

**School Security and Standards Task Force
Meeting Summary**

Springfield - Illinois State Board of Education
Alzina Building
100 North First Street
Videoconference Room, 3rd Floor
Springfield, Illinois

Chicago - Illinois State Board of Education
James R. Thompson Center
100 West Randolph
Videoconference Room, 14th Floor
Chicago, Illinois

Friday, April 15, 2016
1:00 p.m.

Chairman Vose called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.

Members Present

Jeff Aranowski
Robert Bernat
David Henebry
Jeff Vose (Chairman)
Tad Williams

Members on the Phone

Tom Demmer, Rep.
Catherine McCrory
Patrick O'Connor (Vice-Chair)
Ben Schwarm
Carol Sente, Rep.

Members Absent

Neil Anderson, Sen.
Tom Cullerton, Sen.
Laura Frisch
Patrick Hartshorn
Roger Schnitzler
John Simonton
David Tomlinson
Steven Wilder

Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) Staff

Hannah Rosenthal

Members of the Public

Nick Giannini, Chief of Staff for Senator Tom Cullerton
Jacob Seukunian, Legislative Assistant for Senator Neil Anderson

Approval of Minutes from February 19, 2016 Task Force Meeting

Motion for approval of the minutes: Moved by David Henebry and seconded by Representative Carol Sente. Voice vote. **Motion carried.**

The Physical Plant Subcommittee will need to vote on the February 8, 2016 Physical Plant Subcommittee Meeting minutes at the next Subcommittee meeting and then the full Task Force can vote at next Task Force meeting.

Discussion of and Possible Vote on Physical Plant Subcommittee Recommendations

Physical Plant Subcommittee Chair David Henebry said that Subcommittee members met and reviewed all the commentary that they received. Representative Sente said that she and Representative Demmer want to speak with the rest of the Task Force about what recommendations need to go in the final report versus what is handled by rules or legislation. Representative Sente suggested backing up on the renovation/ addition issue that continues to stump Task Force members regarding the timeline or size of a project and if security changes would be required. She suggested that the recommendations include language similar to: “as school districts are considering capital projects with their boards and architects, they should review the best practices identified in this report, and as their projects and budgets seem feasible, we would like school districts to incorporate security best practices.” This way, the Task Force is not defining a renovation or addition size. Task Force members are encouraging decision-makers and their consultants to review their report, and depending on the scope of the project and their budgets, see what is reasonable.

Representative Sente recalled earlier conversations about the Task Force continuing on as a unit but not meeting all the time. Representative Sente suggested an annual meeting for the Task Force to review new security protocol. Members would have a mechanism to come back together but it would not be unduly burdensome. If the financial situation or security protocol changed, Task Force members could make updates. Representative Demmer and Representative Sente spoke about how individuals planning new schools should make every effort to incorporate the best practices immediately because the cost is lower. In terms of legislation, however, if consultants say they can address the goal in a slightly different way, the Representatives questioned if the Task Force wants to be that prescriptive. Representative Sente said that the heaviest emphasis in the Task Force’s final report should definitely be that new schools take security issues seriously and incorporate the best practices.

Regarding the color-coding of floor plans, Representative Sente spoke with Pat O’Connor, Representative Demmer, several superintendents and first responders and concluded that it is highly beneficial to have a uniform color code. One color does not have to mean something specific to a school district or to a first responder, but they should seem reasonable and uniform. Representative Sente suggested that schools keep a legend on their maps until people become familiar with the color code. Mr. Henebry’s selection – with six areas identified with different colors (main entrance and administrative area in orange, hallways and corridors in yellow, classrooms in green, public spaces in blue, unoccupied spaces in gray, and electrical room in red) – makes logical sense. Representative Sente thought that the Task Force should allow school district three months from the date of the report to talk to consultants, ask architects to update the colors on the floor plans, and talk to first responders. Mr. Henebry added that if someone wanted to differ from one of the requirements for new construction, they could send a letter to ISBE for review. He can add language explaining this review process. Mr. Henebry will change the language to “recommended” for all the items listed under additions and renovations. Mr. Henebry said that the Subcommittee talked about leaving square footage in the recommendations as a benchmark so that if a school district is only adding two classrooms, the district does not have to wait for a full review of the requirements. Representative Sente would prefer that the square footage be taken out for renovations and additions so that there is not a threshold. She is okay with saying that after the school board and consultants review the feasibility of incorporating the items into the capital project they would submit their thoughts in a letter to ISBE.

Mr. Aranowski asked if this is going to be part of the final report or a series of recommendations to the General Assembly, maybe through Representative Sente or another legislator. Task Force members could vote on the document with the edits that were discussed or the Physical Plant Subcommittee could edit the document and Task Force members could vote on the entire updated document at the next meeting. Representative Sente and Representative Demmer agreed that they would be the chief sponsors on any piece of legislation coming out of the Task Force. Representative Sente said that it would be good to identify soon what would be in legislation; unless there is something pressing, these could all be recommendations included in the final report. Mr. Aranowski confirmed that Task Force members made two recommendations to the General Assembly for statutory change in their report to the Governor’s Office and the General Assembly in December 2015: 1) that the Task Force lives on past June 30; and 2) that one of the required safety drills is unannounced. Mr. O’Connor said that he is concerned

with laying out too much for legislation but he thinks it is a good idea to promulgate best practices that can be used by districts across the state. His biggest concern is being unduly burdensome. He said that if he were a superintendent doing a major renovation and he knew there were best practices for security out there, he would look at them. Representative Sente recalled that at a previous Subcommittee meeting, the only additional potential piece she heard to add to the legislation was telling school districts to distribute the report to their boards and administrative staff. She does not feel strongly one way or another so she does not see a need to add anything more to the legislative section. Representative Demmer added that if he and Representative Sente were to put some of these things in legislation, there would be a lot more scrutiny and the Task Force would have to air on the side of being gentle. The Task Force does have the ability through the final report to put out recommendations and guidance without worrying about exceptions. He would prefer going the report direction and understanding that as schools and board members are undergoing these projects, this is a great resource for them. Ben Schwarm said he could not support adding new unfunded mandates for school districts right now.

Regarding color-coding, Mr. Schwarm is concerned about standardizing colors statewide. A lot of school districts are already purchasing programs through vendors and have digital blueprints that are color-coded. They are working very well and the responders love them but they may not be the exact colors that the Physical Plant Subcommittee would want to put out there as a recommendation. Task Force members need to be careful because they do not want school districts or first responders to have to undo everything they have done in the last couple of years. Representative Sente said that she does not feel strongly about the uniformity of colors but wants to emphasize that changing the colors is easy; on a software program nowadays it does not take very long. Unless there is a central location and first responders are coming from outside of the area, if the local school districts and the local first responders understand the color-coding and like the colors they have chosen, she does not care about the specific coloration. Mr. O'Connor said that the Task Force does not want to reinvent the wheel if there are programs out there that are already working for communities, but realistically, it would be nice to have a standard. School districts are already using different colors that are working with their first responders, but if the Task Force wants a state uniform color, that could be proposed. Mr. O'Connor said that if he was sending people to respond outside of his area, they would be working at the direction of the locals so first responders could probably get by without a uniform color. Representative Sente said that schools can change the colors using their existing software and she is not suggesting that districts use a different software program or hire a consultant.

Chairman Vose reiterated that on the Physical Plant Recommendations document version 1.5 Final Draft, 1.1 through 1.6 were recommended as requirements and 1.7 through 1.9 were recommendations. Everything listed as "required" would shift to "recommended" and the Task Force would vote on the recommendations as a whole. Chairman Vose said that his only concern is that the changes are not in writing. Mr. Aranowski said he did not find any of the recommendations to be objectionable. He thinks it is all great practice. Chairman Vose said that if there are no objections, he would prefer to vote now instead of voting on the updated document at the next meeting. There were no objections to 1.1 or 1.2. Regarding 1.3, Mr. Henebry explained identifiable boundaries. He said that this could be a fence or a hedge or something that defines the edge of the property that is distinguishable. This is in the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CEPTD) recommendations that the Task Force already adopted. In a rural area on a 40 acre site, sometimes a post on each corner and the way the grass is mowed can distinguish where the edge is. Mr. Henebry said he does not want to get too prescriptive on this. There are a lot of different ways that schools can distinguish the edge of the property. He did not want to require a fence around all school properties. Mr. Schwarm said he was thinking about larger properties, those with irregular boundaries, and those that are in residential areas. Schools have to go by local zoning ordinances so they could not put up fences anyway. He said he realizes that this is just a recommendation but he thinks it could cause trouble down the road for someone. There were no objections to 1.5, 1.6, 1.7 or 1.8.

Regarding 1.9, Representative Sente said the Task Force should be sure to add other options, not just the blue pull stations. For example, there is the cellphone app. Mr. Henebry said that the sentence needs to be restructured or the language changed such that it is clear that there are other technologies out there that achieve what the blue boxes (used in District 112) achieve. The idea is to be able to generate an alert from various places within the building. Chairman Vose suggested writing "provide pull stations or alternative alarms" and removing the "blue"

piece. He said the Task Force needs to come up with a generic way of writing it without advocating for one specific company. Robert Bernat said it is not the name of the company. He thought it made sense to put the word “blue” in there because it differentiates these from fire pull stations. When people think blue they think police. Mr. Aranowski said that the Task Force could put in the final report a footnote that says “Nothing in this document is intended to endorse a company. Some terms are being used loosely.” It would be good to have a disclaimer for the whole document. Mr. O’Connor suggested inserting “panic station,” “pull station” or “emergency communication station.” That will be generic enough and anyone working in the system will understand it. Dr. Bernat asked about using the word “police.” The pull stations are not for fire or generic first responders. He suggested “law enforcement pull station.”

Motion for the Task Force to adopt the Physical Plant Subcommittee’s recommendations, labeled 1.5 Final Draft, by amending 1.9 to remove the word “blue” and to insert “law enforcement” so that 1.9 reads “law enforcement pull station,” and for these recommendations to be incorporated as suggestions and best practices to school districts in the Task Force’s final report to the State Board of Education, along with a footnote that states that nothing in the report is meant to endorse a specific product or a specific company: Moved by Jeff Aranowski and seconded by Representative Carol Sente. Roll call vote: Anderson, Not Present; Aranowski, Yes; Bernat, Yes; Cullerton, Not Present; Demmer, Yes; Frisch, Not Present; Hartshorn, Not Present; Henebry, Yes; McCrory, Yes; O’Connor, Yes; Schnitzler, Not Present; Schwarm, Yes; Sente, Yes; Simonton, Not Present; Tomlinson, Not Present; Vose, Yes; Wilder, Not Present; Williams, Yes. **The motion passed with 10 yes votes.**

Chairman Vose thanked everyone for their contributions to the discussion. Mr. Aranowski thanked the Subcommittee for the recommendations. Part of the task of the Task Force, whether it is in the first report, second report or just in terms of analysis, is to give consideration to securing physical structures. The work that was done with the Physical Plant Recommendations specifically met a targeted need within the obligations in the statute.

Discussion of and Possible Vote on “See, Hear and Speak Up” Program and Policy

Mr. Aranowski said he would like more time to take a look at the “See, Hear and Speak Up” document. He asked if anyone would have any objections to tabling it until the next meeting. Representative Sente said that she understands that some districts or agencies do not like the “See Something, Say Something” system. She asked if the Task Force wants to be more general and encourage schools to have discussions with their students and their teachers, whether in an assembly setting or one-on-one. Schools should tell students and teachers that when they observe an individual behavior that is out of place, it is good culture in the school to do x, y and z. She asked if the Task Force is looking to specifically adopt “See, Hear and Speak Up.” Mr. Aranowski said that school districts or schools may not know how to engage in this conversation or where to start without resources on what might work for them. From his perspective, it is important that they have something. Maybe not “See, Hear and Speak Up” but something intentional that reaches staff, students and visitors to the extent possible (parents, community members) and that addresses what to do in emergencies. His initial take on “See, Hear and Speak Up” is that it is great to promote to school districts but it may not work for a particular district or a particular school within a district, and they may have something else. Dr. Bernat said that there is not anything else; this is cutting edge and he does not know of any district that has a different method. The federal government’s “See Something, Say Something” identifies suspicious activity as an unusual item or situation, someone asking curious questions, or someone paying unusual attention to a facility, which leaves schools nowhere. “See, Hear and Speak Up” is designed to put meat on the bones. Nobody is going to remember everything, but if they remember something of this, it will help them. It is broken down into the 4 Ms: means, motive, method and mentality, which will get someone thinking as to whether what they saw is unusual, out of the ordinary or merits further look. Representative Sente asked how this falls in line with the Task Force’s general concept of not highlighting one specific organization, company or vendor. Dr. Bernat clarified that this is not an organization. This came from the Task Force’s Prevention Subcommittee after research, including research from Dr. Peter Langman who spoke with the Task Force. It is not copyrighted; Dr. Bernat just used ™ as a placeholder temporarily. Mr. Aranowski said that he is not an attorney but he can ask one of ISBE’s attorneys if the Task Force can create a document that could be copyrighted. He thinks that since it was developed through a public body, it is a public document. Representative

Sente said that she did not know that a subcommittee that drafted this. Mr. O'Connor said that he thinks that Representative Sente's concern is that the Task Force is narrowing down to one methodology. He does not have a concern as far as recommending this as a methodology that can be explored. Mr. Aranowski said that the Task Force should take an extra couple of weeks to look at "See, Hear and Speak Up" and then put it on the agenda for a formal vote at the next meeting. At that time, Dr. Bernat can do a refresher of what it is, what it is not and specific content. Representative Sente agreed with Mr. O'Connor and said she would like the Task Force recommendations to suggest something more general, such as "We encourage schools to have these conversations with their teachers, their students, etc. There are various resources out there. See appendix for one such resource. If you have one that works for you that would be satisfactory as well."

Chairman Vose said that a lot of the discussion on this specific program goes along with the Training Subcommittee's focus on asking school districts to adopt procedures for students and staff to follow in the event of breached security or an intruder. He asked Mr. Aranowski to update Task Force members on the federal grant and what Illinois will be able to do with those federal dollars or the Illinois Emergency Management Agency (IEMA) grant that the ISBE is working on. The Task Force may have opportunities to push these out through a potential website, academies or professional development for educators. Mr. Henebry said that there are differences between "See Something, Say Something" and "See, Hear and Speak Up." To him, this is a policy issue so it should be adopted at the school board level throughout the state. He thinks school boards should be aware of what the differences are and the Task Force should define those differences in the final report, so the people who are consuming the report can sit down and discuss it as a policy and determine to what extent they want to go beyond "See Something, Say Something" or adopt this as their policy. Mr. Aranowski agreed but added that "See Something, Say Something" is very general. "See, Hear and Speak Up" is not necessarily a departure from that, it implements it and fills in the blanks. Chairman Vose confirmed that the Task Force will push agenda item #5 to the next meeting.

Discussion of and Possible Vote on Adoption of Federal Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Plans and Existing ISBE School Emergency & Crisis Response Plan Guide

Chairman Vose reviewed the Task Force's charge. First, the Task Force was charged with gathering information concerning security in schools as it presently exists. Chairman Vose thinks Task Force members accomplished this through the presentations at their meetings. Second, the Task Force was charged with receiving reports, testimony from individuals, school districts, principals, teachers, security experts, architects, engineers, law enforcement community. Chairman Vose thinks these were accomplished within Task Force meetings and at the public forums. Third, the Task Force was charged with creating minimum standards for securing schools. Chairman Vose believes the minimum standards are there. A lot of these items have been covered as Task Force members reviewed other states and Illinois' Safety Drill Act. It was about ten years ago that the sheriffs, Chief of Police, state police, fire marshal, fire chiefs, Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), school boards and the State Board of Education came together to create the Safety Drill Act. Chairman Vose said that the Task Force has made some excellent recommendations. The Physical Plant Subcommittee worked through the fourth charge, giving consideration to physical structure and security recommendations. Mr. Schwarm asked if Task Force members were going to vote to accept the Training Subcommittee's revised recommendations because he did not see the Training Subcommittee's final report on the agenda. He said that when the Task Force gets to the Training Subcommittee report and to item #6, that will cover the model security plan policy. Mr. Aranowski said that he does not think there was any reason why it was left off the agenda and it can be added as an action item for the next meeting.

Chairman Vose confirmed that Task Force members have accomplished most of their tasks with the ISBE School Emergency & Crisis Response Plan Guide, the Federal Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Plans, the Illinois Association of School Board's Policy Reference Education Subscription Service (PRESS) items, and the suggested possible funding recommendations. Mr. Aranowski said that the IEMA grant for training will be available in the summer. There are going to be regionally-based trainings for school districts, ROEs and first responders. He has had some discussion with ISBE's federal partners. A lot of what the Task Force is doing ISBE can push out to

training. The training will be Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) approved and specific to Illinois.

Regarding the Task Force's charge to create a model security plan policy, Mr. Aranowski highlighted the last word, "policy." Federal guidance already exists for individual school emergency operations plans, and in looking at the Task Force's charge, the federal guidance is great. It does not say what a school's plan should look like; rather, it provides a shell of what a plan should look like and poses a series of questions. It gets at the core of what emergency operations plans should be by putting more emphasis on planning and less on the final product. It encourages schools to not just put their name on a template. Mr. Aranowski noted that the federal guidance was developed by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and FEMA, and has been vetted extensively. The guidance has a chart where schools can prioritize hazards specific to their regions, and includes pieces on Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) implications, student privacy rights, Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) guidelines, psychological first aid, active shooter situations and how school climate can contribute to crises. Mr. Aranowski said that his thought is that Task Force members adopt the federal guidance as their model security plan policy whereby districts would go through the document in their planning. The Task Force can incorporate any recommendations from the Training Subcommittee into the final report. In the coming months, the federal government will also be releasing district emergency operations plan guidance. Dr. Bernat reminded Task Force members that David Esquith from ED discussed the guidance with them. There are sister documents for higher education and religious institutions. Dr. Bernat thinks that it is useful for ISBE to join with these other entities because of the uniformity. Mr. Aranowski said he wanted to be explicitly clear that the law requires the Task Force to create a model security plan policy. The Task Force would be adapting a policy, not creating one. Mr. Aranowski thinks it would be ludicrous to reinvent the wheel when so much work has been done by ISBE's federal partners in the area already. Mr. O'Connor said that if Task Force members take the federal guidelines and draft them towards their policy, Task Force members would be doing the state a great service because the school security grants in higher education and K-12 are getting tighter on their requirements. If Illinois is going to compete for federal dollars in the future, the grants are closer to the federal requirements. Mr. Aranowski agreed that if the federal government is moving in this direction, using the federal guidelines would only have the effect of setting Illinois schools up to be successful in applying for grants. Mr. Schwarm added that this fits exactly into the Training Subcommittee's final report and what is current practice in school districts. The Training Subcommittee's second recommendation is that "School districts adopt a policy that requires an Emergency Operations Plan; a designated District Safety Coordinator; a safety team for each school building; objectives substantially similar to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)'s Guide to Developing High Quality School Emergency Operations Plans, and; a school safety drill plan (including at least one drill to be unscheduled and random)."

Motion for the Task Force to vote on adopting this as its model security plan policy to go to the State Board of Education and to also consider additions and modifications pursuant to the Training Subcommittee: Moved by Ben Schwarm and seconded by Robert Bernat. Discussion: Tad Williams suggested that the Task Force wait to vote until the next meeting and give everyone a chance to look at the Training Subcommittee recommendations again. It is not technically on the agenda. Mr. Aranowski said that the Task Force can vote on this next month but he wants to make sure that ISBE staff have time to work on the final report. He thinks the Task Force should be fine as long as a draft is done by the second week in June.

Motion amended to support item #6 on the agenda: Moved as amended by Ben Schwarm and seconded by Jeff Aranowski. Voice vote. **Motion carried.** Task Force members will discuss and vote on the Training Subcommittee's final report at the next meeting.

Mr. Aranowski asked if he could make a simplistic statement about compliance and not about quality. He does not intend for this to swing members' potential votes but if the Task Force does not have a plan policy by the next meeting in May, the Task Force will fall behind in drafting the final report. Mr. Aranowski asked Task Force members to let him know as soon as possible if they will not be supporting the adoption of the federal guidance.

Open Discussion and Next Steps

Mr. Aranowski asked Ms. Rosenthal to resend the Federal Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Plans, ISBE's existing School Emergency & Crisis Response Plan Guide, the Training Subcommittee's final report and the "See, Hear and Speak Up" document in the same email. Chairman Vose said that Task Force members need to be prepared to vote so that they can get the report in. Dr. Bernat said that the next meeting should be the hard deadline. Chairman Vose confirmed that the Task Force would table agenda items #5 and #6 for the next meeting. Representative Sente requested that the attachments sent via email have dates on them. Mr. Aranowski said that Ms. Rosenthal will look at legislative calendars and will reach out to legislative staff to make sure the legislators are available for the vote. He said he appreciates their support and efforts and does not want to move forward without them. The Task Force needs to hold the vote sooner rather than later in the event that they need to have meetings in May and June to finalize everything. Representative Sente said that they will be down in Springfield every day in May. A Friday afternoon will probably work best. Mr. Henebry said he may be moving to India so he may not be able to participate.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn: Moved by Jeff Aranowski and seconded by Representative Carol Sente. Voice vote. **Motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 2:29 p.m.