School Safety Advisory Committee  
March 7, 2013  
ESD 105, Yakima  
MEETING NOTES  

Present: Frank Hewins; Randy Town; Paul Martin; Brian Winter; Greg Williamson; Lois Menard; Nancy Bernard; Mary Schoenfeldt; Bob Graham; Susan Sartain; Kevin McKay; Robert Morales; Shelby Langdon; Bob McMullen; Gabe Villanueva; Bruce Kuennen; Mike Donlin.  
K20: Peggy Sandberg, Keith Merritt, Scott LeBar; Walt Bigby; Scott Emry, Chuck Goodwin; Mary Sue Linville.  

Frank Hewins opened the meeting at 9:00. As there were several new people and several people on K20, everyone introduced himself/herself.  
Frank asked for a motion to accept the notes form the February meeting. The group took a few minutes to review those notes. It was moved and seconded to accept them; they were accepted unanimously.  

The first agenda item was an update on the ongoing SRO/SSO survey. Mike indicated that, as of the date of the meeting, there had been 513 responses to the brief survey. The survey had been sent to school principals. With 295 districts, and a reported 1943 “principals”, the number of responses reflected a 26.4% return rate with 65% of the LEA’s represented. Using the definitions provided (developed by Randy T.), from the responses:  
1. 26% indicated that they had an SRO; 14%, an SSO/CSO; 2% private security and 63% had none;  
2. Of those with “none”;  
   a. 59% indicated that it was due to lack of funding; 16%, not a priority and 18% unsure;  
3. Of those with a security officer:  
   a. 76% shared with another school; 24% did not share  
   b. 35% indicated that their security person was on campus for 1 hour/day; 15% said 7 hours and 28% said 8+ hours/day;  
   c. 39% indicated all their security staff was “armed”; 42% none are armed; there was a range of other responses.  
   d. 93% of the armed security staff carries a gun; 71% has a tazer; 31% carries a club.  
4. (Following the meeting, Mike did some further looking at numbers based on school level. The numbers are rough due to the variety of configurations of schools. Of those which indicated that they are clearly elementary or secondary (middle/junior/highschool), 38% were elementary and 54% secondary. There are also several K-8 and K-12 buildings, and several more which did not indicate level.)  

Although the rate has slowed, there is still information coming in. There were several follow-up questions which these numbers generated:  
1. If you had funding, would you hire an SRO / SSO / contract for private security?  
2. Who pays for the current staff? (There was limited information provided in the current survey.)  
3. What is the level of training for the various categories of school security personnel? Are they trained to standards?  
4. Can we further refine the questions around being “armed”?  

Frank also shared some preliminary data from AASA on SRO’s nationwide:  
1. Fewer than 60% of schools have an SRO; most are MS/HS level;
2. 90% are armed;
3. Fewer than 50% of LEA’s provide training;
4. 99% of schools said that their SRO’s had a positive impact on their school.

There were some bill updates.
1. 5197 – School Safety / Alarms systems: discussion centered around the details of implementing such a requirement. Would the alarm go straight to local law enforcement or to a 3rd party provider first? If the requirement of simply an alarm, first responders would not know what the emergency situation was. How would this be accommodated? What if an alarm were accidently activated and school staff was unaware? “The devil is in the details.”
2. 5563 – Sexual Abuse / CSEC Education: Requires an update to sexual abuse and safety education; WSSDA, OSPI and several organizations are named within the bill to write/update materials, and provide/disseminate training.
3. 5620- Safety Drill Requirements: Changes the # of required fire drills, but maintains 1 drill / month: 3 lock down, 1 shelter-in-place, 3 fire, 1 other. Some pushback form Fire Safety: we can’t get lax on fire preparedness. May be a combination of fire and ‘other’ drills to keep fire in the forefront.
4. 8203 -> 5618 – Student searches: adds SRO’s to the reasonable search standard in schools.
5. 5301 – Data – Requires disaggregation by race/ethnicity; requires collection of new ‘discipline’ categories; requires definitions.

Although the intent is very good, the question was raised as to whether legislators understand the complexity of some of these issues.

Greg updated the Committee on the status of the Safety Corps legislation. He reminded the Committee that, not too many years ago, school safety and the functions of the Safety Center were funded at over $20M. We are now at about $200K/bienniu. He noted that, although the events of 12.14.12 in CT were tragic, they did raise awareness of the need to focus in on school safety. In addition, it is also well documented that students who feel safe and secure in school perform better. Earlier on, we had defined “school safety” and developed a “safety Corps” concept paralleling that of the School Nurse Corps. It was rolled into the dropout budget package. After Sandy Hook and after conversations with the Advisory Committee, that “Safety Corps” concept was separated back out of the dropout package. The package was shared with Randy Dorn (OSPI), Sue Rahr (CJTC), and the ESD superintendents. The package may be built into proviso language as operating budget.

The focus topic for the day’s meeting was on active shooters. Randy led the group into the discussion by noting that the ESD and all the local superintendents had met on 1.4.123, with weekly meetings with superintendents after that, to discuss school safety measures. Yakima County Sherrif’s Office Lt. Brian Winter noted that in terms of school safety, schools and law enforcement have to be on the same page, with no grey areas. We can no longer think, “It can’t happen here.” Law enforcement can’t be at schools all the time to prevent emergencies. To help schools prepare, Randy had prepared a brief survey of schools.

Randy and Brian discussed Run-Hide-Fight ; noting that we are all part of our own rescue. They also talked about secure school entrances, safe haven rooms, esp. for high needs students, and the need for standard
vocabulary, preparation and responses from all schools. They noted that there is an MOU among all agencies involved in emergency responses.

There were questions around interoperability of radio contact systems and about compatibility of camera systems.

Gabe Villanueva then shared some questions which schools/districts would want to consider if they plan to hire private security firms. Mary Sue noted that districts would also want to look closely at contract verbiage on indemnification amounts to ensure that they were adequately covered.

Mary Schoenfeldt presented on lesson learned from Newtown. Along with the devastation of the tragedy, itself, Mary pointed out a variety of other impacts that this – or other forms of – tragedy have on a community: on the infrastructure, on handling gifts/good will/volunteers, dealing with the media, and many more. One suggestion for local districts/schools and other agencies was the creation of some ready-made communication templates for use immediately post emergency. It was a very powerful reminder that we need to prepare for the long term, have redundant systems, and realize that it will take a long, long time before we can ever return to ‘normal.’

Final comments: Nancy let the Committee know that Mary Hansen is no longer with the DOH. Randy shared dates for CPTED trainings. Mike told everyone of this October’s ShakeOut dates: 10.17 @ 10:17 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00.

Next Meeting: April 4, 2013, ESD 112, Vancouver