Safety and Security Evaluation

August 2012

**A. Description of the Program:**

The Board recognizes the necessity for a planned safety program to create a safe environment for the students attending, and for the professional and support staff employed by the school district. The maintenance of healthful and safe conditions throughout the school district is a responsibility shared by the Board, superintendent and all professional and support staff.

Every attempt will be made to meet safety and health standards established by state and federal laws and regulations. The cooperation of school, home and community in providing a safe and healthful environment is encouraged by the Board.

Safe practices will be a scheduled part of instruction in the classrooms, laboratories and school shops. Proper supervision of students and other citizens using the school facilities will be required. Hazardous conditions indicated by inspectors will be reported to the Board and corrected. Each building administrator will develop and implement a safety program, report hazardous conditions to the superintendent and hold employees and students responsible for the observance of all safety rules and procedures.

The district will fully utilize federal, state and local violence prevention programs and resources available to students, teachers or staff that the district determines are necessary and cost effective for the school district. By July 1, 2001, the superintendent will designate a school safety coordinator who will have a thorough knowledge of such programs. Board Policy: EB

**B. Budget Information:**

There are no funds allocated to this program. This program identifies needs related to other

programs. Projects that are identified are funded by these other programs.

**C.** **Date Reviewed: August 2012**

Safety Task Force met May 29, 2012 to evaluate progress for the 2011-2012 School Year

**D. Program Personnel Responsible:**

Dr. Travis Hux, Assistant Superintendent of Support Services

**E. Evaluators:**

Dr. Travis Hux, Assistant Superintendent of Support Services

**F. Current Program Goals and/or Objectives:**

MSIP Standard 6.6: The schools are orderly; students and staff indicate they feel safe at school.

1. A written code of conduct which specifies acceptable student behavior, consequences,

and discipline procedures and which includes appropriate measures to ensure the safety

of students to and from school, during school, and during school-sponsored activities is.

distributed to teachers, parents, and students

2. Students and staff indicate they feel safe at school.

3. Standards of conduct are enforced consistently, and violence-prevention training has

been implemented.

4. Data is gathered on student violence and substance abuse, and is used to modify

programs and strategies to ensure safe and orderly schools.

MSIP Standard 8.11: The district’s facilities are safe.

1. Safety and emergency devices are in place and operational.

2. Staff members and students are trained in the safe and proper use of all safety and

emergency devices where applicable.

3. The district has developed, implemented, and documented safety procedures, which

include:

-safety inspections for buildings and grounds

-appropriate safety/emergency drills

-a reporting system for accidents

-security and crisis management plans for each building

-violence-prevention training for the staff.

CSIP Goal I: Facilities, Support and Instructional Resources: Provide and maintain appropriate instructional resources, support services, and functional and safe facilities.

1. Provide and maintain appropriate, functional and safe facilities.

1. Conduct a facilities needs assessment to provide up-to-date information for facilities planning that includes input and feedback from buildings and programs. (Completed February 2010)
2. Develop a 5 year facilities plan utilizing the district’s long-range facilities study and the needs assessment data. (Completed February 2010)
3. Develop a Safe Schools Community Task Force. (Completed February 2010)
4. Revise district and building safety/crisis response plans through partnership with city and county public safety organizations. (Completed February 2010)
5. Review and revise the 10 year facilities plan utilizing the district’s long-range facility study and the needs assessment data. (Ongoing)
6. Meet regularly with the Safety Task Force to develop and assess goals based on the safety study and safety survey data. (Ongoing)
7. Continue to achieve the goals outlined on the district’s 10 year safety plan. (Ongoing)
8. Continue to develop the Emergency Response Information Portal (ERIP) to meet the needs of the district in a crisis response. (Ongoing)
9. Continue to assess, develop and implement safety professional development. (Ongoing)

**Board Goal: 2011-2012:**

Assure that all children and staff are in a safe environment through the review and full implementation of building and district crisis/disaster plans, ongoing assessment of district facilities, and the increased cooperation of various outside agencies.

**Additional Goals and/or Objectives:** Implement the recommendations of the 2009-2010 Safety Assessment:

1. Working with area law enforcement to obtain DARE/Truancy Officer. (Expected

Completion December 2012)

2. Emergency management training and exercises. (Ongoing)

3. Improved access control. (Expected Completion Summer 2012)

**G. Data Used to Evaluate Program**:

1. Board Policy Section J (highlights student conduct)
2. Violence Prevention Training 2010-2012
3. OSEDA Safe and Drug Free School Data 2010 & 2012

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MO Safe & Drug Free Schools Survey** | **Level** | **RQS 2010** | **MO 2010** | **RQS 2012** | **MO 2012** | **RQS**  **Diff.** | **RQS**  **Impact** | **MO Diff.** | **MO**  **Impact** |
| A. I feel safe at school. | Disagree | 22.09 | 16.43 | 14.44 | 10.47 | -7.65 | + | -3.97 | - |
|  | Agree | 77.91 | 83.57 | 85.56 | 87.52 | 7.65 | + | 1.96 | - |
| B. I feel safe going to or from school. | Disagree | 17.63 | 12.42 | 11.57 | 10.2 | -6.06 | + | -1.37 | - |
|  | Agree | 82.37 | 87.78 | 88.43 | 89.47 | 6.06 | + | 1.04 | - |

4. HR Climate Survey Data 2012

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **HR Climate Survey** | **Level** | **RQS 2012** |
| A. Student safety is a priority (physical) | Priority | 98% |
|  | Not a priority | 2% |
| B. Door to door safety for students school/back | Safe | 95% |
|  | Not Safe | 5% |

5. UL Fire Alarm Certificates

6. Fire Extinguisher Certificates and AED Registration Documents

7. AED Training Documentation

8. Written Safety Procedures

9. Safe Plans Safety Assessment: 12/15/09

10. Hollis and Miller Facilities Assessment: 12/15/09

11. Facilities Assessment Presented to the Board of Education: 02/22/10

12. Safety Assessment Presented to the Board of Education: 02/22/10

13. Safety Task Force Meeting Dates: 8/11/09, 10/15/09, 12/03/09, 02/18/10, 05/20/10, 9/16/10, 10/28/10, 1/6/11, 2/15/11, 4/15/11, 9/6/11, 11/1/11, 1/9/12, 3/7/12, 5/29/12

14. Joint Planning Committee Meeting with First Responders: 01/21/10

15. Use of Private Security Services Began: 08/09/10

16. Installation of Security Cameras Began: 08/09/10

17. COPS Grant Secured for Cameras in BR-NT, RSHS, and RHS-CMS

18. Installation of relay switches by technology 2009-2010

19. Purchased Radios for all buildings: 12/13/10

20. Executive Security installed panic buttons during the summer of 2010

21. Administrator Safety Training Dates: 02/03/10, 05/05/10, 07/22/11, 05/02/12

22. Future administration training dates with Safe-Plans: 07/26/12

23. Professional Development Training Topics for 2010-2012: CPR, AED, Gang Awareness, Buzzer Entry for Secretaries, Table-top Exercises

24. Information on Schlage ND-Series door locks

25. Information on Data Card Entry

**H. Analysis of Strengths:**

1. Written Code of Conduct exists for both students and staff in Board Policy. Written code of conduct exists for both students and staff in handbooks.
2. Various training exercises with differing levels of staff have been occurring and facilitated by Safe-Plans. This type of training is ongoing.
3. OSEDA Safe and Drug Free School Data is collected through survey within the District. OSEDA Data is used to create goals and objectives related to safety.
   1. Regarding the question about RQS students feeling safe at school, those that disagreed reduced by 7.65% and those that agreed increased by 7.65% from 2010 to 2012.
   2. Regarding the question about RQS students feeling safe going to or from school, those that disagreed reduced by 6.06% and those that agree increased by 6.06% from 2010 to 2012.
   3. Regarding the question about RQS students feeling safe at school compared to Missouri students, the RQS student percentage that disagreed was 3.97% higher than the Missouri student percentage and the percentage of those that agreed was 1.96% lower in 2012.
   4. Regarding the question about RQS students feeling safe going to or from school compared to Missouri students, the RQS student percentage that disagreed was 1.37% higher than the Missouri student percentage and the percentage of those that agreed was 1.04% lower in 2012.
4. HR Climate Survey Data is collected through survey within the District. This is the first year of the new survey, which gives a baseline, but no longitudinal data at this time.
   1. Regarding the question about RQS “students safety is a priority (physical)”, 98% of those surveyed felt safety was a priority.
   2. Regarding the question about RQS “students safety is a priority (physical)”, 2% of those surveyed felt safety was considered but not a priority.
   3. Regarding the question about RQS “door to door safety for students to school/back”, 95% of those surveyed felt students were safe.
   4. Regarding the question about RQS “door to door safety for student to school/back”, 5% of those surveyed felt students were not safe.
5. UL Fire Certificates have been obtained for all schools in the District.
6. Safety and emergency devices are in place and operational.
7. Many key staff members and students are trained in the safe and proper use of all safety and emergency devices where applicable.
8. The District has developed and implemented, safety procedures, which include:

-safety inspections for buildings and grounds

-appropriate safety/emergency drills

-a reporting system for accidents

-security and crisis management plans for each building

1. A Safety Assessment was conducted in December of 2009.
2. A Facilities Assessment was conducted in December of 2009.
3. A 10 year long-range plan was created for safety needs.
4. A 10 year long-range plan was created for facility needs.
5. A Safety Task Force was created and met regularly during the 2009-2012 School Years.
6. District and building safety/crisis response plans have been revised after conducting a joint planning meeting which included partnership with city and county public safety organizations.
7. Assistant Superintendents of Elementary, Secondary, and Support Services reviewed and implemented the use of security officers through contracted services with a security company.
8. The technology department conducted a needs assessment for video surveillance at schools. Since then over 500 cameras have been installed.
9. Associate Superintendent wrote a COPS SOS grant in an effort to fund $150,000.00 of the needed upgrades in video surveillance.
10. The technology department has installed additional relay switches for administrators to communicate via Nextel in areas where communication was not able to occur.
11. The District implemented more than 300 radios as a means of redundancy for communication during a crisis situation.
12. The District installed panic buttons in offices in all facilities that trigger building alarms and notify police.
13. The District has conducted training sessions with building administrators through Safe-Plans during the 2009-2012 school years.
14. Continued training is scheduled to take place with administrators through Safe-Plans for the 2012-2013 school year.
15. The District will provide professional development training for all staff. Safety training will occur with staff periodically throughout the school year.
16. The District has plans for renovation of entries to buildings with the use of key cards in 2015.
17. The District has plans for renovation of locks on classroom doors to be lockable from the interior in 2015.

**Additional Strengths:**

1. Assistant Superintendent has been assigned to be accountable for emergency operations plans.
2. Site mapping of every building in the District has been completed.
3. All emergency related information has been loaded onto an online system (ERIP).
4. Bus video camera systems have been upgraded.
5. AED medical equipment was installed in all facilities.
6. Pandemic Influenza Plan has been developed for the District.
7. School-emergency services relations have been established.
8. Police exercises are being conducted in District buildings.
9. One fire drill per year per school is required to be conducted with the assistance of the fire department.
10. Transportation department conducts monthly safety meetings.
11. Transportation department conducts pre-trip inspections before each use of each bus.
12. All buildings are now equipped with NOAA weather radios.
13. Intercom renovations have taken place at WR, SW, LH, LB, CMS, RSMS, and RSHS and continue at other buildings. FR and RO scheduled for summer 2012.
14. Procedures have been developed for communication in buildings if/when the intercom/PA is non-functional.
15. A severe weather plan has been created with regard to students in transit.
16. Severe weather text notification system has been set up for all administrators in the District.
17. Heat procedure related to summer school activities has been created.
18. Employees have been given permission from administration to contact 911 as a primary source, rather than funneling through the building principal.
19. A safety campaign has been developed and implemented, that includes TV, Newspaper, web, flyers, email, the Edge, flyers, posters, violence prevention hotline, surveys, presentations.
20. Memorandums of Understanding have been developed and implemented with various facilities near schools for the use of a secondary off-site location for emergencies.
21. Entrance signage has been placed on all exterior doors: “This door remains locked at all times. Visitors must report to the office before entering.”
22. Command posts have been established for all facilities by 1st responders. They have been mapped and placed on the ERIP system.
23. The Emergency Response Information Portal (ERIP) has been developed with all emergency plans and is accessible to administrators and 1st responders.
24. Trespassing signage has been developed in conjunction with police and prosecutors and placed at the perimeter of all facilities.
25. Administrators were trained in conducting threat assessments on students, staff, and visitors.
26. Quick reference guides on the updated emergency plans were created and distributed out to all staff members.
27. An off-duty law enforcement job description was created so police officers know exactly what their duties are while working at schools.
28. Emergency Medical Services have been established for all events occurring in the District that expect 700 or more attendees.
29. Security officers have recently been expanded beyond the two high schools to also include all three middle schools.
30. The Director of Buildings and Grounds conducts safety inspections of all facilities annually.
31. Insurance companies MEM and WRM conduct annual safety reviews of the District.
32. Emergency communication has been established at the administration building because there is no intercom system.
33. A visitor procedure has been established to ensure that no visitors are left alone in school buildings.
34. An outside vendor now conducts annual bleacher inspections and repairs. The bleachers at RSHS football field are being renovated during the summer of 2012.

**New Goals and Objectives:**

1. It was noted in the 2012 OSEDA Survey of Students that there was a 15.3% positive change since the last survey in 2010 regarding the question about students feeling safe at school.

Based on these numbers above, the District will further improve the perceptions of students “feeling safe” in the District by not less than 5% within two years.

1. It was noted in the 2012 OSEDA Survey of Students that there was a 5.93% negative difference between RQS students and Missouri students regarding the question about feeling safe at school.

Based on these numbers above, the District will further improve the perceptions of RQS students “feeling safe” in the District so they are within or above the average of students in the State of Missouri.

1. It was noted in the 2012 OSEDA Survey of Students that there was a 12.12% positive change since the last survey in 2010 regarding the question about students feeling safe going to and from school.

Based on these numbers above, the District will further improve the perceptions of students “feeling safe going to and from school” in the District by not less than 5% within two years.

1. It was noted in the 2012 OSEDA Survey of Students that there was a 2.41% negative difference between RQS students and Missouri students regarding the question about students feeling safe going to and from school.

Based on these numbers above, the District will further improve the perceptions of students “feeling safe going to and from school” in the District so they are within or above the average of students in the State of Missouri.

1. It was noted in the 2012 HR Survey of Staff that 98% feel that student safety is a priority.

Based on these numbers above, the District will maintain the level of perception of staff regarding “students safety being a priority” in the District.

1. It was noted in the 2012 HR Survey of Staff that 95% feel that students are safe going to and from school.

Based on these numbers above, the District will maintain the level perception of staff regarding “students being safe going to and from school” in the District.

**J. Board Focus:**

**What information can you share that ensures this program is the best focus for our students in this particular area or need? (Research)**

**Indicators of School Crime and Safety, 2011**

**U. S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics and Bureau of Justice Statistics**

This annual report examines crime occurring in school as well as on the way to and from school. It also provides the most current detailed statistical information on the nature of crime in schools and school environments; and responses to violence and crime at school. The data for this survey was released February 22, 2012.

**Key Findings**

Preliminary data show that there were 33 school-associated violent deaths[1](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f1) from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010 ([*Indicator 1*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_01.asp)). In 2010, among students ages 12–18, there were about 828,000 nonfatal victimizations at school,[2](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f2) which include 470,000 victims of theft[3](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f3) and 359,000 victims of violence[4](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f4) (simple assault and serious violence[5](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f5)) ([*Indicator 2*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_02.asp)). In 2009–10, about 74 percent of public schools recorded one or more violent incidents of crime, 16 percent recorded one or more serious violent incidents,[6](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f6) and 44 percent recorded one or more thefts[7](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f7) ([*Indicator 6*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_06.asp)). The following key findings are drawn from each section of the report.

*Violent Deaths*

* Of the 33 student, staff, and nonstudent school-associated violent deaths[1](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f1) occurring between July 1, 2009, and June 30, 2010, 25 were homicides, 5 were suicides, and 3 were legal interventions. From July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010, there were 17 homicides and 1 suicide of school-age youth (ages 5–18) at school ([*Indicator 1*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_01.asp)).
* During the school year 2008–09 there were 1,579 homicides among school-age youth ages 5–18, of which 17 occurred at school. During the 2008 calendar year, there were 1,344 suicides of youth ages 5–18, of which 7 occurred at school ([*Indicator 1*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_01.asp)).

*Nonfatal Student and Teacher Victimization*

* In 2010, students ages 12–18 were victims of about 828,000 nonfatal victimizations at school,[8](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f8) including 470,000 thefts[9](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f9) and 359,000 violent victimizations,[10](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f10) 91,400 of which were serious violent victimizations[11](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f11) ([*Indicator 2*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_02.asp)).
* In 2010, a greater number of students ages 12–18 experienced total victimizations (theft and violent crime) at school than away from school. That year, 32 victimizations per 1,000 students occurred at school, and 26 victimizations per 1,000 students occurred away from school ([*Indicator 2*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_02.asp)).
* In 2010, no measurable differences were found in the violent victimization rates at school vs. those away from school ([*Indicator 2*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_02.asp)).
* The total crime victimization rate of students ages 12–18 at school declined from 43 victimizations per 1,000 students in 2009 to 32 victimizations per 1,000 students in 2010 ([*Indicator 2*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_02.asp)).
* Four percent of students ages 12–18 reported being victimized at school[9](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f9) during the previous 6 months in 2009 ([*Indicator 3*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_03.asp)). Three percent of students reported theft, [10](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f10) 1 percent reported violent victimization, [11](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f11) and less than half of a percent reported serious violent victimization. [12](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f12) In addition, students attending public schools reported being victimized at twice the rate of students attending private schools (4 percent vs. 2 percent).
* Eight percent of students in grades 9–12 reported being threatened or injured with a weapon, such as a gun, knife, or club, on school property[12](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f12) in 2009. Specifically, 3 percent of students were threatened or injured with a weapon one time, 2 percent were threatened or injured with a weapon two or three times, 1 percent were threatened or injured with a weapon four to eleven times, and 1 percent were threatened or injured with a weapon twelve or more times[13](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f13) ([*Indicator 4*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_04.asp)).
* In 2009, about 10 percent of male students in grades 9–12 reported being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property in the past year, compared to 5 percent of female students ([*Indicator 4*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_04.asp)).
* During the 2007–08 school year, a greater percentage of teachers in city schools (10 percent) reported being threatened with injury than teachers in town schools (7 percent) and suburban or rural schools (6 percent each) ([*Indicator 5*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_05.asp)). A greater percentage of teachers in city schools (5 percent) and suburban schools (4 percent) reported being physically attacked, compared to teachers in rural schools (3 percent).
* A greater percentage of secondary school teachers (8 percent) reported being threatened with injury by a student than elementary school teachers (7 percent) ([*Indicator 5*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_05.asp)). However, a greater percentage of elementary school teachers (6 percent) reported being physically attacked than secondary school teachers (2 percent).

*School Environment*

* During the 2009–10 school year, 85 percent of public schools recorded that one or more crime incidents had taken place at school,[14](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f14) amounting to an estimated 1.9 million crimes ([table 6.1](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/tables/table_06_1.asp)). This figure translates to a rate of 40 crimes per 1,000 public school students enrolled in 2009–10. During the same year, 60 percent of public schools reported a crime incident that occurred at school to the police, amounting to 689,000 crimes—or 15 crimes per 1,000 public school students enrolled ([*Indicator 6*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_06.asp)).
* In 2009–10, about 74 percent of public schools recorded one or more violent incidents of crime, 16 percent recorded one or more serious violent incidents, 44 percent recorded one or more thefts, and 68 percent recorded one or more other incidents.[15](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f15) Forty percent of public schools reported at least one violent incident to police, 10 percent reported at least one serious violent incident to police, 25 percent reported at least one theft to police, and 46 percent reported one or more other incidents to police ([*Indicator 6*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_06.asp)).
* During the 2009–10 school year, 23 percent of public schools reported that bullying occurred among students on a daily or weekly basis, and 9 percent reported widespread disorder in classrooms on a daily or weekly basis ([*Indicator 7*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_07.asp)).
* Sixteen percent of public schools reported that gang activities had occurred during the 2009–10 school year, and 2 percent reported that cult or extremist activities had occurred during this period. The percentages of public schools that reported gang activity at all at their schools during the school year decreased from 20 percent in 2007–08 to 16 percent in 2009–10 ([*Indicator 7*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_07.asp)).
* Three percent of schools reported that student acts of disrespect for teachers other than verbal abuse occurred at least once a week in 2009–10, lower than the 11 percent in 2007–08 ([*Indicator 7*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_07.asp)).
* In 2009, about 20 percent of students ages 12–18 reported that there were gangs present at their schools ([*Indicator 8*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_08.asp)). Students in 6th grade reported a lower percentage of a gang presence at their school than students in grades 8 through 12. The percentage of students in 6th grade who reported a gang presence was not measurably different from students in 7th grade. There were no measurable differences in the percentages of male and female students who reported a gang presence at their schools in 2009.
* The percentage of students in grades 9–12 who reported that drugs were offered, sold, or given to them decreased from 32 percent in 1995 to 23 percent in 2009 ([*Indicator 9*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_09.asp)).
* In 2009 in grades 9–12, higher percentages of American Indian/Alaska Native students (34 percent) and Hispanic students (31 percent) reported that drugs were made available to them on school property than Black students (22 percent), White students (20 percent), and Asian students (18 percent) ([*Indicator 9*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_09.asp)).
* In 2009, about 9 percent of students ages 12–18 reported being targets of hate-related words at school and 29 percent of students reported seeing hate-related graffiti at school during the school year ([*Indicator 10*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_10.asp)).
* Higher percentages of Black students and Hispanic students (11 percent each) reported being targets of hate-related words at school than White students (7 percent) in 2009. In addition, a higher percentage of Hispanic students (32 percent) than White students (28 percent) reported seeing hate-related graffiti ([*Indicator 10*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_10.asp)).
* In 2009, about 28 percent of 12- to 18-year-old students reported having been bullied at school during the school year and 6 percent reported having been cyber-bullied ([*Indicator 11*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_11.asp)). A higher percentage of females (20 percent) than males (13 percent) reported being the subject of rumors in 2009, while a lower percentage of females (8 percent ) than males (10 percent) reported being pushed, shoved, tripped, or spit on. Also, a higher percentage of females (6 percent) than males (4 percent) reported being excluded from activities on purpose.
* In 2009, about 39 percent of 6th-graders reported being bullied at school, compared with 33 percent of 7th graders, 32 percent of 8th-graders, 28 percent of 9th-graders, 27 percent of 10th-graders, 21 percent of 11th-graders, and 20 percent of 12th-graders ([*Indicator 11*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_11.asp)).
* Six percent of students ages 12–18 reported being cyber-bullied in 2009. About 3 percent reported being subject to harassing text messages ([*Indicator 11*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_11.asp)). About 4 percent of females reported being subject to harassing text messages compared with 2 percent of males.
* In 2007–08, about 34 percent of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that student misbehavior interfered with their teaching, and 32 percent reported that student tardiness and class cutting interfered with their teaching ([*Indicator 12*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_12.asp)). Seventy-two percent of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that other teachers at their school enforced the school rules, and 89 percent reported that the principal enforced the school rules.
* A higher percentage of secondary school teachers than elementary school teachers reported that student misbehavior (39 percent vs. 33 percent) and student tardiness and class cutting (45 percent vs. 26 percent) interfered with their teaching in 2007–08 ([*Indicator 12*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_12.asp)). During the same year, a lower percentage of secondary school teachers than elementary school teachers agreed that school rules were enforced by teachers (56 percent vs. 79 percent) and by the principal in their school (86 percent vs. 89 percent).

*Fights, Weapons, and Illegal Substances*

* In 2009, about 31 percent of students in grades 9–12 reported they had been in a physical fight at least one time during the previous 12 months anywhere, and 11 percent said they had been in a fight on school property during the previous 12 months.[16](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f16) Generally, a higher percentage of students in 9th grade reported having been in fights than students in any other grade, both anywhere and on school property. Generally, a smaller percentage of Asian students reported being in fights anywhere and on school property than students of other racial/ethnic groups. In addition, 4 percent of males said they had been in a fight anywhere twelve or more times, compared to 1 percent of females, and 1 percent of males said they had been in a fight on school property twelve or more times, compared to less than half a percent of females ([*Indicator 13*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_13.asp)).
* Between 1993 and 2009, the percentage of students who reported carrying a weapon at least one day anywhere during the past 30 days declined from 22 percent to 17 percent, and the percentage who reported carrying a weapon at least one day on school property also declined, from 12 percent to 6 percent ([*Indicator 14*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_14.asp)).
* In 2009, about 27 percent of males carried a weapon anywhere, compared to 7 percent of females, and 8 percent of males carried a weapon on school property, compared to 3 percent of females ([*Indicator 14*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_14.asp)).
* In 2009, about 42 percent of students in grades 9–12 reported having at least one drink of alcohol anywhere in the past 30 days, while 4 percent had at least one drink on school property ([*Indicator 15*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_15.asp)).
* Since 2003, there has been no measurable difference between the percentages of male and female students in grades 9–12 who reported alcohol consumption anywhere. However, there were differences in the reporting of how often alcohol was consumed in 2009. One percent of male students reported consuming alcohol anywhere all thirty days ([figure 15.2](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/figures/figure_15_2.asp) and [table 15.3](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/tables/table_15_3.asp)). In terms of alcohol use on school property, a greater percentage of males reported using alcohol at least one time during the previous 30 days than did females in every survey year ([*Indicator 15*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_15.asp)).
* In 2009, about 21 percent of students in grades 9–12 reported using marijuana anywhere in the past 30 days, while 5 percent reported using marijuana on school property. According to students' reports, male students were twice as likely as females to use marijuana on school property (6 percent vs. 3 percent, respectively). Six percent of male students reported using marijuana anywhere 40 times or more during the previous 30 days, compared to 2 percent of females ([*Indicator 16*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_16.asp)).
* Generally among 9th–12th-graders, the percentage of Asian students reporting using marijuana anywhere and on school property during the previous 30 days was smaller than that of most other racial/ethnic groups. In addition, the percentage of students reporting using marijuana anywhere increased with grade level: a smaller percentage of 9th-graders reported using marijuana anywhere (16 percent), than 10th-graders (21 percent), 11th-graders (23 percent), and 12th-graders (25 percent) ([*Indicator 16*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_16.asp)).

*Fear and Avoidance*

* In 2009, a higher percentage of students ages 12–18 reported that they were afraid of attack or harm at school (4 percent) than away from school (3 percent) during the school year ([*Indicator 17*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_17.asp)).
* Higher percentages of 6th-graders and 7th-graders (6 percent each) reported being afraid of attack or harm at school than 8th-graders (4 percent) and 11th-graders (3 percent) ([*Indicator 17*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_17.asp)).
* The percentage of students who reported that they had avoided at least one school activity or one or more places in school during the previous school year because of fear of attack or harm decreased from 7 percent in 2007 to 5 percent in 2009. Specifically, in 2009, about 2 percent of students avoided at least one school activity, and 4 percent avoided one or more places in school[17](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f17) ([*Indicator 18*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_18.asp)).

*Discipline, Safety, and Security Measures*

* During the 2009–10 school year, 39 percent of public schools (about 32,300 schools) took at least one serious disciplinary action against a student for specific offenses. Of the 433,800 serious disciplinary actions taken during the 2009–10 school year, 74 percent were suspensions for 5 days or more, 20 percent were transfers to specialized schools, and 6 percent were removals with no services for the remainder of the school year ([*Indicator 19*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_19.asp)).
* The percentage of public schools taking at least one serious disciplinary action declined over time between 1999–2000 (54 percent) and 2009–10 (39 percent); and the percentage was lower in 2009–10 than in 2007–08 (46 percent). ([*Indicator 19*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_19.asp)).
* During the 2009–10 school year, 93 percent of public schools reported that they limited access to social networking websites from school computers, and 91 percent prohibited the use of cell phones and text messaging devices during school hours ([*Indicator 20*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_20.asp)).
* Between the 1999–2000 and 2009–10 school years, there was an increase in the percentage of public schools reporting the use of the following safety and security measures: controlled access to the building during school hours (from 75 to 92 percent); controlled access to school grounds during school hours (from 34 to 46 percent); faculty required to wear badges or picture IDs (from 25 to 63 percent); the use of one or more security cameras to monitor the school (from 19 to 61 percent); the provision of telephones in most classrooms (from 45 to 74 percent); and the requirement that students wear uniforms (from 12 to 19 percent) ([*Indicator 20*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_20.asp)).
* In the 2007–08 school year a lower percentage of public schools reported the use of an electronic notification system for a schoolwide emergency (43 percent) and a structured, anonymous threat reporting system (31 percent) than in the 2009–10 school year (63 percent and 36 percent, respectively) ([*Indicator 20*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_20.asp)).
* In 2009, nearly all students (99 percent) ages 12–18 reported that they had observed the use of at least one of the selected security measures at their schools.[18](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#f18) The majority of students ages 12–18 reported that their schools had a code of student conduct (96 percent) and a requirement that visitors sign in (94 percent). Approximately 68 percent of students reported the presence of security guards and/or assigned police officers, and 91 percent reported the presence of other school staff or other adult supervision in the hallway. Metal detectors were the least observed of the selected safety and security measures: 11 percent of students reported the use of metal detectors at their schools ([*Indicator 21*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_21.asp)).

[1](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r1) "School-associated violent death" is defined as "a homicide, suicide, or legal intervention (involving a law enforcement officer), in which the fatal injury occurred on the campus of a functioning elementary or secondary school in the United States." Victims of school-associated violent deaths included students, staff members, and others who are not students.  
[2](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r2) "At school" includes the school building, on school property, on a school bus, and going to and from school.   
[3](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r3) "Theft" includes attempted and completed purse-snatching, completed pickpocketing, and all attempted and completed thefts, excluding motor vehicle theft. Theft does not include robbery, in which the threat or use of force is involved.   
[4](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r4) "Violent victimization" includes serious violent crimes and simple assault.   
[5](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r5) "Serious violent victimization" includes rape, sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault.   
[6](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r6) "Violent incidents" include rape, sexual battery other than rape, physical attack or fight with or without a weapon, threat of physical attack with or without a weapon, and robbery with or without a weapon.   
[7](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r7) "Serious violent incidents" include rape, sexual battery other than rape, physical attack or fight with a weapon, threat of physical attack with a weapon, and robbery with or without a weapon.   
[8](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r8) "Theft or larceny" includes taking things worth over $10 without personal confrontation. Please see appendix B for a more detailed definition.   
[9](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r9) "Theft" includes attempted and completed purse-snatching, completed pickpocketing, and all attempted and completed thefts, excluding motor vehicle theft. Theft does not include robbery, in which the threat or use of force is involved.  
[10](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r10) "Violent victimization" includes serious violent crimes and simple assault.   
[11](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r11) "Serious violent victimization" includes rape, sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault.   
[12](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r12) "On school property" was not defined for survey respondents.   
[13](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r13) Subtotals do not add to total due to rounding.   
[14](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r14) "At school" was defined for respondents to include activities that happen in school buildings, on school grounds, on school buses, and at places that hold school-sponsored events or activities. Respondents were instructed to include incidents that occurred before, during, or after normal school hours or when school activities or events were in session.   
[15](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r15) "Other incidents" include possession of a firearm or explosive device; possession of a knife or sharp object; distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs or alcohol; vandalism; and inappropriate distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs.   
[16](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r16) "On school property" was not defined for survey respondents.   
[17](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r17) "Avoided school activities" includes avoiding any (extracurricular) activities, skipping class, or staying home from school. In 2007 and 2009, the survey wording was changed from "any extracurricular activities" to "any activities." Please use caution when comparing changes in this item over time. Avoiding one or more places in school includes avoiding the entrance, any hallways or stairs, parts of the cafeteria, restrooms, and other places inside the school building.   
[18](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/key.asp#r18) Readers should note that this indicator relies on student reports of security measures and provides estimates based on students' awareness of the measure rather than on documented practice. Selected security measures include, for example, controlling access during school hours, drug testing and prohibiting tobacco use, requiring ID badges, metal detectors, and sweeps and technology. For a more detailed list of selected security measures and a summary of the use of various security measures as reported by schools please see [*Indicator 20*](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/ind_20.asp).

**What data sources have been reviewed and analyzed to establish the connection between the program and the results? (Data Analysis)**

OSEDA Safe and Drug Free School Data 2010 & 2012

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MO Safe & Drug Free Schools Survey** | **Level** | **RQS 2010** | **MO 2010** | **RQS 2012** | **MO 2012** | **RQS**  **Diff.** | **RQS**  **Impact** | **MO Diff.** | **MO**  **Impact** |
| A. I feel safe at school. | Disagree | 22.09 | 16.43 | 14.44 | 10.47 | -7.65 | + | -3.97 | - |
|  | Agree | 77.91 | 83.57 | 85.56 | 87.52 | 7.65 | + | 1.96 | - |
| B. I feel safe going to or from school. | Disagree | 17.63 | 12.42 | 11.57 | 10.2 | -6.06 | + | -1.37 | - |
|  | Agree | 82.37 | 87.78 | 88.43 | 89.47 | 6.06 | + | 1.04 | - |

HR Climate Survey Data 2012

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **HR Climate Survey** | **Level** | **RQS 2012** |
| A. Student safety is a priority (physical) | Priority | 98% |
|  | Not a priority | 2% |
| B. Door to door safety for students school/back | Safe | 95% |
|  | Not Safe | 5% |

**What evidence do you have to show this program is improving student performance or meeting/exceeding board or district goals?**

* + - 1. It was noted in the 2012 OSEDA Survey of Students that there was a 15.3% positive change since the last survey in 2010 regarding the question about students feeling safe at school.
      2. It was noted in the 2012 OSEDA Survey of Students that there was a 5.93% negative difference between RQS students and Missouri students regarding the question about feeling safe at school.
      3. It was noted in the 2012 OSEDA Survey of Students that there was a 12.12% positive change since the last survey in 2010 regarding the question about students feeling safe going to and from school.
      4. It was noted in the 2012 OSEDA Survey of Students that there was a 2.41% negative difference between RQS students and Missouri students regarding the question about students feeling safe going to and from school.
      5. It was noted in the 2012 HR Survey of Staff that 98% feel that student safety is a priority.
      6. It was noted in the 2012 HR Survey of Staff that 95% feel that students are safe going to and from school.

**Can this program sustain itself if funds are cut? If not, what makes this program the one we should fund or support? (Results)**

There is no budget for this program. Funds are obtained from other programs as needed. The majority of the functions of the program could continue to exist without additional funding as the program is headed up by employees who work in other positions along with patrons who volunteer their time.

Funding is mainly needed to upgrade or maintain projects that are noted in the recommendations below. These projects were based on recommendations from the 2009 safety assessment.

Less significant amounts of funding would be needed for professional development training.

**K. Recommendations:**

*The following are recommendations made as a result of the December 2009 District Safety Assessment. To address the essential questions above and to achieve the above mentioned goals and objectives attempts should be made to institute the following recommendations.*

1. Raytown should continue the *deterrence media* campaign to proactively educate students, parents and community members on measures implemented to improve safety and security in Raytown schools.
2. Raytown should continue to utilize universal minimum safety standards to ensure that all buildings have physically safe environments.
3. Raytown should continue enhancing the threat assessment program.
4. Because gangs regularly change tactics and trends, Raytown should implement quarterly gang awareness training to educate school administrators the latest trends and reporting protocols.
5. Raytown should continue efforts of having security officers assigned to every middle and high school campus.
6. Raytown should continue to maintain school site mapping data (aerial photographs, area maps, floor plans, etc.) that are loaded into the Missouri Office of Homeland Security ERIP system.
7. Raytown should continue to maintain clearly defined perimeters and signs posted at regular intervals.
8. Raytown should continue to improve video surveillance on all campuses.
9. Raytown should continue to maintain fencing to create perimeters.
10. Raytown should continue maintain signage at entrances and around perimeters indicating visitor policies and loitering/trespassing.
11. Raytown should continue to ensure that no lighting/landscaping conflicts exist. All trees near light poles should be trimmed extremely low or replaced with low growing shrubs or plants.
12. Raytown should continue to encourage visitors (and even students) to utilize a desired point of entry, it is important that this entrance be clearly identified. Signs are strategically placed that not only inform visitors to report to the main office, but also identify the proper entrance.
13. A sequential marking system (numeric or alphanumeric) should be placed in all entrances/exits in the district. The system should be standard throughout the district (i.e. starting with the main entrance and “1” and progressing clockwise), markings should be on the interior and exterior and the markings should be at least 10 inches in height.
14. Raytown should continue the process of having visitor badges stored out of reach from visitors.
15. Raytown should continue implement the procedure of having visitors that are not known to the office staff present identification. The identification should be checked against the sign in information.
16. Raytown should consider establishing a minimum standard for classrooms to meet lockdown requirements (I.e. locking door with no interior facing widows greater than 12 inches wide). All staff (especially teachers in rooms that do not meet these requirements) should be trained in methods to reinforce the lockdown of their classroom.
17. Raytown should continue to maintain radio communications that enable interoperable communications between school personnel, the district, and first responders.
18. Raytown should continue to maintain panic alarms for staff in areas that may be separated from main areas of the school and/or assigned to work with at risk students.
19. Raytown should continue emphasize the need to keep hallways free from clutter and hold teachers accountable for the areas near their classroom.
20. Raytown should continue to implement Emergency Operations Plans should include policy for students not in a secure classroom during a lockdown emergency.
21. Raytown should continue to implement school plans to track and account for resources. If leaders are to rely on their plan for emergency management information; plans should catalog available resources, preferably in functional annexes. The following information should be available to leaders:
22. On-site communications assets
23. Command post locations (interior, exterior and off-site)
24. More structured Incident Command System.
25. Raytown should continue require support buildings to maintain emergency plans. Support building plans should provide guidance on response to evacuation (I.e. fire), shelter in place (I.e. severe weather), intruder response and direct building personnel towards resources in the event of an emergency. These plans should be trained and updated annually.
26. Raytown should implement fire drills that focus on evacuating away from a known hazard; which may not necessarily be the nearest exit.
27. Raytown should continue to maintain evacuation rally points or staging areas that avoid parking lots and minimize proximately to emergency response operations is recommended.
28. Raytown should continue to maintain Lockdown related plans by:
29. Identifying the minimum standard for room to meet lockdown requirements (I.e. locking door with no interior facing widows greater than 12 inches wide).
30. Identifying where students in areas that do not meet a minimum lockdown requirement are taken in the event of a lockdown.
31. Instruct teachers not to open secured classrooms for students left in hallways.
32. Train emergency response teams to help move students left in hallways and common areas to securable locations or away from the school.
33. Establish effective methods for communicating instructions to all classrooms and common areas.
34. Training staff in a strategy that incorporates the “3 Out” approach to respond to an active shooter. The “3 Outs” are:
    * Lock Out (Lockdown)
    * Get Out (Evacuate)
    * Take Out (Fight back as a last resort)
35. Raytown should continue to maintain emergency plans transferred to the Missouri Office of Homeland Security ERIP system and utilize its ICS components.
36. Raytown should continue to maintain key members of Raytown’s District incident management infrastructure with training in: ICS 100, 200 700 & 800.
37. Raytown should continue implementing a robust training program to ensure all decision makers understand their role in an emergency. Recommended training curriculum includes:
38. Incident Command System (ICS) for Schools
39. Security Awareness For Educators
40. Enhanced Threat Assessment Program
41. More robust dills for all facilities (fire, weather, & intruder)
42. Tabletop Exercises

**Signatures:**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Travis Hux, Assistant Superintendent of Support Services Date**