevention and intervention activities shall be identified in the local school division's drug and violence prevention plans developed pursuant to the federal Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Title IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act).

- D. Except as may otherwise be required by federal law, regulation, or jurisprudence, the principal shall immediately report to the local law-enforcement agency any act enumerated in clauses (ii) through (vii) of subsection A that may constitute a criminal offense and may report to the local law-enforcement agency any incident described in clause (i) of subsection A.

Further, except as may be prohibited by federal law, regulation, or jurisprudence, the principal shall also immediately report any act enumerated in clauses (ii) through (v) of subsection A that may constitute a criminal offense to the parents of any minor student who is the specific object of such act. Further, the principal shall report that the incident has been reported to local law enforcement as required by law and that the parents may contact local law enforcement for further information, if they so desire.

- E. A statement providing a procedure and the purpose for the requirements of this section shall be included in school board policies required by § [22.1-253.13:7](#).
- F. The Board of Education shall promulgate regulations to implement this section, including, but not limited to, establishing reporting dates and report formats.
- G. For the purposes of this section, "parent" or "parents" means any parent, guardian or other person having control or charge of a child.
- H. This section shall not be construed to diminish the authority of the Board of Education or to diminish the Governor's authority to coordinate and provide policy direction on official communications between the Commonwealth and the United States government.

(1981, c. 189; 1990, cc. 517, 797; 1991, c. 295; 1994, cc. [265](#), [285](#); 1995, cc. [759](#), [773](#); 1996, cc. [916](#), [964](#); 1999, c. [970](#); 2000, cc. [79](#), [611](#), § [22.1-280.1](#); 2001, cc. [688](#), [820](#); 2002, c. [388](#); 2003, cc. [899](#), [954](#); 2004, cc. [517](#), [542](#), [939](#), [955](#); 2005, cc. [461](#), [484](#), [528](#); 2006, c. [146](#); 2010, c. [525](#); 2011, cc. [384](#), [410](#).)

Governor's School Safety Task Force Legislative Information

§ 9.1-101. Definitions.

"**School resource officer**" means a certified law-enforcement officer hired by the local law-enforcement agency to provide law-enforcement and security services to Virginia public elementary and secondary schools.

"**School security officer**" means an individual who is employed by the local school board for the singular purpose of maintaining order and discipline, preventing crime, investigating violations of school board policies, and detaining students violating the law or school board policies on school property or at school-sponsored events and who is responsible solely for ensuring the safety, security, and welfare of all students, faculty, staff, and visitors in the assigned school.

§ 9.1-102. Powers and duties of the Board and the Department. *(excerpt only)*

44. Establish, in consultation with the Department of Education and the Virginia State Crime Commission, compulsory minimum standards for employment and job-entry and in-service training curricula and certification requirements for school security officers, which training and certification shall be administered by the Virginia Center for School Safety pursuant to § 9.1-184. Such training standards shall include, but shall not be limited to, the role and responsibility of school security officers, relevant state and federal laws, school and personal liability issues, security awareness in the school environment, mediation and conflict resolution, disaster and emergency response, and student behavioral dynamics. The Department shall establish an advisory committee consisting of local school board representatives, principals, superintendents, and school security personnel to assist in the development of these standards and certification requirements;

49. Establish minimum standards for (i) employment, (ii) job-entry and in-service training curricula, and (iii) certification requirements for campus security officers. Such training standards shall include, but not be limited to, the role and responsibility of campus security officers, relevant state and federal laws, school and personal liability issues, security awareness in the campus environment, and disaster and emergency response. The Department shall provide technical support and assistance to campus police departments and campus security departments on the establishment and implementation of policies and procedures, including but not limited to: the management of such departments, investigatory procedures, judicial referrals, the establishment and management of databases for campus safety and security information sharing, and development of uniform record keeping for disciplinary records and statistics, such as campus crime logs, judicial referrals and Clery Act statistics. The Department shall establish an advisory committee consisting of college administrators, college police chiefs, college security department chiefs, and local law-enforcement officials to assist in the development of the standards and certification requirements and training pursuant to this subdivision;

Governor's School Safety Task Force Legislative Information

§ [23-9.2:10](#). Violence prevention committee; threat assessment team.

- A. Each public college or university shall have in place policies and procedures for the prevention of violence on campus, including assessment and intervention with individuals whose behavior poses a threat to the safety of the campus community.
- B. The board of visitors or other governing body of each public institution of higher education shall determine a committee structure on campus of individuals charged with education and prevention of violence on campus. Each committee shall include representatives from student affairs, law enforcement, human resources, counseling services, residence life, and other constituencies as needed. Such committee shall also consult with legal counsel as needed. Once formed, each committee shall develop a clear statement of: (i) mission, (ii) membership, and (iii) leadership. Such statement shall be published and available to the campus community.
- C. Each committee shall be charged with: (i) providing guidance to students, faculty, and staff regarding recognition of threatening or aberrant behavior that may represent a threat to the community; (ii) identification of members of the campus community to whom threatening behavior should be reported; and (iii) policies and procedures for the assessment of individuals whose behavior may present a threat, appropriate means of intervention with such individuals, and sufficient means of action, including interim suspension or medical separation to resolve potential threats.
- D. The board of visitors or other governing body of each public institution of higher education shall establish a specific threat assessment team that shall include members from law enforcement, mental health professionals, representatives of student affairs and human resources, and, if available, college or university counsel. Such team shall implement the assessment, intervention and action policies set forth by the committee pursuant to subsection C.
- E. Each threat assessment team shall establish relationships or utilize existing relationships with local and state law-enforcement agencies as well as mental health agencies to expedite assessment and intervention with individuals whose behavior may present a threat to safety. Upon a preliminary determination that an individual poses a threat of violence to self or others, or exhibits significantly disruptive behavior or need for assistance, a threat assessment team may obtain criminal history record information, as provided in §§ [19.2-389](#) and [19.2-389.1](#), and health records, as provided in § [32.1-127.1:03](#). No member of a threat assessment team shall redisclose any criminal history record information or health information obtained pursuant to this section or otherwise use any record of an individual beyond the purpose for which such disclosure was made to the threat assessment team.

(2008, cc. [450](#), [533](#); 2010, cc. [456](#), [524](#).)

Governor's Task Force on School and Campus Safety

**Presentation Notes: Donna Michaelis,
Director of Virginia Center for School Safety, Department of Criminal Justice Services**

January 14, 2013

Slide 1

Good afternoon esteemed members of the School and Campus Safety Task Force and honored colleagues.

I am Donna Michaelis, Director of the Virginia Center for School Safety and Public Safety Training Manager at the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. It is my honor to be here today to share with you the background of School and Campus Safety training efforts in the past decade at DCJS. I am offering a brief snapshot of legislation, training, and data relevant to our challenge here today in hopes of guiding sound discussion and relevant recommendations.

Slide 2

In my brief presentation, I will offer an overview of what school safety looks like in Virginia. Please keep in mind, Virginia is considered to be a leader in school safety efforts across the nation, in regards to our legislation, resources, and training. Many other states as well as national associations, look to Virginia to guide their own efforts.

We will look briefly at:

- Relevant laws and their requirements;
- School resource officer data in Virginia schools;
- School Security officers and how many divisions are utilizing them; and
- Certain elements of the school safety audit survey and some trend data.

In the world of higher education, DCJS has a limited legislative role but is highly involved in the creation of the campus security officer program and assisting in the support and training of threat assessment teams and violence prevention committees.

Slide 3

I will start with K-12 Public education. I would like to point out that in the remainder of my presentation, all the data I present is in relation to public education. DCJS has no legal mandate to provide training and support services to private schools however, all of our trainings, conferences, and resources are made available to private education. Private schools do not have to comply with school safety audits, crisis management plans or other legislative mandates I will discuss. Yet, having said that, we are often contacted by private schools often for technical assistance and resources to assist them.

Slide 4

To start, it is important to point out that DCJS looks at schools slightly differently than the Virginia Department of Education. While DOE's definition and allocation of a "school code" depend upon whether there is a defined school enrollment and SOL testing, DCJS views it slightly differently. Since our charge is to assess building security and safety conditions, as well as student and teacher perceptions of such, we look at the physical school structures that house students on a daily basis throughout the school year. Therefore, an alternative school, which houses students everyday but whose actual enrollment lies with their "home school" will be labeled a "school" for school safety audit purposes but will not be considered a separate school by DOE. For purposes of the school safety audit, DCJS and the VCSS would require such school to conduct a school safety survey.

Slide 5

This breakdown by type of schools in Virginia is by the grade levels taught at each school. Generally these are

K – 5 = elementary school

6 – 8 = middle, and

9 – 12 = high

The 2012 survey conducted from August – September 2012 reveals the following:

58% of Virginia schools are elementary schools

17% of schools are classified as middle schools

And 19% are considered high schools.

"Other schools" encompasses Department of Correctional Education (Now DOC) schools, Governor's Schools, and regional schools. These schools make up the remaining 6% to bring the total to 1981.

Slide 6

Our schools and campuses are statistically one of the safest places you can be. The highest percentages of where we are likely to be hurt or killed are NOT in our schools or on our campuses. As the Incident Based Reporting system attests only:

3/10 of 1% of homicide incidents between 2005—2011 occurred in our schools or colleges.

We are much more likely to be killed in our home. Over 50% of homicides in that same time period occurred in the home.

Another 25% of homicides occurred on our roadways.

While horrific tragedies like Sandy Hook in Connecticut and our own VA Tech rattle us to the core, statistically, and thankfully, they are not the norm.

Slide 7

Following the senseless killings at Columbine in April 1999, our General Assembly created the Virginia Center for School Safety and placed it at the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services in July 2000. The Center was allocated a portion of state funds and one position to accomplish the following mandates:

First, the Center shall:

1. Provide **training** for Virginia public school personnel in school safety, and in the effective identification of students who may be at risk for violent behavior and in need of special services or assistance;

In last year's General Assembly session, evidence-based antibullying tactics was also added to the list of items for which the Center should provide training.

Currently, the Center provides over 75 trainings per year and at least 3 major conferences. Training topics include:

Suicide Prevention including SafeTALK , Question, Persuade, and Respond (QPR), Applied Suicide Intervention Skills Training (ASIST)

Bullying Prevention including two major conferences in the past year for over 800 participants titled

Bullying in our Schools and Bullying Prevention in the Promotion of a Positive School Climate which was conducted in conjunction with University of Virginia's Youth Nex Center, the Department of Education and the Department of Health.

Legal Issues Trainings to include Advanced Legal Issues for SROs and School Administrators, Interview Skills, Search and Seizure, and The Rights of School and Police Personnel in Managing Your School Environment.

Communication/Conflict Resolution including such titles as Communicating and Intervening with At-Risk Youth, Communicating with Demanding Parents and Difficult Students, and Working with Volatile People.

In the realm of School-Police Partnerships, we hosted this year our first "Public Schools and Public Safety Partnerships: A Conversation to Address the Impact of Community Violence on Schools "for school superintendents and law enforcement executives. We highlighted the need to cooperate and collaborate to address violence in our communities as it affects our students. Other partnership trainings include School Resource Officer Basic Training, School Security Officer Basic Training, and Advanced Training for SROs and School Principals. Annually since 2001, the Virginia Center for School Safety has hosted the Virginia School Safety Training Forum. Approximately 700 participants attend to hear 8 keynote speakers and 40 workshops on relevant school safety topics. Also, in the past two years we have added Autism Awareness for Law Enforcement Officers.

Other pertinent topics include **Gang and Drug Prevention**, **Crisis Management in Schools**, and Homeland Security in our Schools.

2. We are to serve as a **resource and referral center** for Virginia school divisions by conducting research, sponsoring workshops, and providing information regarding current school safety concerns.

To this end, we offer:

- Virginia Street Drug Identification Guide
- Juvenile Law Handbook For School Administrators
- Virginia Rules Law Related Education Program in concert with the Office of the Attorney General
- The Incident Commander System (computer simulated table top scenarios)
- The video Critical Incident: What To Do in the First Twenty Minutes: (on how to survive and respond to a school shooting BEFORE the police arrive)
- Also with the Office of the Attorney General we promote two gang prevention videos for middle and high school titled the Big Lie: Unmasking the Truth and The Wrong Family.

3. **Next we are to maintain and disseminate information** to local school divisions on **effective school safety initiatives**. This is accomplished through the plethora of conferences, specialized trainings, and task specific forums and roundtables previously described.
4. We also collect, analyze, and disseminate various Virginia school safety data, including **school safety audit information** (code § [22.1-279.8](#).) We annually publish School Safety Audit Report at the conclusion of the annual survey of principals.
5. Next we are to encourage the development of **partnerships** between the public and private sectors to promote school safety in Virginia;

Obviously, in looking at this aggressive list of mandates, DCJS could not begin to accomplish these goals without the assistance of our sister agencies. All of the agencies here have assisted us in reaching our audience of school personnel, law enforcement officers working in schools and on campuses, school and campus security, prosecutors and other vital school personnel by allowing us to bring their trainings and programs to our audience or assisting us in sponsoring trainings, conferences and resources. By combining our efforts, we have done great things together.

Specifically, **Virginia Department of Education** annually co-sponsors our Virginia School Safety Training Forum which brings together 700 attendees from Virginia schools and law enforcement agencies. They assist in the distribution of resources and in the promotion of the School Safety Audit Program.

Virginia Department of Health offers vital suicide prevention programming in the form of SAFE Talk, Campus Connections, and Applied Suicide Intervention Skills Training. They also co-sponsor our annual conferences and provide workshops on violence and sexual assault prevention and evidence based bullying prevention programs.

Virginia Office of the Attorney General (OAG) has been a vital partner in the promotion of law related education programs for schools and legal training seminars on safety issues affecting our children. Through the Virginia Rules Program, school resource officers, as well as many other advocates in our schools and community, have access to 19 SOL correlated law related and violence prevention lesson plans. The OAG has also assisted in many training programs to include Search and Seizure issues, human trafficking, Virginia Community and Law Enforcement Gang

Training and in the review and compilation of the Virginia Juvenile Law Handbook for School Administrators.

Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services is assisting us with mental health first aid for law enforcement officers and in Autism Awareness for law enforcement officers.

Virginia Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control has been a strong advocate by offering drug and alcohol prevention information and workshops and in promotion of the Youth Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Project.

Virginia State Police annually co-hosts and sponsors the Virginia School Safety Training Forum and Annual DARE Conference by pooling our resources and working together for the benefit of our mutual audience. There are many, many others as well.

7. We are also tasked with providing **technical assistance** to Virginia school divisions in the development and implementation of initiatives promoting school safety and in providing **training for and certification of school security officers**.

Slide 8

As mentioned previously, the safety audit is mandated.

- ✓ Per legislation, a "school safety audit" means a written assessment of the safety conditions in each public school to first identify and develop solutions for physical safety concerns, including building security issues and secondly to identify and evaluate any patterns of student safety concerns occurring on school property..
 - ✓ It directs the Virginia Center for School Safety to develop a list of items to be reviewed and evaluated in the school safety audits.
 - ✓ Each local school board must require all schools to annually conduct school safety audits,
 - ✓ And provides for FOIA protection for security and surveillance parts of the audit and crisis plans,
- The Center, in partnership with the VDOE, determined that a survey of all school principals and their school safety team was the most efficient and salient means of collecting information in regards to the definition of the audit and for use by the General Assembly and the constituents of the Commonwealth.
 - The Center worked in cooperation with DOE and a School Safety Audit Task Force to develop survey topics and questions that addressed best practices and captured schools' current safety practices and recommendations.
 - The use of the school safety survey tool is to guide school administrators and division superintendents in the best practices and evidence based processes in the field of school safety while capturing an accurate snapshot of current practices.
 - Under the **Crisis Management Plan legislation**:

- Each school board shall ensure that every school that it supervises shall develop a written school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plan.
- And the local school division superintendent shall certify this review in writing to the Virginia Center on School Safety no later than August 31 of each year.

Slide 9

- To date, 100% of Virginia Public Schools have complied with the requirement to conduct an annual school safety audit.
- 100% of Virginia Public School Divisions developed a written school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plan.
- 97% of schools practiced their crisis management plan during the 2011 – 2012 school year.

Slide 10

- **Only 28% of schools had to activate their crisis management plan for any reason at all.**
- Of the 28% of schools that activated their crisis management plans (**548 schools**), most of the activations were for reasons of non-violent, non-criminal events.
*(to include weather-related events, accidents/
health-related events, power outages, smoke/fumes/fire, false alarm, hazardous chemical, etc.)*

Slide 11

In the APA, school safety regulations state that:

8VAC20-131-260.

Each school shall maintain records of regular safety, health, and fire inspections that have been conducted and certified by local health and fire departments. These regs include

at least one simulated lock-down and crisis emergency evacuation activity to be conducted early in the school year.

School safety survey results state that:

94% of schools* reported they have practiced their lockdown drill at least once per year.

Please be reminded that not all “schools” that DCJS surveys must comply with this regulation since they are not deemed schools by DOE. However, as you can see, most still do.

Slide 12

In moving onto to school resource officers, they are by Code, (**§ 9.1-101**), defined as a certified law-enforcement officer hired by the local law-enforcement agency to provide law-enforcement and security services to Virginia public elementary and secondary schools.

However, in the creation of the § 9.1-110. School Resource Officer Grants Program and Fund.

...the Fund designated that grants would be awarded to local law-enforcement agencies and local school boards to employ uniformed school resource officers, in **middle and high schools**.

Slide 13

- From the 2012 school safety audit survey, 47% of all schools report having at least a part time presence of school resource officers.
- The number of **fulltime** school resource officers assigned to all schools since 2008 has remained relatively consistent dropping only 3 % from 2008 to 2011 in spite of economic hardships on the localities. (29% to 26% respectively)
- Local law enforcement agencies and school divisions pay for the salaries of these personnel.

Slide 14

The following schools reported that they have **School Resource Officers (SROs)** working at least part time in their school in the 2012 survey.

Elementary 271 (of 1152 schools) = **24%**

Middle 289 (of 339 schools) = **85%**

High 323 (of 332 schools) = **87%**

Slide 15

In regard to “school security officers” the code defines them as an individual who is employed by the local school board for the singular purpose of maintaining order and discipline. This includes preventing crime, investigating violations of school board policies, and detaining students violating the law or school board policies on school property or at school-sponsored events. These persons are solely responsible for ensuring the safety, security, and welfare of all students, faculty, staff, and visitors in the assigned school.

Slide 16

- There are currently 900 school security officers certified and working within 30 school divisions within the Commonwealth.
- 17 % of schools reported in 2012 to have school security officers in schools at least part time. (330 schools)

- The number of school security officers working full time in public schools has remained fairly consistent since 2008 dropping only one percent from 2008 to 2011 (18% to 17%).

Slide 17

Other pertinent facts from this year's survey reveal information on security and surveillance, particularly Access Control Strategies

- **53% of all schools** reported that they had a **controlled access system** in place.
- The breakdown by school type is 59% of all elementary schools.
- 51% of all middle schools
- And 37% of all high schools.

Slide 18

- In reference to locked entrances,
- **73% of all schools** report that **all exterior entrances are locked** during school hours.
- The breakdown by school type is 78% of all elementary schools
- And 74% of all middle schools.

Slide 19

- 61 % of all high schools report that all exterior entrances are locked during school hours.
- Finally, in reference to surveillance,
- **46% of all schools** reported that **someone is stationed at the front entrance** of the school at all times during school hours to ensure that visitors report to the main office for visitor check-in.

Slide 20

- **The breakdown by type of school is 43% of all elementary schools** reported that **someone is stationed at the front entrance**.
- **46% of all middle schools**
- And **56% of all high schools**.

Slide 21

As I mentioned at the beginning, DCJS's responsibilities in regard to legislative mandates in higher education are minimal. In 2006, after completion of the Crime Commission Study on Campus Safety, the General Assembly passed legislation mandating that DCJS create minimum training standards for campus security officers. DCJS also created an advisory committee to assist in the

development of such. This Advisory committee would prove to be a starting point for assistance with other campus safety related issues and trainings as well.

Slide 22

Code § 9.1-102 directs DCJS to establish minimum standards for employment, job-entry and in-service training, and certification requirements for campus security officers.

The Department shall also provide **technical support** ...and assistance to campus police departments and campus security departments on the establishment and implementation of policies and procedures.

The Advisory **committee shall** consist of college administrators, college police chiefs, college security department chiefs, and local law-enforcement officials to assist in the development of the standards and certification requirements and training.

Slide 23

- To this end, the Governor passed proposed regulations on May 31, 2012
- CJSB approved final regulations on December 6, 2012
- 1,100 CSOs trained to date
- 83 CSO instructors
- 160 classes instructed to date

Slide 24

In 2008, after the tragedy at VA Tech, the General Assembly passed legislation mandating violence prevention committees and threat assessment teams on public institutions of higher education. ([§ 23-9.2:10](#))

Slide 25

Since DCJS had an established advisory committee on campus safety, the committee asked DCJS to assist with training and guidance in the development of such. With international and national experts within our Commonwealth, DCJS began to collaborate with VA Tech and other experts in the field to provide the model and training for these newly mandated teams.

Slide 26

- Each committee shall be charged with:
 - providing guidance to students, faculty, and staff regarding recognition of threatening or aberrant behavior that may represent a threat to the community;
 - identification of members of the campus community to whom threatening behavior should be reported; and

- policies and procedures for the assessment of individuals whose behavior may present a threat.

Slide 27

- Each committee shall establish a specific threat assessment team.
- Each threat assessment team shall establish relationships or utilize existing relationships with local and state law-enforcement agencies as well as mental health agencies to expedite assessment and intervention with individuals whose behavior may present a threat to safety.

Slide 28

DCJS took lead in assisting colleges and universities with the implementation of this legislation. In concert with Virginia Tech and the University of Virginia, we held some formational training then launched a specific series of trainings aimed at basic and advanced threat assessment team training and relevant legal issues surrounding them.

Slide 29

We have expanded our scope in relation to threat assessment team training by launching training topics and conferences on other issues as well. In 2011, DCJS hosted a National Forum on Campus Sexual Assault with international experts in the field. 135 colleges and universities from across the nation attended including University of California, Harvard University, Yale University and many others from across the nation.

Slide 30

School and campus safety will continue to be an ongoing and relevant topic in which we must continue to work together, share information, seek out best practices and evidence based programming to ensure that our students can thrive and achieve in the safest environment possible. If you find you have questions about anything school safety related, please get in touch with me and we get answers back to you as soon as possible. Thank you for your time.

Governor's School and Campus Safety Task Force Public Safety Workgroup

Definitions

1. **Crime Analysis** is a process of collecting and studying detailed information in order to identify the underlying cause of crime, or fear of crime.
2. **Crime Prevention** - "Crime Prevention is the anticipation, recognition and appraisal of a crime risk and the initiation of some action to remove or reduce it." -- National Crime Prevention Institute
3. **Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED**-pronounced septed) is a philosophy that states, "The proper use and effective design of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the incidence and fear of crime, and an improvement in the quality of life." -- C. Ray Jeffrey
4. **Crisis Plan**-Defined in 22.1-279.8 Code of Virginia as the essential procedures, operations, and assignments required to prevent, manage and respond to a critical event or emergency.
5. **Electronic Access Control** - uses computers to solve the limitations of mechanical locks and keys. A wide range of credentials can be used to replace mechanical keys. The electronic access control system grants access based on the credential presented. When access is granted, the door is unlocked for a predetermined time and the transaction is recorded. When access is refused, the door remains locked and the attempted access is recorded. The system will also monitor the door and alarm if the door is forced open or held open too long after being unlocked.
6. **Electronic Access** is a method of security that uses devices to electronically identify an authorized user and provide access through unlocking the control point.
7. **External Security** - External Security Measures means any measure taken outside a facility to provide a more secure environment. These measures may address enhancements to the exterior physical structures (locks, lights, alarms, etc.), the design features relative to providing observation opportunities, access control and a sense of ownership or the procedures, policies and operations addressing external issues such as parking, fencing, school bus loading and unloading etc.
8. **Incident Command System (ICS)** The Incident Command System (ICS) dates back to the early 1970s. Responding to a series of wildland fires in Southern California, municipal, state, county, and federal resources worked together to achieve a single goal. Because agency differences in communications, control, strategy management, and other leadership concerns, as well as the use of nonstandard terminology, caused many difficulties, the agencies produced a plan called FIRESCOPE to combat these problems and create centralized control. The National Fire Academy adopted this program, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police endorsed it in 1987. The federal government eventually endorsed this plan and now requires its use in any operation involving hazardous materials.

9. **Internal Security Measures** means any measure taken inside a facility to provide a more secure environment. These measures may address enhancements to the physical structures (locks, lights, alarms, etc.) or the procedures, policies and operations within a facility (mail handling, staff assignments, reporting responsibilities etc.)
10. **National Incident Management (NIMS)** On February 28, 2003, President Bush issued Homeland Security Presidential Directive-5. HSPD-5 directed the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop and administer a National Incident Management System (NIMS). NIMS provides a consistent nationwide template to enable all government, private-sector, and nongovernmental organizations to work together during domestic incidents (www.fema.gov). Through Incident Command System (ICS) training, NIMS provides a unified approach to incident management; standard command and management structures; and emphasis on preparedness, mutual aid and resource management.
11. **Perimeter Security** – may include state-of-the-art security systems, including perimeter security, perimeter intrusion detection (PIDS) and intruder deterrent such as patrolling security officers or may be as simple as fencing, gates and appropriate landscaping.
12. **Private Security Officer/Registrant** - means any qualified individual who has met the requirements under this article to perform the duties of alarm respondent, locksmith, armored car personnel, central station dispatcher, courier, electronic security sales representative, electronic security technician, electronic security technician's assistant, personal protection specialist, private investigator, security canine handler, detector canine handler, unarmed security officer or armed security officer. (§ 9.1-138) Training Requirements - Unarmed Security: 18 hours, Armed Security: 18 hours plus Firearms Training, 8 hours-Armed Security Officer Arrest Authority, 14 hours-Handgun, 2 hours-Shotgun
13. **Problem Solving** in a law enforcement context generally refers to a process of obtaining information, evaluating or analyzing it in order to identify the underlying problem and then developing and implementing a response to address the underlying problem. There is generally follow-up evaluation to measure effectiveness.
14. **Safety Audit** - Defined in 22.1-279.8 Code of Virginia as a written assessment of the safety conditions in each public school to identify and, if necessary, develop solutions for physical safety concerns
15. **School Resource Officer** - means a certified law-enforcement officer hired by the local law-enforcement agency to provide law-enforcement and security services to Virginia public elementary and secondary schools. (§ 9.1-101)
16. **School Security Officer** - means an individual who is employed by the local school board for the singular purpose of maintaining order and discipline, preventing crime, investigating violations of school board policies, and detaining students violating the law or school board policies on school property or at school-sponsored events and who is responsible solely for ensuring the safety, security, and welfare of all students, faculty, staff, and visitors in the assigned school. Not a law enforcement officer (§ 9.1-101). Training Requirement – 32 hours

17. **School Crisis Management** – A crisis is generally described as an unstable or crucial time or state of affairs in which a decisive change is impending, especially one with the distinct possibility of a highly undesirable outcome. In a crisis, school personnel could be faced with inadequate information, limited time, impending or current violence and insufficient resources. Natural disasters can be floods, earthquakes, fires and/or tornadoes striking a community with little or no warning. An emergency is normally described as an unforeseen combination of circumstances or the resulting state that calls for immediate action to avoid a “disaster.” Planning for emergencies properly requires that a four phase process is utilized. This four phase process (items a-d) involves the four components listed below. Other definitions follow.

- a. **Mitigation/Prevention:** What a school can do to reduce or eliminate the risk to life and property from a hazardous event. (Reduce the need for Response) Practice drills, establish safety procedures (e.g. all visitors report to office), train staff and students, practice checking locked doors, examine discipline policies, identify security issues (i.e. develop a “locked door” policy)
- b. **Preparedness:** Focus on the process of planning for the worst-case scenario. Expect surprises. Establish the Crisis Management/Intervention Plan empowering all necessary resource and school personnel. Communication, Training and Equipment are key elements of Preparedness. Command Center and Classroom Go-Kits play an important role in school preparedness.
- c. **Response:** Immediate implementation of the Crisis Management/Intervention Plan during a crisis. Follow the designed plan and do not try to invent a new plan in the middle of a crisis!
- d. **Recovery:** Restoring the learning and teaching environment after a crisis and returning to the business of school. This includes debriefing, emotional needs assessment, clean up or repair of the building, and long and short-term stress management for all concerned. Recovery involves psychological and structural components.
- e. **Go-Kit:** Generally describes a container of items placed in the Command Center and classrooms to be used for crisis/emergency situations. The Command Center Kit should contain an AM/FM radio/weather monitor, school maps, master keys, communication devices, emergency Fire/EMS and law enforcement contact names and numbers and the Division wide Crisis Guide. A pair of binoculars in the Command Center go-kit could serve to identify potential problems at a distance and to quickly ascertain the level of an emergency on a playground or along the edge of the school property. Classroom go-kits should include names of students in each class period, students identified as having physical, emotional, or medical limitations needing special assistance in emergencies, those needing periodic medication, surgical gloves, band aids, first aid supplies, and the points of contact persons designated to answer pertinent questions.
- f. **Crisis Management/Intervention Team:** Persons representing school nurse/EMS/First Aid trained volunteers, custodian(s), administrator(s), School Resource/DARE Officer(s), Fire/EMS services representative, teachers, who identify the types of crises that may occur in the school and define what events would activate the school's crisis/emergency plan.
- g. **Command Center:** The operations location of the crisis team during a crisis or drill housing representatives of school staff, law enforcement, Fire/EMS, medical personnel and other appropriate service agencies with access to communication, keys, school maps, etc. Because the office may be compromised in an emergency, a secondary command center should also be established and adequately equipped.

- h. **Triage Area:** A designated place to allocate medical attention and treatment to patients and disaster victims under a system of priorities designed to maximize the number of survivors. School nurses and/or volunteer First Aid personnel must maintain the area until medical teams/Fire-EMS personnel arrive on scene.
 - i. **Evacuation and Reverse Evacuation:** To withdraw, relocate, or move students/people in an orderly manner from an insecure or unsafe area to an area/place determined to further ensure their personal safety.
 - j. **Shelter in Place:** Seeking safe shelter or safe physical concealment from harm in an open area such as a cafeteria or gym. To shelter in place in a classroom means having students sit against a solid wall, away from windows. Have employees familiar with the building's mechanical systems. Turn off all fans, heating and air conditioning systems. Some systems automatically provide for exchange of inside air with outside air. These systems, in particular, need to be turned off, sealed, or disabled.
 - k. **Lockdown:** When all staff and students are directed by the administration to report to or to remain in the classrooms or to "shelter in place" when in an open classroom or play ground area. Teachers lock their doors and account for all students under their care while having students sit away from windows and against solid walls.
 - l. **Intruder/Guest:** A guest is an authorized patron, parent, or any volunteer or visitor who abides by school rules governing entry and accessibility into a school building. A guest may become an intruder when he/she fails to abide by established and posted rules after being requested to do so by a school official or employee.
 - m. **Green "All Clear" Safe Card:** The green card is a paper card with the room number assigned and placed under the classroom door out to the hallway to indicate to law enforcement/school authorities that the room is "safe" at the immediate point in time and that all students are accounted for and are in their "shelter in place" positions.
 - n. **Secure the Perimeter/Secure the Building:** When the threat is external versus an immediate threat to the campus. This is an alternative to a lockdown when the threat is in the community but may pose a threat to the campus. Staff and students are directed by the administration to report to or to remain inside the school, but may continue instruction.
18. **Security Survey/Report** differs from an audit primarily in that historically the audit examines the process to ensure certain things are in place that may lead to solutions but it does not provide the solutions generally. The survey is a detailed examination of the physical environment for vulnerabilities by a team or individual specifically trained in CPTED, Target Hardening, and crime prevention techniques resulting in recommendations for removing or reducing those vulnerabilities in a report.
19. **Target Hardening** is a concept of protecting vulnerable areas through the use of physical security devices. (Locks, electronic access control, etc.)
20. **Threat Assessment** - Threat Assessment is a process to identify and respond to students, faculty and staff who may pose a danger to others on campus, may pose a danger to themselves, or who may simply be struggling and in need of assistance and resources. www.threatassessment.vt.edu; ...for the purpose of preventing violence in school or on campus, including the assessment and intervention with individuals whose behavior poses a threat to the safety of the campus community. (§23-9.2:10)

21. **Threat Assessment Team** - ...each committee or team shall include representatives from student affairs, law enforcement, human resources, counseling services, residence life, and other constituencies as needed. Such committee shall also consult with legal counsel as needed. (§23-9.2:10) .

Threat Assessment Team is a group of trained professionals from different departments across campus who discuss and evaluate behaviors of concern that could precede a violent event. This could be violence to self, others, campus, or the ... community. (www.threatassessment.vt.edu)