Safety Center Advisory Committee Core Group  
April 26, 2012, WRMG  
NOTES  

Present: Tony Zeman, Bob Graham, Frank Hewins, Greg Williamson, Randy Town, Walt Bigby, Denise Fitch, Mary Sue Linville, Nancy Bernard, Bob McMullen, Bruce, Kuennen, Mike Donlin  

Welcome:  

Frank Hewins welcomed the group; He noted that the agenda for the day was based on draft summary notes from the 2008 Advisory Committee retreat at Snoqualmie facilitated by Marilyn McGuire; over time, staffing and critical issues have changed, as has the purpose of Advisory Committee meetings;  

Greg also noted that there has been a change in the formal funding relationship between OSPI and the CJTC around the School Safety Center. Funding is now appropriated to the CJTC and contracted back to OSPI.  

Bob Graham noted that there have also been changes at the CJTC and that the CJTC now has a different leadership philosophy. He did not elaborate on this at this meeting.  

Purpose & Plan for Today:  

The group discussed the purpose of today’s meeting: to revitalize the Advisory Committee and identify priorities and activities for the coming year.  

Advisory Committee Vision-Mission-Purpose:  

1. It was noted that he 2008 draft document and the push to formalize Advisory Committee went nowhere; consensus: informal was good for the group, less reliance on protocol; the Committee could make legislative action recommendations and provide grant oversight; From 2008 onward, there have been momentum & funding shifts.  
   - Mary Sue noted that meetings in recent years have seemed to focus on receiving reports on activities, but not on generating “new” information or actions  
   - Therefore, there has been a lack of “excitement”; we need to rekindle the excitement!  

There was discussion on our connection with the legislature, sustainability, focus & momentum  
   - There was a questions as to whether the Committee should focus on “input, reviewing program proposals” versus making program proposals.  
   - It was strongly stated that the Advisory Committee needs a connection to the legislature so that we can be a sounding board – and not blind-sided by proposed legislation, and also...  
   - to make recommendations for new and/or review & advice on proposed legislation.  
   - Changes at OSPI (Martin; Shawn Lewis moves) make this a good time to clarify & recommend the function of this group.
2. The group also discussed the name of this body: **school safety advisory** or school **safety center** advisory. This led to further conversation about our Committee Vision-Mission-Purpose:
   - Based on earlier documents and proviso language, the group discussed clarifying some of the wording around the Advisory Committee. What does it really mean? Who really does this the work?
   - For clarification, we distinguished proviso language: (budget language) versus statue language (as in the HIB legislation)
   - Current proviso: narrows the scope; also see the web site & training
   - What is SCHOOL SAFETY? What recommendations do we make around the broader scope of school safety?
   - Are we a mile wide and an inch deep? It was noted that we do not have much choice in being the mile wide; we can prioritize the depth
     - WHAT puts kids at risk?
     - Mary Sue noted that her organization has data on safety/liability across 126 districts

3. Some wording to be revisited: in effect, this group is the **School Safety Advisory Committee**.

4. The group looked at current issues, the low hanging fruit that keeps us busy:
   - **AWSP Leadership Framework**: the first two evaluation criteria speak to school climate and school safety as they impact students and academic achievement.
   - Safety Center ‘calls’: walk thru the list: most of our calls are HIB, cyberbullying/digital safety, truancy and discipline related. In addition, the Gangs in Schools Task Force and the Anti-HIB Work Group are very active. Emergency Disaster preparedness is yet another ongoing concern.
   - Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS, a Public health model) provides a framework for prevention and intervention efforts.
   - The possibility of creating a **surveygizmo** to ask schools what they see as their major issues was raised. Mike noted that we actually have a surveygizmo created which we can use, if the Committee decides to do so.
   - Ultimately, the question is what **IS** our core business with respect to school safety.
   - **Prevention-Intervention- (mitigation) - Response-Recovery --- How do they fit into that core business?**

5. Several other issues were brought up: a crisis plan is preventative – if used and kept current
   a. Health & safety / medications
      i. Example: epi-pens by bus drivers, etc…who are not medical professionals
      ii. ADA compliance - as part of school safety

6. Safety Center web site:
   a. Along with the current links, we may want to add a “who to call for.....” list
   b. This would include all those others at OSPI who are involved in some aspect of safety, prevention and intervention: drop outs, student health, etc....

7. As it relates to measuring school safety and our overall efforts, **Walt reminded the group to “start with the end in mind”**: how do we measure student / school safety?
   a. HYS questions – what do they ask? What do we want to know?
   b. Calls to safety center
c. Other data pieces/sources

Therefore, what do we want to measure and know?

8. In reviewing AWSP Criterion #2 – Safety Planning, how do we impact:
   - Knowledge & skills?
   - Evaluation criteria?
   - How do we actually DO all this?
   - Do we have the infrastructure to support all this? Is there funding?
   - NB: Can we/how do we “ensure” school safety?
   - What on the Safety Center web site is missing for the AWSP

9. In addition, the group discussed school improvement planning aligned with comprehensive safe school planning. How to measure this?
   - AWSP Criteria #3 – Planning with Data: make the recommendation to include safety into the data mix:
     o HYS
     o ACES
     o Gang affiliation / activity
     o Title I Parent Perception surveys
     o Etc.

Membership:

1. With respect to Advisory Committee membership:
   - Who is and who should be involved?
     o Mike will send a list of “all” past members or member organizations
   - Who else? The committee looked at the proposed 2008 list of member organizations. Many have participated in the past; others have not participated. New names were added to that list. Among those additional organizations mentioned were:
     o The Ombudsman Office, Private schools, DSHS/DBHR, School Counselors & Psychs, Youth Suicide Prevention Program, Afterschool programs (21st Century CLC’s), representation from eastern WA and other parts of the state.
     o It was suggested that we categorize the contacts/groups,
     o An initial set of organizational categories would include:
       - OSPI
       - Superintendents
       - Principals
       - Risk Management
       - Emergency management
       - Law Enforcement/Security
       - Fire services
       - Health / Social services
       - Higher Ed
       - Parents / Student advocacy
• Private Schools
• Other groups / organizations

- We discussed a revitalized advisory committee and inviting prior participants – or representatives from their organizations.
- The Committee would have:
  - A rewritten definition
  - Goals & objectives / results
  - A surveygizmo – or two: to organizations/stakeholders: interested? In what?
  - A focus on current (2012) needs
  - Current interest in participation (Who to contact now?)

2. The question was raised as to whether to expand to include K-16. (focus on K-12 – with expanded issues as needed)
- Also, there was discussion around using the K-20 network to facilitate meeting participation.

3. The Committee RECOMMENDS:
   a. Maintaining a K-12 focus, but recognizing that K-16 issues may arise with K-12 students on college campuses;
   b. Request report submissions prior to meetings to maximize actual meeting time;
   c. Solicit agenda items prior to meetings;
   d. Find a legislative champion;
   e. Create a set / series / list of topic or issue items for discussion at meetings. This would help individuals and “organizational categories” to determine which meetings to participate in;
   f. A Resource: WHO TO CALL list – if you have _____ issues at your school
   g. Mary Sue related the story of a young, 12 year old transgender student; getting ready to have the operation; needs access to bathrooms and showers --- raises potential, new HIB issues.

4. To accomplish this, the Committee will therefore: generate a letter:
   a. Explain the revitalized Safety Advisory Committee
   b. Solicit renewed interest in the Committee
   c. Ask for someone to represent their group/organization

5. As we create a revitalized School Safety Advisory Committee:
   We discussed aspects of a DEFINITION of SCHOOL SAFETY: lots of overlap and layering of need & services. We will create a definition based on the following:
   a. Safe learning environment / comprehensive safe school plan
      i. Physical safety  (Mapping; HazMat; .... )
      ii. Emotional / mental / behavioral / environmental health
      iii. Physical health: Coord. School Health
      iv. Intellectual safety
v. Fear

vi. Impact on Behavior, attendance, academic achievement....

vii. Vulnerability (to physical/natural dangers)

viii. Threat – natural; personal

ix. Cyber-safety/digital safety

x. Cybersecurity

xi. SRO’s

xii. State law - RCW:


c. Data

d. Drop Out prevention

e. Policy

f. Training / PD

g. POLICY QUESTION: Who protects the health and safety of kids in the same way that L & I does for adults/employees.

h. Research-based best practice – evidence based

i. Partnerships: Law enforcement, SRO’s, Fire, EMD (Local & state), Other, related state agencies,

j. QUESTION: Do we drop “center” in the definition of this Advisory Committee?

   i. Does that raise liability concerns?

   ii. Statute language – permission?? Legislative change. OSPI change.

   iii. Process-Product

iv. Information & Guidance:

v. One of the first charge: Advise the School Safety Center

vi. Greg will move this forward with Randy Dorn

vii. VOTE on name change: Unanimous:

   The Committee agreed to a name change:

   Washington State School Safety Center Advisory Committee

Governance:

1. The group looked at the list of defined Committee officers from the 2008 document:

   - Chair: Appointed by Sup’t. – Change to:

     - Elect from w/in the committee &

     - Approved / endorsed by Supt.

     - 2 year term

     - ADD: by a majority of members at the June meeting – versus a quorum

   - Past Chair: no one – DELETE the role as an “office”

   - “Legislative Liaison”: DELETE as an “office”
- Change name to: Leg. Affairs coordinator, perhaps; Chair, maybe?

2. Need a legislative rep. person

3. Need a Process on taking position / testifying / representing our stand: proactive / reactive
   i. Email poll
   ii. Phone
   iii. Meeting
   iv. Tag onto existing meetings/conferences/etc.
   v. SO: Who? Internal to this group?
      - Who all are in this group for this purpose?
      - Category of groups
      - What will that person do?
      - How will the word get out and feedback come back?

4. **Need to determine meeting frequency & location**: 
   a. Every other month (even # months)
   b. During legislative session: may change
      i. Greg’s suggestion of weekly leg. Updates
      ii. Call in, catch-up
      iii. Frequency may vary depending on the need
   c. June planning meeting for next year
   d. Process: send in reports prior to meetings

5. Plan safety-focused topics / items presentations for bi-monthly meetings
   a. Coordinate with other safety-related activities impacting schools

6. **LOCATION**: East – West – and other ‘rural / remote’ locations
   a. Across the state
   b. At least ONE mtg. east of the mountains / elsewhere
   c. K-20 or goto meeting – Cost? Tech requirement?
   d. One face-to-face (barbeque) meeting in June

7. **CJTC Role:**
   a. Randy – more fully FTE (.9 FTE)
   b. Gangs trainings – Mt. Vernon coming up
   c. Drug trainings – updated, timing modified to help accommodate school staff schedules
   d. Stud. Substance Abuse – Steps to Deterence
   e. Design a 3-day SRP training for SRO use? TBD how and who. Timing and targeted audience.
   g. Coordinating mapping, emergency drill, SRO etc., training
   h. Frank asked if the CJTC were comfortable with the Adv. Committee expanding its “safety” role?
   i. Bob said yes; he thought that’s what we were doing, anyway
j. Bruce asked how did the leg/budget change impact business?
   i. Reverse the pass through
   ii. Greg: connections & info sharing; coordinating how
   iii. The public perception hasn’t changed

**Rubric – How do we measure the success of the Adv. Comm.?**

1. Long range: baseline and annual follow-ups
2. Results or actions:
   a. Actions: what we do / move forward
      i. Recommendations to the legislature
      ii. Shared information
      iii. Adv. Comm. participation / reports
      iv. # Trainings: kinds / participants
      v. Mike’s documentation
      vi. Research on school safety – best practice here and elsewhere
      vii. What do other states have? What do they do?
      viii. National School Safety Center
   b. Results: impact
      i. Things moved forward thru the legislature
      ii. State reporting tools (HYS) (Safety reports) (Title I Parent Perceptions)
      iii. Behavior & attendance
      iv. “See the needle moving” in a positive direction
      v. How many schools/districts have completed X Y Z (mapping / Compliance Officers, etc…)
      vi. Funding

**Bringing it all together:**

We’d like to see:
   a. Safety Corps/Core (ESD Prevention Directors)
   b. Pre-service training for teachers, admin., sup’t.
   c. Board training
   d. Community awareness & relationships
   e. The Advisory Committee may also lend support of other, related issues which do not fall specifically within the Safety Center

**SUMMARY:** The Safety Advisory Committee decided to:

1. Re-name the group: The School Safety Advisory Committee
2. Refine the definition of “school safety” in 2012 – forward;
3. Hold bi-monthly meetings – starting in June; coordinate dates with and around with other activities;
4. Generate a list of names – for review (Mike will send the “old” list for review.);
5. Write a letter of invitation to renew or begin participation;
6. Identify legislative connectivity;
7. Generate a ‘review of safety literature’;
8. Create a rubric of success measures;
9. **Next Meeting: June 21;**
   - 9:00-noon;
   - **Washington Risk Management Pool / Franklin Pierce SD / or other location**

* Following this Advisory Committee meeting, Frank had a chance to talk with Randy Dorn that same evening. He had a conversation with him about the School Safety Advisory Committee. Frank noted that Randy seemed very comfortable with the removal of ‘Center’ in the name and the expanded role of the Advisory Committee. Randy also noted that he would need to research it more closely and hear from Greg and Mike on the benefits of the change.