Governor’s School and Campus Safety Task Force
School and Campus Safety Taskforce Meeting

West Reading Room
Patrick Henry Building
January 14, 2013

Meeting Convened by Secretaries Laura Fornash, Marla Decker and Dr. Bill Hazel

1:00 pm – 1:15 pm  Introduction and swearing-in of members of the Taskforce

1:15 pm – 1:30 pm  Discussion of legal procedures relating to the Taskforce (FOIA)
                    Office of the Attorney General

1:30 pm – 1:45 pm  Opening and Charge of the Taskforce
                    Governor Robert F. McDonnell

1:45 pm – 2:00 pm  Explanation of Organization of Taskforce and Workgroups
                    Marla Decker, Secretary of Public Safety

2:00 pm – 2:30 pm  Resources for School Safety: Briefing for the Governor’s Taskforce
                    Dr. Cynthia Cave, Department of Education

2:30 pm – 2:45 pm  Break

2:45 pm – 3:15 pm  Virginia Schools and Campus Safety: Snapshot of Current Data in
                    Preparation for Future Changes
                    Donna Michaelis, Department of Criminal Justice Services

3:15 pm – 3:45 pm  The Mental Health Perspective
                    James Stewart, Department of Behavioral Health

4:00 pm – 4:30 pm  Public Comment

    Closing          Dr. Bill Hazel, Secretary of Health and Human Resources
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
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 Hieatt, 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

###
Resources for School Safety
Briefing for the Governor's Task Force
on School and Campus Safety

Dr. Cynthia A. Cave, Director
Office of Student Services
Virginia Department of Education

Guidance Documents and Model Policies

Developed in 1996 by the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE); revised in consultation with advisory group and Virginia Center for School Safety (VCSS) and approved by Board of Education (BOE) in November 2007

Code § 22.1-279.8.D. Each school board “shall ensure that every school …shall develop a written school crisis, emergency management, and medical emergency response plan…”


Provides:
Procedures, operations, and assignments for prevention, management, and response to critical events or emergencies; such as violence, intruders, accidents, medical emergencies, explosions, bomb threats, weapons, natural disasters, terrorism, pandemic flu, and non-emergency school crisis

Includes:

Planning, Risk assessment and Preparation, Crisis Response Teams, Communications, Student-Parent Reunification, and Recovery

Training, Sample Policies and Documents

Resources

The Model School Crisis Management Plan

Developed in 1999, revised in 2002, in consultation with VCSS, to provide sample policies, procedures, and forms adaptable to local needs

Includes examples from school divisions and school plans

In accordance with Code § 22.1-279.8.D.
The Virginia Educator’s Guide for Planning and Conducting School Emergency Drills

Developed in 2001 by VCSS and VDOE

Addresses legal requirements for drills; assessment of need; planning and conducting drills

8VAC20-131-260B.2 (Standards of Accreditation of the BOE) requires one simulated lock-down and crisis emergency evacuation early in school year

Guidelines for the Development of Policies and Procedures for Managing Student Behaviors in Emergency Situations

Developed in 2009 by VDOE to provide assistance to school divisions for developing policies and procedures to manage aggressive or violent behavior of students in emergency situations

Addresses physical restraint and seclusion of students in emergency situations
Elementary School Gun Safety Guidelines and Curriculum

Established by BOE in accordance with Code § 22.1-204.1. to assist school boards electing to provide firearm safety education programs for elementary school grades

Purpose: Promote student safety through guidance on instruction in principles of gun safety and accident prevention

Provides: Information, lesson plans, materials, and suggested scripts for teachers

Student Conduct Policy Guidelines


Provides elements of student conduct policy and definitions and standards, including those on alcohol and drugs, intentional injury of others, threats, bullying, and weapons
**Student Conduct Policy Guidelines, cont.**

Section 22.1-279.6.B. of the Code requires local school boards to adopt and revise regulations on codes of student conduct that are consistent with, but may be more stringent than, the guidelines of the Board.

Section 22.1-253.13:7.C.3. of the Code requires local school boards to maintain and follow an up-to-date policy manual that includes “standards of student conduct…”

---

**A Model Policy Against Bullying**

Definitions of bullying and related terms

Strategies to prevent bullying

Investigation and response to bullying incidents

Sample forms

In process of review by VDOE
**Guidelines and Resources for Internet Safety in Schools**

One of several VDOE resources developed to assist school divisions with instruction on Internet safety and policy development for acceptable use.

Provides assistance in the development of policies to protect children from cyberbullying, online abuse, and Internet related dangers.

---

**Virginia School Search Resources**

*Virginia Guidelines for Student Searches in Public Schools*, adopted by the BOE on November 18, 1999, in accordance with Code § 22.1-279.7.

School boards shall adopt regulations governing student searches.

*Virginia School Search Resource Guide* developed in 2000 by VDOE to provide guidance and sample policies and procedures to school boards and school personnel.
Guidelines Concerning Drug Testing in Virginia Public Schools


School boards may require or encourage drug testing in accordance with BOE guidelines.

Student Assistance Programming Manual

Developed by VDOE to provide a framework and process for implementing Student Assistance Programming—a systemic approach to student behavioral health care education and services in partnerships with community agencies.

To be posted on Web site January 2013.
Informational Reports

Annual Report of Discipline, Crime, and Violence

Presents statistics on incidents of discipline, crime, and violence reported to VDOE from school divisions, in accordance with Code § 22.1-279.3:1. and federal law, the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
The Annual Virginia School Safety Audit Survey

Conducted by VCSS, with support of VDOE, in accordance with Code §§ 22.1-279.8.B. and 9.1-184.

Purpose: Assess safety conditions in schools, including crisis and emergency management planning, safety concerns, and school security

Other Resources

VCSS Publications

Links to U.S. Department of Education and other state and national Web sites

Training Opportunities
Contact Information:

Dr. Cynthia Cave
Virginia Department of Education
Office of Student Services
(804) 225-2818
Cynthia.Cave@doe.virginia.gov
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

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
Snapshot of K-12 Public Education

Breakdown by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school (N=1981)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary schools</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle schools</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High schools</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other schools</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

- 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

- 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
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).

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

...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%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey year</th>
<th># schools with full time SRO</th>
<th># schools total</th>
<th>% schools with full time SRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey year</th>
<th># schools with at least part time SRO</th>
<th># schools total</th>
<th>% schools with at least part time SRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey year</th>
<th># schools with full time SSO</th>
<th># schools total</th>
<th>% schools with full time SSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey year</th>
<th># schools with at least part time SSO</th>
<th># schools total</th>
<th>% schools with at least part time SSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Campus Security Officer Regulations and Training Program

- 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.
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

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.
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

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.
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

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
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!
THE MENTAL HEALTH PERSPECTIVE

Governor’s Task Force on School and Campus Safety
January 14, 2013

James W. Stewart, III
DBHDS Commissioner
A gunman kills 20 students, ages 6 and 7, and six adults before taking his own life.

“Gunman Kills 32 at Virginia Tech In Deadliest Shooting in U.S. History”
The Washington Post
MYTH: Mental Illness = Violence

- Only about 4 percent of violence in the U.S. is attributed to people with any mental illnesses.

- Lifetime prevalence of violence among people with serious mental illness (e.g. schizophrenia and bipolar disorder) was 16 percent compared with 7 percent among people without any mental disorder.
  
  – 2012 National Institute of Mental Health study

20 Years of Research

Most people who are violent are not mentally ill, and most people who are mentally ill are not violent.

Because serious mental illness affects a small percentage of the population, it makes—at best—a very small contribution to the overall level of violence in society.

People with mental illnesses are more likely to be the victims than the perpetrators of violence.

Substance abuse among people with mental illnesses significantly increases the risk of violence - just as it does with individuals without a serious mental illness.

Mental illness may be a modest risk factor for violence, but there is no clear evidence of causality; age, gender and socioeconomic status are more reliable predictors of violence than mental illness.
## Recent Mass Shootings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Perpetrator (Age)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th># Killed (Wounded)</th>
<th>Mental Health History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Adam Lanza (20)</td>
<td>Newtown, CN Elem School</td>
<td>26 (2)</td>
<td>Brother: he “is autistic, or has Asperger syndrome and a ‘personality disorder’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>One Goh (43)</td>
<td>Oakland, CA University</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
<td>Unknown history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>James Eagan Holmes (24)</td>
<td>Aurora, CO Movie Theatre</td>
<td>12 (58)</td>
<td>Lawyer: he has a mental disorder and was in treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Wade Michael Page (40)</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI Sikh temple</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Andrew J. Engeldinger (36)</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN, Factory</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Jared Lee Loughner (22)</td>
<td>Tucson, AZ Political Event</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Anders Behring Breivik (32)</td>
<td>Oslo and Utøya, Norway</td>
<td>8 (209) - Bombing 69 (110) - Shooting</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Maj. Nidal Hasan (39)</td>
<td>Fort Hood, TX</td>
<td>13 (32)</td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Seung-Hui Cho (23)</td>
<td>Virginia Tech University</td>
<td>32 (17)</td>
<td>Middle school: Severe social anxiety disorder selective mutism, and major depressive disorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Commission Blueprint for Reform

- Redesigning the involuntary commitment process to be more consistent, fair and effective for all
- Improved access to a broad array of voluntary mental health services;
- Use of person-centered approaches to reduce coercive care; and
- Reducing criminalization through diversion of persons with mental illness from arrest and jail.
Funding for Mental Health Reform

2008 General Assembly – Appropriated approximately $28M (annualized funding was $17.3M) for core mental health services, including:

- Outpatient psychiatry,
- Counseling,
- Case management
- Jail diversion
- Emergency response services
- Funds to implement the new statutory requirements associated with law reforms.

Subsequent CSB budget reductions of $24.6M (annualized) erased many of these gains and other services.

Three Primary Goals

- **Heighen awareness** and recognition of signs of mental illness, alienation and possible violence – without stigmatizing mental illness, which is not inherently linked to violence. And **empower people** to act by calling for help, directing persons to help, or alerting families or authorities.

- **Ensure availability of a response** capacity when people do present or are sent for help.

- **Strengthen and expand supports** for persons with severe and persistent mental illness.
Programs to Heighten Awareness and Get People to Help

Statewide Suicide Prevention Campaign
ASIST (Applied Suicide Intervention Skills Training) model and a “train the trainer” approach.

Statewide Mental Health First Aid Campaign
Mental Health First Aid is a 12-hour training course to give the public key skills to help someone who is developing a mental health problem or experiencing a mental health crisis.

School-based Assessment and Treatment Programs
Preventive response requires an infrastructure of assessment and care in schools to recognize and intervene when children and adolescents show evidence of risk factors.

Ensuring Availability of Help

• Proposals exist to increase outpatient assessment and treatment capacity and restore some of the capacity intended by the General Assembly following the Virginia Tech tragedy, but lost to budget reductions.
• Legislation to implement the few remaining recommendations of the Commission on MH Law Reform.
Support for Persons with Serious Mental Illnesses

Programs of Assertive Community Treatment (PACT)

Teams delivering community-based services designed to meet each individual’s specific needs, including case management, psychiatric services, 24-hour access, home visits and mobile outreach

- Nationally recognized for effectiveness keeping those with serious and persistent mental illness safe, out of the hospital, and engaged in the community
- Currently 16 PACT teams in communities across Virginia
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
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.


"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."


"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."


“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.


- 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).


• 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.


• 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.


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.
“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 – Waltheof 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).

“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.”


“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.”


“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.

---


“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

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


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.”
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# Reference Materials from State School Safety Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Center Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Office of Safe Schools</td>
<td>California Department of Education, Office of Learning Support</td>
<td>Louise Chiatovich, Safe Schools and Violence Prevention P.O. Box 944272 Sacramento, CA 94244-2720 Phone: 916-323-2183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Colorado School Safety Resource Center</td>
<td>700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000 Denver, CO 80215 Phone: 303-239-4435 Fax: 303-239-4510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Safe Schools and Communities Coalition</td>
<td>The Governor’s Prevention Partnership John Daviau, Director of School, Campus &amp; Community Programs 30 Arbor Street Hartford, CT 06106 Phone: 860-523-8042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Office of Safe Schools</td>
<td>Florida Department of Education Lorraine Allen, Senior Educational Program Director 325 W. Gaines Street, Room 301 Tallahassee, FL 32399 Phone: 850-245-0416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>School Safety Project</td>
<td>Georgia Emergency Management Agency Steve Harris, Manager PO Box 18055 Atlanta, GA 30316 Phone: 404-635-7000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Indiana School Safety Specialist Academy</td>
<td>Department of Education Clarissa Snapp, Director Office of Student Services Room 229 State House Indianapolis, IN 46204 Phone: 317-234-0326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Kentucky Center for School Safety</td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University Jon Akers, Director 521 Lancaster Drive 105 Stratton Building Richmond, KY 40475 Toll-free Phone: 877-805-4277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Division of Safe and Orderly Schools</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Missouri Center for Safe Schools</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Nebraska School Safety Center</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>New York State Center for School Safety</td>
<td>Mary Grenz Jalloh, Executive Director 175 Route 32 North New Paltz, NY 12561 Phone: 845-255-8989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Center for the Prevention of School Violence</td>
<td>Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Joanne McDaniel, Director 1801 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699 Toll-free Phone: 800-299-6054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
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