

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

MR. JAMES F. NOTTER
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Telephone: 754-321-2600

Facsimile: 754-321-2701

January 10, 2008

TO: School Board Members

FROM: Katherine Blasik, Ph.D., Associate Superintendent
Research, Evaluation, Assessment & Boundaries

VIA: James F. Notter
Superintendent of Schools

SUBJECT: **COMPREHENSIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
EVALUATION, 2006-07**

In 2005, the United States Department of Education (USDOE) awarded a follow-up grant under the Emergency Response and Crisis Management (ERCM) grant program to Broward County Public Schools (BCPS) to implement the second phase of the Comprehensive Emergency Management Program (CEMP). The CEMP was designed to utilize innovative approaches and strategies to provide a strengthened emergency response in BCPS to ensure that all students learn in a safe and secure environment. The attached report examines the progress of implementing the recommendations of the previous grant evaluation and the extent to which program objectives have been accomplished. Perceptions of stakeholders and first responder agencies regarding the process were also examined.

Overall, the District's emergency response procedures and planning processes have been strengthened, with the CEMP achieving seven of eight program objectives and addressing five of six recommendations from the 2005 evaluation. Stakeholders responded positively regarding the planning and collaboration between BCPS and first responder agencies and the improved ability of the District to adequately respond to emergency situations. New processes were established to improve communication between stakeholders, including the online planning process, which serves as a communication bridge between schools and first responders, and provides a common template for safety plans for all District schools; and guides were developed as a customizable tool for communicating with parents. The District currently has no policy requiring schools to conduct emergency drills (not including fire drills) and a lack of common procedures prohibit measuring improvements in response time.

Recommendations were made to institute guidelines for conducting emergency drills, as well as monitoring and improving the District's Emergency Response and Sustainability Plan, including the community and governmental partnerships developed therein. A recommendation was also made to consider developing the SAFE Team Training post-test into a certification exam to be used as an indicator of training completion, in addition to developing processes to verify District training compliance. If you have any questions or comments regarding this report, **please contact me at 754-321-2470 or Dr. Russell Clement, Director, Research Services at 754-321-2500**. This report may be accessed via the Research Services Web site (http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/research_evaluation/newmain.htm).

JFN/KAB/RWC:dww
Attachment

cc: Executive Leadership Team

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
OFFICE OF
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS & SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE UNIT
(754) 321-0725 – FAX (754) 321-0930

Signature on file

December 24, 2007

TO: Jim Notter
Superintendent of Schools

FROM: Joe Melita, Executive Director
Professional Standards & Special Investigative Unit

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO EMERGENCY RESPONSE & CRISIS MANAGEMENT GRANT**

Recommendation 1: Develop processes to record and verify each school's compliance with the District policy that requires SAFE teams include at least three trained staff members (Objective 4).

Response: Currently SIU has in existence a Safety & Security Committee that is comprised of district departments and principals from all levels. This is a forum to discuss and address school safety. New procedures, training, and policies are recommended via this platform. SIU will propose this recommendation to the committee to determine the appropriate implementation and accountability in collaboration with HRD and Area Superintendents.

Recommendation 2: Institute guidelines requiring that all schools conduct emergency drills beyond fire drills currently practiced at District schools. Common procedures should be developed with consideration to identifying methods for measuring response time at all District schools.

Response: The School Board of Broward County Safety & Security Committee will review steps necessary to implement a policy mandating emergency drills for schools. The State of Florida's Safe & Drug Free Schools has introduced a bill that will require schools to conduct emergency drills. The passing of this bill will support these efforts.

Recommendation 3: Monitor and improve the District's Emergency Response and Sustainability Plan to ensure the continuous improvement of the school safety plans. Improvements in school safety plans should also facilitate the examination of hazards addressed by District schools for future evaluations

Response: SIU will encourage the District Safety & Security Committee and the First Responders Committee to review the online Safety Plan template and offer suggested changes or improvements annually. As a result new directives, procedures, and protocols can be implemented via the online Safety Plan, which can present the appropriate accountability involving school safety duties.

Recommendation 4: Continue to expand the number and comprehensiveness of community governmental and private agencies involved in the development and review of the School Safety Plans.

Response: The First Responder Committee will serve as the conduit to determine further involvement beyond the Law Enforcement & Fire Department reviewing procedures. A major factor in the review process is the first responder agreement regarding responding procedures to schools. Typically these two agencies are the

lead agencies for first response to school emergencies. SIU will propose the expansion to include support agencies for possible changes to the safety plan template.

Recommendation 5: Consider developing the SAFE Team Training post-test into a certification exam that can be taken to indicate the completion of training, or exempt those with the requisite knowledge from attending training sessions. This certification record could then be utilized as another method to document a school's compliance with the SAFE Team training policy.

Response: SIU will meet and discuss the best course of actions with SBBC Human Resource Development (HRD) Department for direction. All trainings have been developed in collaboration with HRD to ensure appropriateness and continuity with district goals and objectives. SIU will take the necessary steps to encourage a required annual update training from Administration to SAFE Team staff to maintain consistency, continuity, and address staff turnover.

JM/rlb

The School Board of Broward County, Florida
Comprehensive Emergency Management Program
Evaluation Report, 2006-07



Robin Bartleman, Chair
Maureen S. Dinnen, Vice Chair
Beverly A. Gallagher
Jennifer Leonard Gottlieb
Phyllis C. Hope
Stephanie Arma Kraft, Esq.
Robert D. Parks, Ed.D.
Eleanor Sobel
Benjamin J. Williams

James F. Notter
Superintendent of Schools

Katherine Blasik, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent, Research, Evaluation, Assessment & Boundaries

Russell Clement, Ph.D.
Director, Research Services

Dean Vaughan
Evaluation Administrator

Dr. Bill Younkin
Evaluator

January 2008

The School Board of Broward County, Florida prohibits any policy or procedure which results in discrimination on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, national origin, marital status, race, religion or sexual orientation.

The School Board of Broward County, Florida
Comprehensive Emergency Management Program
Evaluation Report, 2006-07

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	<i>i</i>
II.	INTRODUCTION	1
III.	THE COMPREHENSIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	3
IV.	COST IMPACT	4
V.	PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	4
VI.	METHOD	5
VII.	RESULTS	5
VIII.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	15
IX.	RECOMMENDATIONS	16
X.	REFERENCES	17
XI.	APPENDIX	18

The School Board of Broward County, Florida
Comprehensive Emergency Management Program
Evaluation Report, 2006-07

Executive Summary

In 2003, Broward County Public Schools (BCPS) was awarded a grant under the Emergency Response and Crisis Management (ERCM) grant program of the United States Department of Education (USDOE) to implement the first phase of the Comprehensive Emergency Management Program (CEMP) which involved revision of school safety plans to include the four phases of crisis management (mitigation and prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery). In 2005, BCPS was awarded a \$500,000 grant for the second phase of the CEMP. This grant was managed by the Department of Professional Standards' Special Investigative Unit (SIU), and was designed to utilize seven innovative approaches/strategies to provide a strengthened emergency response in Broward County to ensure that all students learn in a safe and secure environment. These approaches include:

1. Strengthened collaboration with community agencies.
2. Development of a model for training.
3. Development and implementation of a parent communication plan.
4. Establishment of Practice Drill Procedures.
5. Strengthened school safety plans through evaluation.
6. Strengthened mitigation strategies.
7. Establishment of an online school safety plan system.

Summary and Conclusions

The feedback obtained from the stakeholders is that the planning and collaboration inherent in the school safety plan development and review process has strengthened the ability of the schools and the first responder community to foster a safe and secure environment for learning and to respond adequately to emergency situations. The online nature of the planning process will allow both the schools and the first responder community to develop, share, and revise the plans quickly and cooperatively. The online check off indicating that the plan has been reviewed has alleviated the concerns raised regarding the previous method of actually signing the plans by the reviewing agency. The organizational and committee structures that have been put in place and the sustainability plan developed by the Special Investigative Unit should insure the continuous improvement of the planning and collaborative process and the resultant safety plans.

Project staff has learned that, for the initial trainings of SAFE Team members, face-to-face teaching methodologies are more effective. Follow-up training materials have been provided online utilizing Quia.com (replacing Atomic Learning). A total of seven training sessions have been held involving 188 school-based personnel during the 2006-07 school year. Only half (n=99) of those trained took the post-test and 9 of these scored so high on the pre-test that learning gains could not be measured. Additionally, there is no way to independently verify whether the schools have fully complied with the District policy requiring SAFE teams including at least three trained staff members (Objective 4).

A common template for the school safety plans was developed, and training was conducted for the schools to be able to adapt the template to their individual circumstances. The plans were posted online where local first-responder agencies reviewed them and submitted their comments. The draft of a Parent Guidebook and a Parent Communication Guide was developed and provided to school staffs so that they can adapt it and distribute it to the parents of their students.

The Comprehensive Emergency Management Program has accomplished its goal in that the District's emergency response procedures and planning process has been strengthened to the degree that a proven model for emergency preparation and crisis prevention has been established in BCPS. The process followed meets the recommendations contained in the GAO report on the status of school districts' preparedness (GAO, 2007) and The Practical Information on Crisis Planning (USDOE, 2007). All of the grant objectives were met with the exception of objective 2 (80% will demonstrate an improved average response time for emergency drills). This is due to the fact that many of the procedures at the schools were changed as a result of the development of the safety plan and that there are no common procedures regarding the measurement of response time. The project has addressed five of the six recommendations of the 2005 evaluation report and has implemented them as recommended. Recommendation 2 (review plans over the summer) was not feasible due to the lack of school personnel working in the summer. An acceptable schedule was established through the First Responder Committee.

Recommendations

The Director of SIU, in collaboration with principals and first responder agencies will:

- Develop processes to record and verify each school's compliance with the District policy that requires SAFE teams include at least three trained staff members (Objective 4).
- Institute guidelines requiring that all schools conduct emergency drills beyond fire drills currently practiced at District schools. Common procedures should be developed with consideration to identifying methods for measuring response time at all District schools.
- Monitor and improve the District's Emergency Response and Sustainability Plan to ensure the continuous improvement of the school safety plans. Improvements in school safety plans should also facilitate the examination of hazards addressed by District schools for future evaluations.
- Continue to expand the number and comprehensiveness of community governmental and private agencies involved in the development and review of the School Safety Plans.
- Consider developing the SAFE Team Training post-test into a certification exam that can be taken to indicate the completion of training, or exempt those with the requisite knowledge from attending training sessions. This certification record could then be utilized as another method to document a school's compliance with the SAFE Team training policy.

Additionally, future grants should use funds allocated for substitute salaries/benefits to send employees to trainings and committee meetings to ensure that limited school allocations are not negatively impacted.

The School Board of Broward County, Florida
Comprehensive Emergency Management Program
Evaluation Report, 2006-07

Introduction

Events such as the recent shootings by armed intruders in schools across the nation, natural disasters such as hurricanes destroying schools and communities, the harrowing events of September 11 and the subsequent anthrax scares, together with the threat of influenza or other disease pandemics have heightened awareness for the need for school districts to be prepared to face a range of emergencies within and outside of school buildings. (GAO, 2007; USDOE, 2007). Children rely on the adults who protect them and take great comfort in a calm, reasoned response to a crisis. Teachers and staff must know how to help their students and themselves through a crisis and return their students to their parents safely. “Knowing what to do when faced with a crisis can be the difference between calm and chaos, between courage and fear, between life and death” (USDOE, 2007).

Preparedness has been a focus of many recent federal and state government initiatives, including the Emergency Response and Crisis Management (ERCM) grant program. The purpose of the ERCM grant program is to provide funds for local education agencies to improve and strengthen their emergency response plans. School districts receiving grant funds under this program may use them to develop improved plans that address all four phases of crisis response: prevention/mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. In 2007, the name of this program was changed to the Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools grant program to reflect terminology used in the emergency management field. The Department of Homeland Security provides funding to states and local jurisdictions for emergency management planning, some of which can be awarded to school districts (GAO, 2007). The National Response Plan (NRP) is a comprehensive, all-hazards approach to the management of domestic incidents and provides the basis for the federal government to coordinate with state, local, and tribal governments and the public sector during incidents (DHS, 2007).

At a conference on school safety, convened by Department of Education Secretary Margaret Spellings on October 10, 2006, in response to a rash of school shootings, many of the participants stressed the need for detailed planning; the need for communication among stakeholder groups; and the importance of facilitating partnerships between first responder agencies and the schools (USDOE, 2006). This is reflected in the experience of an Ohio principal who experienced a lockdown as a result of a deputy sheriff being killed nearby. In his summary of the day, he emphasized the vital importance of having an emergency plan in place that had been practiced by the school. The response of the students, staff, and community showed no sense of panic during this most challenging day (Baker, 2005).

The GAO report on the status of school districts’ preparedness (GAO, 2007) provides the following summary of selected practices that the Departments of Education, Homeland Security, and Health and Human Services recommend:

- Allocate time to emergency management planning.

- Conduct an assessment of vulnerabilities.
- Conduct regular drills.
- Identify and acquire equipment to mitigate and respond to emergencies.
- Identify a storage location and replenish emergency supplies on a regular basis.
- Develop an emergency management plan and update the plan on a regular basis. In developing and updating this plan, school districts should:
 - Identify and address a range of events and hazards specific to the district schools.
 - Develop roles and responsibilities and procedures for school community members.
 - Develop roles and responsibilities for first responder and community partners.
 - Develop procedures for communicating with key stakeholders such as parents and students, including those who are English language learners.
 - Develop procedures for special needs students.
 - Develop procedures in the plan for recovering from an incident, including continuing student education during an extended school closure.
 - Determine lessons learned after an incident or training.
 - Develop multi-purpose manuals, with emergency management information that can be tailored to meet individual school needs.
- Include community partners, such as local government and public health agencies in planning.
- Coordinate the school districts' emergency procedures with state and local governments.
- Practice the emergency management plan with first responders and community partners on a regular basis.

The Practical Information on Crisis Planning (USDOE, 2007), delineates the following key principles:

- Effective crisis planning begins with leadership at the top.
- Crisis plans should not be developed in a vacuum.
- Schools and districts should open the channels of communication well before a crisis.
- Crisis plans should be developed in partnership with community groups, public safety organizations, and health professionals.
- A common vocabulary is necessary.
- Schools should tailor district crisis plans to meet individual school needs.
- Plan for the diverse needs of children and staff.
- Provide teachers and staff with ready access to the plan so they can understand its components and act on them.
- Training and practice are essential for the successful implementation of crisis plans.

Section 1006.07(6) Florida Statutes, which is often referred to as the Safe Passage Act, requires school districts to conduct a self-assessment of their school safety and security using the best practices developed and updated by the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability. The Florida Department of Education has produced a Technical Assistance Paper to assist districts in complying with the requirements of this law. Fundamental to the conduct of the self-assessment is the establishment of self assessment teams to focus on one or more of the seven general areas of safety and security (FLDOE, 2007).

A common thread that runs through all of these approaches to school emergency planning is the need for cooperation and collaboration between all of the stakeholders in the process and the facilitation of a steady stream of communication between them in a common vocabulary.

The Comprehensive Emergency Management Program

In 2003, Broward County Public Schools (BCPS) was awarded a grant under the ERCM grant program of the United States Department of Education (DOE) to implement the first phase of the Comprehensive Emergency Management Program (CEMP) which included the revision of the school safety plans to include the four phases of crisis management (mitigation and prevention, preparedness, response and recovery). In 2005, BCPS was awarded a \$500,000 grant for the second phase of the CEMP. This grant was managed by the Department of Professional Standards' Special Investigative Unit (SIU) and was designed to utilize seven innovative approaches/strategies to provide a strengthened emergency response in BCPS to ensure that all students learn in a safe and secure environment. These approaches include:

1. Strengthened collaboration with community agencies.
2. Development of a model for training.
3. Development and implementation of a parent communication plan.
4. Establishment of Practice Drill Procedures.
5. Strengthened school safety plans through evaluation.
6. Strengthened mitigation strategies.
7. Establishment of an online school safety plan system.

Planning for the second phase was carried out during the first phase and implementation began with the award of the grant on October 1, 2005. The development of the online school safety plan system began in 2004 and the online submission of school safety plans for all schools in the district began in 2005. The first full utilization of the system including online review and comment by the first responder community began in 2006. All school safety plans are reviewed online, by three categories of emergency response. These include the SIU and appropriate law enforcement and fire agencies.

Two primary committees have been developed to strengthen the collaboration with community agencies and between departments within Broward County Public Schools (BCPS). The Safety and Security Committee consists of representatives of all departments within BCPS that are involved with safety from either an operational or an informational context. The First Responder Committee consists of representatives of the first responder agencies (police and fire departments) involved with the schools within Broward County and is chaired by the SIU.

The Staff Assistance For Emergencies (SAFE) Team trainings were continued from the first phase of the grant and improved in order to provide training for new school-based SAFE Teams. These trainings were initially planned to be online through a virtual course development and delivery system known as Atomic Learning. The project leadership observed that the SAFE Team members had a low completion rate on the online virtual course and, following discussions with the course participants, concluded that the initial training is best accomplished through

in-person workshops with follow-up and additional training made available online through Quia.com

Cost Impact

Table 1 presents the budget and expenditures reported by project staff for the grant period from October 2005 through September 2007. The approved budget was \$498,000, of which a total of \$390,798 was expended, leaving a balance of \$107,202. Substitute salaries/benefits were not incurred because the costs to send employees to the trainings and committee meetings were absorbed at the school level. In purchased services, some consultant services were not secured and printing costs were not incurred as each school was provided with an electronic copy of the Parent Guide in lieu of printed copies to facilitate customization at the school level. Travel expenses were less than anticipated and funds allocated to send staff to *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design* classes were unused. Project staff planned to use unexpended funds to retain project staff for an additional period of time to complete and fine tune the sustainability plan, the meeting protocols, and the Parent Guide. However, by the time the no-cost extension was granted, project staff found it necessary to find alternative employment and these tasks were absorbed by the project coordinator.

Table 1

CEMP Budget/Expenditure Analysis, October 2005 Through September 2007

Category	Budget	Expenditures	Balance
Salary/benefits	302,450	244,099	58,351
Purchased services	84,073	47,323	36,750
Travel	17,073	9,897	7,176
Supplies and equipment	77,138	77,254	-116
Indirect cost 3.05%	17,266	12,225	5,041
Total	498,000	390,798	107,202

Purpose of the Evaluation

This evaluation examines the progress of the grant staff in implementing the recommendations of the previous grant evaluation and the extent to which the objectives of the current grant have been accomplished. Specifically, the research questions addressed in this study were:

1. What has been the progress of the implementation of the CEMP?
2. To what degree have the recommendations of the 2005 evaluation report been addressed?
3. To what degree have the objectives of the project been met?
4. What are the perceptions of the stakeholders in the school regarding the project?
5. What are the perceptions of the first responder agencies regarding the process?
6. What were the major blocking and facilitating factors encountered during implementation and what steps were taken to overcome or capitalize on them?

Method

This evaluation study has been designed primarily as a case study. A combination of approaches was used to collect data to answer the questions posed in this report. Interviews were conducted with BCPS administrators, grant personnel, and members of the Safety and Security and First Responder Committees. Telephone interviews were conducted with a sample of committee members not in attendance. Program documents, which include training schedules and evaluations, meeting minutes, attendance logs, and activity logs, were reviewed. Additional questions were added to the District's Annual Customer Survey administered to Teachers, Parents and Students every year in March to assess their awareness of the emergency procedures at their school.

Results

1. What has been the progress of the implementation of the CEMP?

The school safety plan development process for all schools in the District has been established as an electronic system allowing for online review and comment by appropriate first responder agencies and the first year of implementation has been completed. As issues and concerns arose regarding the operation of the system, they were addressed by the project staff.

Seventeen District staff members received National Incident Management System (NIMS) IS 700 training for NIMS compliance. This course is a web-based independent study (IS) course that is designed to introduce the NIMS components, concepts and principals. This training developed a cadre of District staff who are able to assist with the development of the Comprehensive Emergency Management Program. A policy to institutionalize the Incident Command System, which specifies the roles and responsibilities of District and school-based personnel, as well as the procedures for coordination with the first responder agencies in the event of an emergency, has been developed. The District has adopted a standardized emergency code system and the Parent Emergency Guide has been developed and released to all principals to adapt to their location and distribute.

The committee structure, as anticipated in the grant model, has been developed and implemented. The First Responder and the Safety and Security Committees have begun to function and have established a regular meeting schedule. The Special Investigative Unit (SIU) has met with the alternative centers for special needs students to determine their additional equipment needs for emergency preparedness. The Department of Psychological Services, in conjunction with SIU, has initiated a Recovery Committee in order to establish procedures and protocols for instructions after a school emergency, ranging from what to do with concerned parents to community agency and media communication protocols. The committee has produced a School Recovery Guide for SAFE Teams that is separated into three phases: prevention, response, and recovery.

The training program, one of the strategies contained in the grant model, was initiated with a Safety and Security Summit held at Piper High School and involving approximately 650 participants. Attendees included school security specialists, principals and other school-based

staff, District departments involved in any aspect of safety and security preparedness, and representatives of the first responder and emergency operations community. A total of seven SAFE Team trainings have been held with a total participation of 188 school-based staff.

Safety and Security training has been added to the Leadership Experiences and Administrative Development (LEAD) program which is a training program for teachers who desire to become administrators. Additionally, mandatory information sessions will be held yearly for all principals covering safety and security. The SIU is collaborating with the First Responder Committee to produce shooter intruder training video. A visit was made to the Clark County, Nevada school system to compare emergency procedures.

Overall, SIU has fully implemented the initiatives outlined in the grant and has established a plan for sustainability and continuous improvement beyond the grant period.

2. *To what degree have the recommendations of the 2005 evaluation report been addressed?*

Recommendation 1: Although school staffs may have independently worked with law enforcement or fire rescue personnel to incorporate emergency equipment training into drills, equipment training was not provided. Staff Assistance for Emergencies (SAFE) team members and law enforcement and fire rescue staffs indicated that training was needed for more school personnel—especially teachers. Therefore, SIU, in conjunction with law enforcement and fire rescue representatives, will develop emergency equipment and other pertinent SAFE team training. The training received by SAFE team members will be shared with more members of each school's staff.

The SAFE Team trainings have been conducted since the initiation of the program in 2003. Schools are required to have SAFE Teams with at least three members trained who can then pass on this training to the other team members. This year, a total of 188 individuals have been trained in seven training sessions. This represents the annual training needed for new members and as a result of school staff turnover. In addition, the training materials are available on the Emergency Preparedness Web site, providing a methodology for each school to have additional members receive the training and take an assessment test measuring their mastery of the material.

Recommendation 2: The FEA grant required training to follow a result-driven model so that participants demonstrated understanding of the training content and the ability to perform procedures before entering the next level of training. Training was provided in group lecture format. Therefore, no measure/assessment was made of the pre or post learning or the effectiveness of the training. Following a result-driven model, participants must demonstrate understanding of training contents and the ability to perform procedures before entering the next level of training. A pre/post instrument developed by SIU will measure this understanding and performance.

Pre-test and post-test instruments were developed and used for all of the trainings except for the first one, which was held prior to the development of the instruments. The post-tests were administered online as a follow-up, but were taken by only half of the

training participants ($n=99$). All of the participants that took the post-test scored 75% or higher. The only participants that did not demonstrate pre-post learning increases were nine participants who scored 85% or above on the pre-test.

Recommendation 3: Over half of the law enforcement and fire rescue personnel interviewed indicated limited time to review the School Safety Plan (SSP), because school staffs waited until the last week to obtain approval signatures. Several law enforcement/fire rescue personnel suggested that the plans should be reviewed in the summer when it is possible to do a walk-through with the school administration. Therefore, the review of SSP by law enforcement and fire rescue representatives will occur during the summer and coincide with annual fire inspections.

The deadline for submission of safety plans online by all schools was October 13, 2006. On October 16, 2006, these plans were made available for law enforcement and fire department personnel review and comment through November 16, 2006. This schedule was developed in conjunction with the schools and the First Responder Committee and was deemed adequate to allow for a thorough review by both law enforcement and fire department personnel. There were not enough school personnel at the school sites during the summer to allow for adequate participation in the development of the school safety plans. Therefore, this development had to occur during the early part of the academic year.

Recommendation 4: SAFE team members, law enforcement, and fire rescue personnel remarked that although the revised SSP was a useful tool, a condensed version or a quick reference guide would be more appropriate for use in a crisis. SIU has provided on their Web site, a 16-page Emergency Quick Reference Guide template as non-required information for schools. SIU will work with school, law enforcement, and fire rescue staffs to develop the quick reference guide. The Emergency Quick Reference Guide will be required at each school and reviewed by the SSP evaluators for completeness of information.

The Emergency Quick Reference Guide is in the process of being reviewed by the First Responder Committee and SIU. The schools have access to the current version through the Emergency Preparedness Web site and it will be required to be available at each school.

Recommendation 5: There was hesitation on the part of safety agencies to provide signatures on the SSP due to possible legal ramifications. SIU staff will explore legal ramifications of signatures on the SSP with District legal counsel. The determined ramification of signatures on the SSP and commitment to the SSP will be communicated by SIU to law enforcement and fire rescue staffs.

The procedures call for fire department and law enforcement personnel to review and comment on the school safety plans online. The appropriate departments indicate online that they have completed their review but will not have to provide signatures nor will the review be construed as official approval. The First Responder Committee members interviewed indicate that this is an excellent solution to resolving the problem of implied

approval, with the appropriate agencies documenting their comments and allowing the final responsibility for the plans to remain with the school.

Recommendation 6: SIU staff will develop a process to record individual school training attendance of required school staff. SIU staff on an annual basis will monitor SSP. Required SSP corrections by school staff will be recorded. Results of the SSP monitoring of corrections and required training will be provided to the Area Superintendents on an annual basis to improve accountability.

The attendance of school personnel at all trainings and informational programs is being recorded. These trainings have been added to the district staff development schedule to allow participants to sign up annually. As a result, there will be a more accurate recording of persons trained by requiring online registration. SIU staff has reviewed all of the school safety plans and 219 out of 229 schools now have complete safety plans. The results of the reviews have been provided to the Area Superintendents and the remaining 10 plans are being completed.

The project has addressed five of the six recommendations of the 2005 evaluation report and has implemented them as recommended. Recommendation 2 (review plans over the summer) was not feasible due to the lack of school personnel working in the summer. An acceptable schedule was established through the First Responder Committee.

3. To what degree have the objectives of the project been met?

Objective 1: By the end of the project period, 90% of schools in the District will demonstrate an increase in the number of hazards addressed by the School Safety Plan as compared to 2004-05 school year data.

During the 2004-05 school year there was a generic safety plan for all schools that they utilized as the basis for their safety plans. Starting in the 2006-07 school year the schools used a common online template for school safety plans developed by the CEMP to develop their own customized procedures based on input from school, community, and first responder agencies. There have been additional hazards added to this common template (such as bio-security) that were not included in the 2004-05 generic safety plan. Therefore, it can be assumed that 100% of the schools with complete plans demonstrated an increase in the number of hazards addressed. Since a total of 219 out of 229 schools (96%) have complete school safety plans as of the writing of this report, this objective has been met. When the remaining 10 schools complete their safety plans, it can safely be assumed that 100% of the schools will have demonstrated and increase in the number of hazards addressed by their School Safety Plan.

Objective 2: By the end of the project period, 80% will demonstrate an improved average response time for emergency drills, as compared to the average response time in 2004-05.

Emergency drill training was offered over the summer of 2006 and SIU has recommended that schools be required to have two emergency drills per year. However, there is currently

no policy in place requiring all schools to conduct emergency drills for any purpose with the exception of fire drills. Additionally, there are no common procedures regarding the measurement of response time. A set of common procedures is being developed by SIU and The State of Florida has introduced legislation to mandate emergency drills. These actions will ensure that the required baseline data and consistency in measurement procedures will be available for the future.

The emphasis on developing common procedures and the revision of many of the emergency procedures has frequently resulted in an initial increase in time to conduct the drills as the procedures are solidified and improved. These factors (lack of reliable baseline data and procedure revision) render the comparison of response times meaningless. While the procedures for emergency response have been improved through the coordinated safety plan development process, it is not possible at this time to properly assess changes in response times.

Objective 3: By the end of the project period, the District will develop and implement a plan for sustainability and continuous improvement beyond the grant period to include first responder agencies and community partners.

The sustainability plan developed by the program staff in conjunction with the Safety and Security Committee and the First Responder Committee to continue the procedures for the continuous improvement of the school safety plans and the activities (trainings and drills) that relate to them is contained in the Appendix. In summary, the plan calls for the continuation of the programs and procedures instituted as a result of the grant activities. The Safety and Security and First Responder committees will continue to meet and the online procedures for the revision of the school safety plans and their review by the first responder agencies (police and fire) will continue. The SAFE Team and related trainings will continue to be held. The Safety and Security Summit will become an annual event. A permanent technology person (Systems Analyst) has been added to the SIU staff and the other responsibilities associated with continuing the CEMP activities will be absorbed by current SIU staff. The training programs have been added to the district's staff development calendar and are required within programs such as LEAD (for teachers aspiring to become administrators), the first and second year assistant principal program, and the first year principal program. This plan is currently being implemented by SIU. Therefore, this objective has been met.

Objective 4: By the end of the project period, 90% of schools will have at least three staff members trained in emergency response procedures.

The SAFE Team trainings have been conducted since the initial grant established them in 2003 and everyone involved was trained. Schools are required, by policy, to have SAFE Teams including at least three trained staff members. This year, a total of 188 individuals have been trained in seven training sessions, representing the training of new SAFE team members for schools that have experienced staff turnover. The training materials are also available on the Emergency Preparedness Web site, providing a methodology for each school to have additional members receive the training and take an assessment test measuring their

mastery of the material. According to the policy put in place by the District, this objective has been met. However, due to a lack of definitive completion records from the initial SAFE Team trainings and a system to confirm completion of training, it is not possible to independently verify each school’s compliance with this policy.

Objective 5: By the end of the project period, 75% of school staff that complete the Atomic Learning All Hazards Emergency Response Training will demonstrate increased knowledge of emergency response procedures.

This training program for SAFE Team members was determined by the project staff to be more effective in person. Therefore, the online training anticipated to be delivered through Atomic Learning was changed to a traditional seminar approach with online follow-up conducted through Quia.com. The pre-test was administered at the beginning of the training and participants took the post-test after completing the follow-up material presented online through Quia.com. A total of 91% (90 out of 99) of the school staff that completed the training and had both pre- and post-test scores demonstrated increased knowledge. The participants who did not demonstrate knowledge gains ($n=9$) scored 85% or higher on the pre-test, thus making it difficult to measure gain. All of the participants that took the post-test ($n=108$) scored 75% or higher.

Objective 6: By the end of the project period, 70% of parents surveyed will demonstrate a high level of awareness of school emergency procedures.

Two questions were added to the Thirteenth Annual Customer Survey conducted in March – April, 2007 and administered to all students, teachers and a random sample of one third of the parents. The results of the questions added to assess the accomplishment of this goal for parents is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Parent Customer Survey Responses Regarding Safety

Level/Item	N	Percentage responding					
		SA	A	N	D	SD	DK
Elementary School							
The school has provided me with information regarding school safety and security.	17,387	36.5	46.3	7.1	5.3	2.2	2.7
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my child’s school.	16,817	26.4	36.8	10.8	11.8	5.0	9.3
Middle School							
The school has provided me with information regarding school safety and security.	6,221	24.6	49.1	10.8	8.8	3.6	3.2
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my child’s school.	6,014	19.5	39.7	11.5	14.9	5.8	8.6
High School							
The school has provided me with information regarding school safety and security.	3,633	19.6	45.6	14.5	11.8	4.7	3.9
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my child’s school.	3,592	16.0	39.2	13.1	16.3	7.0	8.4

(table continues)

Table 2 (continued).

Level/Item	N	Percentage responding					
		SA	A	N	D	SD	DK
Centers							
The school has provided me with information regarding school safety and security.	75	50.7	37.3	6.7	2.7	0.0	2.7
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my child's school.	75	30.7	36.0	13.3	5.3	2.7	12.0
District Summary							
The school has provided me with information regarding school safety and security.	27,316	31.6	46.8	8.9	6.9	2.8	3.0
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my child's school.	26,498	23.4	37.8	11.3	13.1	5.4	9.0

Note. Scale is: SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; N=Neutral; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree; DK=Don't Know.

Overall, a total of 78% ($n=21,412$) of the parents agreed that the school has provided them with information regarding school safety and security and a total of 61% ($n=16,217$) agree that they are aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at their child's school. These proportions vary slightly by level, with the highest level of agreement observed at the Centers (88%, $n=66$, agreed that they received information and 67%, $n=50$, agreed that they were aware of the lockdown procedures). The lowest level of agreement was observed at the High School level (65%, $n=2,368$, agreed that they received information and 67%, $n=1980$, agreed that they were aware of the lockdown procedures).

The Parent School Emergency Guide was developed and released to the schools in September, 2007 for them to customize to the needs of the school and distribute to parents. These activities were completed following the administration of the survey and their impact has not been reflected in these results.

Objective 7: By the end of the project period, the District will demonstrate improved partnerships between community partners and the District as measured by the First Responder Committee meeting attendance.

The First Responder Committee meetings held during the 2005-06 school year (4/28/06 and 5/19/06) experienced a 63% attendance rate (12 out of 19). The first meeting of the expanded First Responder Committee for the 2006-07 school year experienced a 79% attendance rate (26 out of 33), with the remaining six meetings experiencing attendance rates varying from 36% to 62%. Telephone interviews by the evaluator with a random sample of six non-attendees (stratified to assure three fire and three police departments) revealed that reasons for non-attendance did not reflect a lack of desire for cooperation, but did reflect scheduling conflicts and the fact that some felt that the work of the year had been accomplished.

Objective 8: By the end of the project, 90% of school plans will be developed in coordination with at least two local safety agencies.

The online plan submission and review process developed as part of this grant requires that

the appropriate police and fire departments review and comment on the safety plans. These reviews must be completed and recorded online for the plans to be considered complete. A total of 219 out of 229 schools (96%) have complete safety plans that have been reviewed by the appropriate fire and police agencies, thereby accomplishing this objective.

4. *What are the perceptions of the stakeholders in the school regarding the project?*

Two questions were added to the Thirteenth Annual Customer Survey conducted in Spring 2006 and administered to all students, teachers and a random sample of one third of the parents. Since most of the stakeholders in the school could not be expected to have specific knowledge of the CEMP program, this question is being answered by looking at the stakeholders' perceptions regarding the schools' communication of, and their knowledge of, emergency procedures. The results of the questions added to assess the accomplishment of objective 6 (70% of parents will demonstrate a high level of awareness) is presented in Table 2 contained in the discussion of this objectives. The results of these questions for students and staff are contained in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3
Student Customer Survey Responses Regarding Safety

Level/Item	N	Percentage responding						
		SA	A	N	D	SD	DK	
Elementary School								
My teachers have talked to students regarding school safety and security.	48,774	56.3	27.1	4.7	3.0	2.0	7.0	
I know what to do in case of an emergency at my school.	48,541	71.1	21.1	2.8	1.4	1.4	2.2	
Middle School								
My teachers have talked to students regarding school safety and security.	46,530	33.3	36.5	10.7	6.0	6.0	8.0	
I know what to do in case of an emergency at my school.	46,333	43.7	36.4	8.3	3.8	4.0	3.8	
High School								
My teachers have talked to students regarding school safety and security.	52,841	18.4	43.7	15.5	9.0	6.8	8.0	
I know what to do in case of an emergency at my school.	52,755	27.5	49.9	10.7	5.0	3.3	3.6	
Centers								
My teachers have talked to students regarding school safety and security.	1,305	29.6	35.6	12.4	6.0	7.0	10.0	
I know what to do in case of an emergency at my school.	1,300	38.9	38.2	8.2	3.9	4.9	5.9	
District Summary								
My teachers have talked to students regarding school safety and security.	149,450	35.5	36.0	10.5	6.0	4.0	8.0	
I know what to do in case of an emergency at my school.	148,929	46.8	36.2	7.4	3.4	2.9	3.3	

Note. Scale is: SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; N=Neutral; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree; DK=Don't Know.

District-wide, a total of 71% ($n=106,819$) of the students report that their teachers have talked to them regarding school safety and security and 83% ($n=123,627$) report that they know what to do in an emergency. These proportions are highest at the Elementary level (83%, $n=40,684$, agreed that their teachers have talked to them and 92%, $n=44,746$, agreed that they knew what to do in case of an emergency). The remaining levels are fairly consistent with the proportion agreeing that their teachers had talked to them ranging from 65% to 72% and the number that agreed that they knew what to do ranging from 77% to 81%.

Table 4
Staff Customer Survey Responses Regarding Safety

Level/Item	N	Percentage responding					
		SA	A	N	D	SD	DK
Elementary School							
I have received training regarding school safety and security.	5,954	42.2	46.4	6.2	4.0	0.9	0.3
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my school.	5,948	61.5	36.9	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.0
Middle School							
I have received training regarding school safety and security.	2,076	35.7	48.8	8.4	5.4	1.1	0.6
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my school.	2,073	54.2	42.9	1.4	1.2	0.2	0.1
High School							
I have received training regarding school safety and security.	2,692	28.1	46.3	10.5	11.2	3.6	0.3
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my school.	2,705	48.3	46.4	2.5	1.7	0.8	0.3
Centers							
I have received training regarding school safety and security.	284	39.4	44.4	6.3	8.1	1.8	0.0
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my school.	284	50.7	43.7	3.5	1.8	0.4	0.0
District Summary							
I have received training regarding school safety and security.	11,012	37.5	46.8	7.7	6.1	1.6	0.4
I am aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at my school.	11,016	56.6	40.5	1.4	1.0	0.4	0.1

Note. Scale is: SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; N=Neutral; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree; DK=Don't Know.

Virtually all of the staff agree that they are aware of the evacuation and lockdown procedures at their school. The proportion that agrees that they have received training varies from a low of 74% ($n=2,002$) at the high school level to a high of 94% ($n=1,754$) at the middle school level.

In interviews, the Safety and Security Committee members reported that the committee is in place to ensure that the safety needs of District schools are met. The committee members report that their function is to be an avenue of information dissemination and sharing with and among BCPS departments regarding safety and security. The committee members have observed that a great deal of collaboration has been stimulated by the committee meetings. They are committed

to continue the functioning of the committee and consider it an important part of ensuring the safety and security of the staff and students in Broward County Public Schools.

5. What are the perceptions of the first responder agencies regarding the process?

After the completion of the Safety Plan review process, the evaluator conducted structured interviews in a focus group setting with First Responder Committee at its January 2007 meeting (attended by 19 agencies) and by telephone with a random sample of six agencies (stratified to assure three fire and three police departments) not represented at that committee meeting. Both those present at the meeting and those interviewed later expressed the opinion that the process of building the school safety plans and the existence of the First Responder Committee facilitated the ability of the first responder agencies to have input into the plans and allowed for a better understanding of both jobs (school personnel and first responders). The committee members felt that the process created a synergy in the development of the plans and allowed for understanding and accommodations for the differences between schools and agencies across the county. The committee members found that the networking that occurred in the meetings was invaluable and provided for an opportunity for the various jurisdictions to share resources and expertise. A committee member expressed the opinion that it was “unbelievable that there had been so little communication between the agencies and with the schools prior to the development of the First Responder Committee”. This opinion received general assent from all of the members present.

The discussions within the committee have exposed some interoperability (ability of communications and other systems to work together) problems and issues with conflicting procedures between departments. The members of the First Responder Committee (both attendees and non-attendees) expressed some frustration with the fact that planning for the FCAT was such an overwhelming priority for the schools that sometimes safety planning became a low priority. They felt that one of the strengths of the process was the ability of individual schools to tailor the Safety Plans to the realities of the school and the appropriate local agencies. However, some of the schools missed this opportunity by merely copying and pasting from the plans of other schools. Another barrier to the operation of the committee was the personnel time availability on the part of some of the agencies. This was the major reason expressed for non-attendance.

The first responder agencies believe that the planning process developed by the CEMP program and the functioning of the committee has allowed for a great improvement in their ability to deal with safety and security issues within the schools and feel that the same process should be extended to all schools (e.g. private, charter and universities).

6. What were the major blocking and facilitating factors encountered during implementation, and what steps were taken to overcome or capitalize on them?

The major blocking factors encountered were technical issues surrounding the development of the online submission and review of the School Safety Plans and the online training packages. The online submission process took much more effort to develop than originally anticipated. Following the initial implementation, the schools expressed concern regarding the fact that the online submission process for the School Safety Plans was a document submission process,

rather than an online editing process. This meant that the schools had to maintain a master copy of the plan, edit it, and then up-load the entire plan again. They expressed a desire to be able to edit their plans online. This feature is being developed by Information Technology and should be available for subsequent safety plan development cycles. The continual improvement of this process is built into the sustainability plan developed by SIU.

The program staff also had difficulty developing the anticipated online learning package utilizing the Atomic Learning software and later learned that school staff felt that the methodology was not as effective as traditional training seminars. The program staff concluded that the initial SAFE Team trainings were best accomplished through a face-to-face methodology and that additional trainings and the post-test could then be accomplished through online methodologies. The anticipated online delivery system (Atomic Learning) was replaced by Quia.com as follow-up training. For some SAFE Team training participants, their score on the pre-test was so high that it did not allow for the effective measurement of learning gains. The outcomes of the SAFE Team trainings should be keyed to the certification of the requisite skills and knowledge necessary to be effective team members. The measurement of growth, or the lack thereof, can be misleading due to the fact that growth does not indicate the possession of all the requisite knowledge and skills while lack of growth does not indicate that the requisite knowledge and skills are not present. All of the trainees that took the post-test scored in excess of 75%, even though nine did not demonstrate growth due to their high scores on the pre-test.

The primary facilitating factor has been the degree of involvement and cooperation between and among District staff in the Safety and Security Committee and the first responder community in the First Responder Committee. Everyone involved appears to understand the need for tight coordination between the various groups and are pleased that effective forums for this cooperative effort have been established.

Summary and Conclusions

The feedback obtained from the stakeholders is that the planning and collaboration inherent in the school safety plan development and review process has strengthened the ability of the schools and the first responder community to foster a safe and secure environment for learning and to respond adequately to emergency situations. The online nature of the planning process will allow both the schools and the first responder community to develop, share, and revise the plans quickly and cooperatively. The online check off indicating that the plan has been reviewed has alleviated the concerns raised regarding the previous method of actually signing the plans by the reviewing agency. The organizational and committee structures that have been put in place and the sustainability plan developed by the Special Investigative Unit should insure the continuous improvement of the planning and collaborative process and the resultant safety plans.

Project staff has learned that, for the initial trainings of SAFE Team members, face-to-face teaching methodologies are more effective. Follow-up training materials have been provided online utilizing Quia.com (replacing Atomic Learning). A total of seven training sessions have been held involving 188 school-based personnel during the 2006-07 school year. Only half ($n=99$) of those trained took the post-test and 9 of these scored so high on the pre-test that learning gains could not be measured. Additionally there is no way to independently verify

whether the schools have fully complied with the District policy requiring SAFE teams including at least three trained staff members (Objective 4).

A common template for the school safety plans was developed, and training was conducted for the schools to be able to adapt the template to their individual circumstances. The plans were posted online where local first-responder agencies reviewed them and submitted their comments. The draft of a Parent Guidebook and a Parent Communication Guide was developed and provided to school staffs so that they can adapt it and distribute it to the parents of their students.

The Comprehensive Emergency Management Program has accomplished its goal in that the District's emergency response procedures and planning process has been strengthened to the degree that a proven model for emergency preparation and crisis prevention has been established in BCPS. The process followed meets the recommendations contained in the GAO report on the status of school districts' preparedness (GAO, 2007) and The Practical Information on Crisis Planning (USDOE, 2007). All of the grant objectives were met with the exception of objective 2 (80% will demonstrate an improved average response time for emergency drills). This is due to the fact that many of the procedures at the schools were changed as a result of the development of the safety plan and that there are no common procedures regarding the measurement of response time. The project has addressed five of the six recommendations of the 2005 evaluation report and has implemented them as recommended. Recommendation 2 (review plans over the summer) was not feasible due to the lack of school personnel working in the summer. An acceptable schedule was established through the First Responder Committee.

Recommendations

The Director of SIU, in collaboration with principals and first responder agencies will:

- Develop processes to record and verify each school's compliance with the District policy that requires SAFE teams include at least three trained staff members (Objective 4).
- Institute guidelines requiring that all schools conduct emergency drills beyond fire drills currently practiced at District schools. Common procedures should be developed with consideration to identifying methods for measuring response time at all District schools.
- Monitor and improve the District's Emergency Response and Sustainability Plan to ensure the continuous improvement of the school safety plans. Improvements in school safety plans should also facilitate the examination of hazards addressed by District schools for future evaluations.
- Continue to expand the number and comprehensiveness of community governmental and private agencies involved in the development and review of the School Safety Plans.
- Consider developing the SAFE Team Training post-test into a certification exam that can be taken to indicate the completion of training, or exempt those with the requisite knowledge from attending training sessions. This certification record could then be utilized as another method to document a school's compliance with the SAFE Team training policy.

Additionally, future grants should use funds allocated for substitute salaries/benefits to send employees to trainings and committee meetings to ensure that limited school allocations are not negatively impacted.

References

- Baker, Davis E. (2005). Lockdown! *Principal Leadership*, October, 2005.
- Florida Department of Education (2007), Technical Assistance Paper: How to comply with Section 1007(6), Safety and Security Best Practices. Accessed July 26, 2007 from http://www.fldoe.org/safeschools/safe_passage/safe_passage.asp
- Government Accountability Office (2007), Emergency Management: Status of School Districts' Planning and Preparedness, GAO-07-821T. Accessed July 24, 2007 from www.gao.gov/new.items/d07821t.pdf
- U. S. Department of Education (2006), Lead and Manage My School Conference on School Safety held October 10, 2006, Chevy Chase, Md. Accessed July 24, 2007 from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/28/06/15.pdf
- U. S. Department of Education (2007), Practical Information for Crisis Planning: A Guide for Schools and Communities. Accessed July 24, 2007 from <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/emergencyplan/crisisplanning.pdf>
- U. S. Department of Homeland Security (2004), National Response Plan. Accessed July 24, 2007 from <http://www.scd.state.hi.us/documents/nrp.pdf>

Appendix

Emergency Response & Crisis Management Sustainability Plan

Required Personnel: Training Coordinators (2), Systems Analyst (1), & Clerical Support (1) Status: Currently a System Analyst was hired by SBBC and assigned to SIU. As a result, a permanent technology person will be responsible for Safety Plans, visitor management, and emergency preparedness technology. SIU will absorb Emergency Preparedness programs for schools. Position is currently being considered to be retitled to Emergency Preparedness Coordinator.
Programs: Emergency Preparedness, Prevention, Professional Standards, Security Specialists, and Campus Monitors
Projects: Online School Safety Plan, Emergency Supplies & Materials Coordination, Parent Guide, and Leadership Training
Committees: Safety & Security, First Responder, Pandemic Flu, District Recovery, Professional Development Coordinating Council, and Non-Instructional Development
Special Event(s): Annual Safety and Security Summit

Suggested Required Personnel: Pending, no funds to support function except for technology. Current staff are given added responsibility to support grant objectives		
Personnel Responsibilities:	Training Coordinators/Clerical Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs Assessment Development • Program development and management • Instructional Design • Online Design • Scheduling • Communications • Advertising • Registration • Location set-up • Materials preparation • Trainer preparation/development (Train-the-Trainer) • Follow-up facilitation • Focus Group • Data Collection • Evaluation • Reporting 	Systems Analyst: <i>STAR</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Support • Deployment • Programming • End-User Support • Training <i>Department Technology</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laptop and desktop maintenance • Server maintenance • Peripheral maintenance • Administrator, Investigator, Prevention Team and Clerical technical support • Website development, communication and training <i>Safety Plan</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Support • Programming • Training <i>SESIR</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Support

(Appendix continues)

Appendix (continued).

Programs					
Emergency Preparedness	Prevention	Professional Standards	Security Specialists	Campus Monitors	SRO
<u>Trainings</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAFE Team • Emergency Drill • Safety Plan • Incident Command • Site Assessment • Bio-Security (pending) • Crime Scene Preservation • STAR • Understanding and Planning for Bomb Threats (annual) • Camera Monitor Training 	<u>Trainings</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gang Awareness • Youth Crime Watch • Silence Hurts/ Bullying • Cyber Bullying • Internet Safety • Threat Assessment (required team for every school) 	<u>Trainings</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fit for Duty • The Investigation Process • Critical Incidents • Personnel Emergency Protocol (Code Alert workshop Nov. 19, 2007) 	<u>Trainings</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Assessment & CPTED • Preventing & Planning For Terrorism (National & International) • Weapons of Mass Destruction • Recognizing, Responding, & Reporting • Preserving an Incident Scene • Note Taking & Report Writing 	<u>Trainings</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserving an Incident Scene • Note Taking & Report Writing • Professionalism • Child Abuse • Threat Assessment • SSAT 	<u>Trainings</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRO Pre-School • SRO School • SRO In-Service • SAFE Team • Threat Assessment

Projects			
Online Safety Plan	Emergency Supplies and Materials Coordination	Parent Guide	Leadership Training
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content Development • Timeline Establishment • Stakeholder Communication • School, Law Enforcement and Fire Coordination • Technical Support • Emergency Drill 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ordering • Distribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development • Distribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intern Principal • Interim Assistant Principal • LEAD
Safety plan is reviewed annually by District and first responding Fire/Police agencies.		A WORD version was distributed in September 2007 to all principals to customize and release to parents.	Currently SIU conducts eight classes a year on safety & security to personnel being trained as administrators

(Appendix continues)

Appendix (continued).

Committees				
Safety and Security	First Responder	Pandemic Flu	District Recovery	Professional Development Coordinating Council/ Non-Instructional Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop topics • Collaborate with partners • Coordinate (materials, locations, etc.) • Communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop topics • Collaborate with partners • Coordinate (materials, locations, etc.) • Communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represent department • Communicate district requirements • Implement district requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represent department • Communicate district requirements • Implement district requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represent department • Communicate district requirements • Implement district requirements
Committee will be ongoing. Annually representatives will be reviewed to assess adding additional members	Committee will be ongoing	District representatives currently sit on community committee	District recovery convened during the 2006-07 school year and developed a District recovery guide for schools.	Pending

Special Events: For the 2007-08 school year, the District has implemented a mandatory Emergency Preparedness information session for principals.	
<p>Annual Safety & Security Summit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker coordination • Scheduling • Communications • Advertising • Registration • Location set-up • Materials preparation 	