School Safety Advisory Committee  
ESD 113 - Tumwater  
January 3, 2013  
NOTES

Present: Paul Harrison, Bob McMullen; Keith Shephard; Rosanne Garrand; Gordon Beck; Nancy Bernard; Walt Bigby; Margaret Hansen; Mike Brown; Bruce Kuennen; Joe Pope; Sara Hoover; Randy Town; Mike Hubert; Greg Williamson; Mike Donlin; Frank Hewins, Chair.  
K20: Peggy Sandberg, Scott LeBar; Scott Emry.

Open: Frank Hewins, Committee Chair, opened the meeting at 9:00 with a welcome to all and a special thanks to ESD 113 Superintendent Bill Keim, Carrie Sherman, and the rest of the 113 staff. Frank also noted that the agenda for today’s meeting had been adjusted following the Sandy Hook shooting (December 14, 2012) in order to be able to spend the entire meeting on Sandy Hook-related topics.  
It was moved and seconded to accept the meeting notes from the December 6, 2012 meeting.

Greg summarized a meeting with Superintendent Dorn on Wednesday, January 2, 2013, attended by Greg, Mike and others in the Superintendent’s Cabinet. Greg noted that Superintendent Dorn is very interested in the input and feedback from the Safety Advisory Committee. At that meeting, it was explained that we do have a definition of school safety and that we do have a comprehensive school safety planning process and the Rapid Responder, school mapping system in place across WA. The question is how do we ensure that the plans and school maps are up to date and that safety is incorporated into overall school educational plans.  
In addition to the school safety planning process, there is also a threat assessment process in place. (Additional resources are on the School Safety Center web page.) The overarching questions are:

- What is in place?
- What resources are available?
- What and where are the gaps?
- What funding is in place?
- How do we ensure that we are not forced into or do not succumb to what might be termed “knee-jerk” reactions to the Sandy Hook tragedy?

In addition, there was discussion around potential legislation. This raises the question of legislators who understand and can support the concepts of school safety. Who have been and who are our current “safety champions”?  
Greg reiterated that while OSPI has been and will continue to be supportive of SROs, Superintendent Dorn’s position that simply hiring armed guards or arming school staff is not the solution. He is looking for input and feedback from this Committee.

Bob noted that, today, there are more kids than adults with easy access to phones in schools. As a result, effective communication is different – and potentially more difficult – than in the past. Our bottom line message should be, “School is safe.” However, when an emergency situation arises, schools needs to assess the impact, comfort those who are hurt, and communicate effectively. The new technologies can complicate this. Bob also noted that AWSP has posted a variety of resources to help schools respond to the tragedy and grief from Sandy Hook.
Frank focused the group on prevention: what are districts doing to prevent / prepare for emergency situations, especially rural districts. (Keith noted that Pe Ell is 40 minutes away from its 1st responders in Chehalis. Their plans would look different from a school which is closer to its 1st responders.) Frank’s questions looked at the larger safety / security / climate issues:
- What do we need?
- What makes sense for the safety, security and climate of a school?
- What is the mental health culture of the school?
- What partnerships are in place – or need to be in place?
- How do we create a safe, secure, healthy learning environment?

Frank also noted that, like Superintendent Dorn, it would not be a wise to require – or allow – more guns at school. It is potentially very dangerous and it sends the wrong message to students, staff, and community.

Keith noted, however, that, because of its rural location, Pe Ell was considering doing that. Randy T. said that that had also come up in Yakima County. He noted that, although it would not be a first choice, it might become an option. A step by step process might look like this:
- First: increase and arm School Resource Officers (SROs);
- Second: arm School Security Officers (SSOs) / Campus Security Officers (CSOs). This might also apply to hired, commercial security staff;
- As a last resort, provide (100+ hours of) very intense training for carefully selected staff who would then be allowed to be armed in school.

Walt noted that carried to a logical conclusion, once we start to arm citizens, we might as well arm everyone. And that would be “crazy”.

There was discussion around SROs and armed SROs in schools. Currently some schools and districts do have armed SROs and/or SSO / CSOs – or commercial security guards – in schools. In the past, there was funding to hire and train SROs and SSO/CSOs; however that funding has greatly decreased over time. At present, we do not have accurate information on the numbers of SROs and SSO/CSOs across the state. Earlier on, Randy and Mike drafted a very brief survey to try to gather that information; it was not sent out. Now may be the time. Mike will work with Ruthy and the OSPI web development staff to create a surveygizmo to go out to districts and schools. The results can give us some baseline numbers.

(The surveygizmo was also discussed with Superintendent Dorn on Wednesday. Mike and Ruthy and the web folks are almost done with the brief survey. It will be shared with the group shortly. In the meantime, as well, Bruce was able to provide some additional information from Rapid Responder: currently, 103 Rapid responder users indicate that they are SROs, and 203 are Security Officers. This is out of approx. 2,300+ schools, statewide.)

As the discussion continues, several themes and ongoing activities came through:

1. Our overarching response to school safety issues must be foundational, not reactionary. It must be built around proved practices for building a strong school climate which develops and enhances social-emotional learning (SEL).
a. The planning and implementation process need to be comprehensive, tiered, revisited regularly and part of a school's ongoing school improvement process.

b. Include such programs as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS).

c. Committee Consensus: Arming school staff is not a viable solution to enhancing school safety and a positive school climate.

2. Revisit, modify and support the OSPI Safety Corps

a. School safety funding has decreased in recent years from **over $20M** to **under $200K** for the biennium, and only a portion of that comes to OSPI.

b. Raise the profile of the Safety Corps in the current decision package.

c. Ensure that it is comprehensive, sustainable, and consistent with the rest of the decision package.

d. Ensure that mental health and suicide prevention are included.

e. Examine how safety/safety corps ‘fits’ with the McCleary decision.

f. Rewrite the Safety Corp one-page summary. (Mike will do this.)

3. We have several **planning documents and processes** in place.

a. Determine if they are being used. (Monitoring)

b. Determine what/where are any **gaps** in those plans and processes. (Gap analysis)

c. Estimate resources to fill the gaps.
   i. EX: revisit threat assessment to ensure very early awareness/interventions.
   ii. EX: look into post-trauma support for staff, students, community.
   iii. School visitor process/analysis.
   iv. EX: consider Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). This concept was brought up throughout our conversations.
   v. EX: develop and implementation **protocols** for different pieces of the process.

4. There is a range of **security personnel** across the state.

a. Determine the numbers and locations of SROs, CSOs and other security personnel. (As noted above, this is in process.)

b. Estimate costs to provide security personnel where needed.

c. Determine training costs.

d. Maximize coordination with CJTC to provide (even more) training.

5. Maximize **cross-agency and community connections** and collaborations

a. Identify current connections and collaborations.

b. Identify additional potential connections.

c. Focus on the needs of rural schools and districts.

d. Help ensure a collective impact of support. **No silos.**

6. **Training** is critical. Currently, there is no funding for adequate training.

a. Build this into the Safety Corps package.

b. The training component needs to include all aspects of school safety.
c. Incorporate the AWSP Leadership Framework into the process.

d. Remember that training is not a one-time event. With staff turnover and regular planning updates, at least annual training is critical.

7. Create a “School Safety” position paper. (Mike will work on an initial draft of this.)

8. In addition, create a “talking points” document for Committee members as they talk with legislators and/or the media.
   a. Definitions
   b. Resources
   c. See: Margaret Hansen’s DOH “School Health Fact Sheet” as an example.
   d. Identify Legislators with whom we can talk.

The School Safety Advisory Committee agreed that there is a need for a consistent, balanced approach to school safety, and that arming school staff is not a viable option.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 7 at OSPI in Olympia. These issues will be further discussed along with information and training materials in response to I-502.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00. WA State School Safety Advisory Mtg.
Notes from Frank Hewins:

RE: Issues from Incident at Sandy Hook Elementary, Newtown, CT (12/14/12)

- SPI looking at comprehensive package (“Safety Corps”)
- Impacts are far reaching (eg., students/staff related to victims)
- School culture and climate must be addressed in an ongoing manner
- Expanded support of mental health services
- Re-exam and make adjustments to security practices (locking doors, limiting points of entry)
- CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design)
- Recognition of many of the good things that WA has in place (eg., Rapid Responder Mapping System, practice drills, relationships with local first responders, etc.)
- $20 million put into school safety following Columbine – now down to less than $200,000
- Fast Alert System for lockdown
- Critical need for time available to train and drill with school staff
- ACES (Adverse Childhood Experiences Study) – support from DOH
- Need for a “balanced approach” (communication-connectedness-support)
- Development of state standards for SSO certification (armed?)
- Each of the shooters was suicidal
- Inability of small districts to sustain safety/security (lack of resources)
- Emphasize OSPI funding package (Support for Academic Success) as high priority
- Platform to provide voice of reason to legislature
- Develop position paper to share w/ Legislature & Wine Cellar Group
- Encourage renewed participation from Governor’s Office and new Attorney General
- Visitor management at schools (module available in Rapid Responder)
- Threat assessment protocols – gap analysis - standardization
- Comprehensive school safety plans – gap analysis
- Prototypical schools funding model – adequate safety staffing
- Need for more counselors in schools (continued cuts to budgets over last 5 years)
- Arming of existing school staff is not a viable solution to enhancing school safety
- “Run, Hide, Fight” – training video
Thoughts and notes from the January 3, 2013 School Safety Advisory Committee Meeting

Bob Mc Mullen

In updating the School Advisory Committee Safety Plan:

1. Utilize and develop the existing Safety Corps structure
2. Have a comprehensive, proactive safety focus rather than a reactive focus
3. Recognize that addressing safety issues means recognizing the impact of equitability, diversity, health, and social justice matters on schools and communities
4. Recognize the existence of organizational silos and the need to work together collectively on comprehensive planning which brings separated entities together in mutual support of the safety plan
5. Planning and plan solutions will need to include relevant technological support which increase efficiency and decrease operational costs
6. The community and community connections need to developed and included in the planning
7. OSPI needs be the lead organization in planning the revised safety plan
8. The plan needs to include behavioral protocols for board, district and school personnel to develop and guide safety related behaviors in the field
9. The plan needs to be inclusive and augment the current school safety plan
10. The plan needs to have an RTI type tiered structure which separates and outlines practices for proactively dealing with the routine to the most challenging school safety needs
11. The plan needs to align with the state model schools funding structure and the new teacher and principal state evaluation system goals and procedures
12. The new safety plan must include both content and process focuses
13. The new safety plan must include first responder and police prevention, protection and intervention components
14. The new safety plan must also include advisory representation, support and involvement from community service providers, interventionists, professional educator organizations, parent and diversity associations
15. The new safety plan must include resource information and be developed with a structure which is easily adaptable to the professional development and training needs
16. The plan must be sustainable over time and operate within realistic state budget constraints
17. The plan must be supported by the oversight and guidance of the School Safety Advisory Committee which is comprised of a cross section of representative members
18. The School Safety Advisory Committee will be housed under the Office of the Superintendent of Public Education. It will annually develop and request a safety operations budge from the legislature to provide for school safety program need. It will be responsible for annually reporting to the legislature and the citizens of Washington the status of programmatic work.
19. Every four years an independent outside agency will evaluate the work of the Safety Advisory Committee and report to the results to the legislature and the citizens of Washington
20. The planning of the new safety plan must include marketing strategies to reach all branches of state government legislators as well as the general state citizenry