

School Safety Update

The Newsletter of the National School Safety Center

November 2001

Anthrax threats and terrorism: How should schools prepare?

Following suit to NSSC's *Special Edition, October 2001 School Safety Update*, "Helping schools respond to terrorism, trauma and grief," this month's *Update* will continue to present key issues, strategies and resources to promote safe and peaceful schools in these times of real concern.

The residual affects of recent terrorist acts, continuing threats of terrorism, and the very real discovery of anthrax exposure and contamination all require schools to anticipate and plan for the "possible." Through the use of accurate information, increased vigilance, protocols for threat assessment and crisis response, and viable community partnerships, schools can develop and communicate a soothing and "confidence-inspiring" voice that says, "We are prepared."

In this issue, you will find basic information regarding the threat of anthrax, a school threat assessment protocol, a guide for developing anti-terrorist policies, and advice for identifying and dealing with potential violent acts and/or terrorists. Also included in this issue are two summaries of recent surveys: the Alfred University survey regarding school violence based on the perspectives of students, and the National Association of School Resource Officers' national survey of school resource officers regarding their role and impact in schools.

The threat of anthrax

In recent weeks, our country has been besieged with the threat of biological terrorism. Recent cases of anthrax exposure via the postal system has every workplace, including schools, concerned for the safety of their employees.

The US Postal Service recommends the following steps if one receives a suspicious letter or package. (Additional information is available on the Postal

Service's official web site at www.USPS.com.)

1. Handle with care. Don't shake or bump the package.
2. Don't open, smell, touch or taste the letter or package or its contents.
3. Isolate the suspicious item.
4. Treat the item as suspect. Call the local law enforcement authorities.

The Postal Service also recommends that if a letter/parcel is opened and/or a biological or chemical threat is identified:

1. Isolate it—Don't handle it.
2. Evacuate the immediate area.
3. Wash your hands with soap and warm water.
4. Call the police.
5. Contact postal inspectors.
6. Call the local fire department/HAZMAT Unit.

Receiving a suspicious letter or parcel

According to the Postal Service, some typical characteristics that ought to trigger suspicion include letters or parcels that:

- Have any powdery substance on the outside.
- Are unexpected or from someone unfamiliar to you.
- Have excessive postage, handwritten or poorly typed address, incorrect titles or titles with no name, or misspellings of common words.
- Are addressed to someone no longer with your organization or are otherwise outdated.
- Have no return address, or have one that can't be verified as legitimate.
- Are of unusual weight, given their size, or are lopsided or oddly shaped.
- Have an unusual amount of tape.
- Are marked with restrictive endorsements, such as "Personal" or "Confidential."
- Have strange odors or stains.

Receiving an anthrax threat by mail

If you suspect that a letter or parcel contains anthrax or other biological threat:

1. *Do not handle the mail piece or package suspected of contamination.*
2. Make sure that damaged or suspicious packages are isolated and the immediate area cordoned off.
3. Ensure that all persons who have touched the mail piece wash their hands with soap and water.
4. Notify your local law enforcement authorities.
5. List all persons who have touched the letter and/or envelope. Include contact information and have this information available for the authorities.
7. Place all items worn when in contact with the suspected mail piece in plastic bags and have them available for law enforcement agents.
8. As soon as practical, shower with soap and water.
9. Notify the Center for Disease Control Emergency Response at 770-488-7100 for answers to any questions.

Sample school mail handling policy

According to the *Herald-Leader* in Lexington, Kentucky, the Fayette County Public Schools in October introduced a new policy for receiving and handling mail after a local school received a hoax anthrax letter that closed the school for two days.

The mail handling policy requires that the all mail be opened just once a day, toward the end of the school day. If an evacuation becomes necessary, it would then happen with the least disruption to the school day. Mail is to be opened in an area away from the central office to avoid shutting down the main hub of the school. The recommended location is a bathroom. This allows the mail handler to wash if anything suspicious is opened. [NSSC recommends an area equipped with a sink

and washing facilities and not necessarily a bathroom. Food service facilities should be avoided.] Each school will designate one person to open all mail. This person must wear vinyl gloves and a dust mask when opening the mail. The designated mail handler will keep a change of clothes on hand to change into in case his or her clothes become contaminated from a suspicious material.

In addition to the new mail handling policy, parents have been asked not to use envelopes when sending notes to school with their children. For example, if money for lunch or a special activity is sent to school, parents are encouraged to use clear plastic bags. During these unpredictable times, parents are also urged to rely on e-mail and telephone calls instead of sending letters to school, which may or may not be opened in a timely manner.

Chemical, biological and radiological threats should be included as an integral part of the school's crisis prevention and management plan. School communities should create a close partnership with emergency response personnel, including local medical and crisis response agencies. Each school should contact their local HAZMAT unit, fire department, police or sheriff's office, the state police, the National Guard or military, and state/federal emergency personnel before such a threat or crisis occurs to obtain advice on how to handle such matters.

Developing anti-terrorism policies

Every school system should develop a specific policy on terrorism and terroristic activities including threats and other forms of intimidating behavior. The policy should begin by defining what terrorism is and clearly articulating that such behavior will not be tolerated in the school. Specific sanctions and protocols should be established for handling such student behavior.

The following concepts should be included in the written policy against terrorism perpetrated by students:

- All threats will be taken seriously.
- All students are expected to cooperate with school officials and law enforcement in reporting potential acts of violence or terror, including threats.

What is anthrax?

Anthrax is an animal disease that has been around for tens of thousands of years. Rarely, does anthrax causes serious disease in humans. The germ is a bacterium called *Bacillus anthracis* that "seeds" itself by forming long-lasting spores. These spores can survive in the environment for a long time. Grass-eating animals, such as cattle, are most often infected because they can eat spores living in the soil.

How do people get anthrax?

People can catch anthrax from infected animals or contaminated animal products. Most natural infection comes from skin contact. Uncommon — but by far most deadly — is anthrax caught by inhaling spores. A person has to inhale several thousand spores before infection can take hold. Until the events of September, 2001, there hadn't been a case of inhalation anthrax in the U.S. since 1978.

When anthrax spores get inside the body, they grow rapidly. The germs themselves can cause dangerous infections. Far more dangerous is a substance they produce in the body — anthrax toxin — which helps the bug survive by killing off cells of the immune system. This toxin is so deadly that it can kill even after infection is brought under control.

See <http://content.health.msn.com/content/article/4058.323#q2>

- Any student, parent or school employee, upon receiving information that a person is threatening to commit an act of violence, should assume the threat is serious; immediately report the threat to a school administrator or law enforcement officer; be available and cooperate in providing a statement of information under the cover of anonymity if possible.
- Students making terroristic threats may be expelled and/or prosecuted (Replace the word 'may' with 'shall' if state law permits or requires expulsion).
- The Board may require (prior to readmission) competent and credible evidence that the student does not pose a risk of harm to others.
- Students expelled for terroristic threats may be subject to random searches upon returning to school.

In addition, school boards should also develop a "Flexibility Clause" that grants school administrators broader latitude in handling a variety of student behavior issues and in imposing sanctions that may not be specifically articulated in the student handbook. Include a statement in the student handbook such as the following: "It is impossible to write a rule, regulation, policy or procedure to cover every

action that interferes with student learning. Therefore, even though not specifically addressed in this handbook, conduct that deliberately interferes with the educational process and/or any other action that may be deemed consistent with the educational mission but that violates accepted and ordinary standards of conduct are also prohibited. The degree of severity of this misconduct, as well as the accumulative effect of the misconduct, will determine whether the offense warrants detention, suspension expulsion, or referral to a law enforcement agency."

Dealing with threats

Terrorist attacks may be targeted against some individual or group of individuals or may be random. Contrary to popular belief, there is no specific profile of a terrorist. Actions or characteristics that may indicate a troubled individual has violent intentions include:

- a person hanging around the school perimeter;
- a person who appears slightly disoriented;
- a person with a blank look, staring "into space;"
- a person loitering in or near the building; and
- a person wearing unseasonable clothing.

In addition to the aforementioned, the Los Angeles Unified School District offers the following advice in identifying and dealing with potential violent acts and/or terrorists. The key is to engage the entire school community at a level of vigilance that makes it difficult for any terrorist act to occur.

- Crisis drills can be effective; emphasis should be placed on the anticipation of the event. Local law enforcement and other public safety agencies and community members should be advised when a crisis drill is scheduled in order to avoid potential response problems and misunderstandings about the nature of the event.

- Share intelligence with staff members.
- Counsel work-site employees regarding personal problems. Do not make moral judgements.
- Watch for love triangle situations in the school.
- Management team personnel should be notified of terminated employees.
- Newly suspended or expelled students who show up prior to their reinstatement date should be taken to a secure place and interrogated at once.

Every school should have a set of threat assessment protocols in place for handling violent acts. The definition of such violence should include acts that

may incite terror or fear among the general student body or community.

Let community stakeholders—students, parents, teachers, administrators, law enforcement, and criminal justice system representatives—know that they each have a role to play in preventing and responding to terrorism. Assign specific procedures for each type of stakeholder to follow upon receiving information that someone in the school community may commit an act of violence.

The school threat assessment procedures of the Rapid City Public Schools in South Dakota underscore this partnership and resolve to deal with terrorism in school. (See below.)

Rapid City's School Threat Assessment Response Protocol

School Threat Assessment Response (STAR) Protocol for:

- Rapid City Area (South Dakota) Schools;
- Rapid City Police Department;
- Pennington County Sheriff's Department; and
- Pennington County State's Attorney's Office

Mission Statement

The purpose behind this protocol is to provide for a mechanism to assure that threats of violence in a school environment are addressed, whenever possible, before they occur. The process necessarily involves a variety of elements, ranging from student, parent, teacher, staff member and administration involvement to law enforcement and other criminal justice component participation.

The protocol is designed specifically for those violence issues that affect schools and the students who attend those schools. It is intended to identify credible threats of violence and address those threats and the individual making the threat before the threat is carried out.

NOTE: This protocol is applicable during any school-sponsored event or function, whether the event or function be on school property or not.

Definitions: For purposes of this protocol, the following definitions apply:

1. Threatened Act of Violence: Any threat or action that suggests the possibility that serious physical injury or death may be caused to another.
2. Rapid City Area School Staff Member: Any employee of the Rapid City School District.
3. Rapid City Area School Administrator: Any Rapid City School District principal or their designee.
4. STAR Team Members: STAR Team officers and deputies, responsible for first response and threat assessment, shall include all Rapid City Police Department and Pennington County Sheriff's Office School Liaison Officers. These personnel shall be referred to generally as STAR Team Officers. Additionally, the STAR Team shall consist of three (3) designated prosecutors from the Pennington County State's Attorney's Office, who shall be referred to as STAR Team prosecutors.
5. STAR Team Coordinators: The coordinators of the STAR Team, responsible for oversight of this protocol, shall include the Pennington County State's Attorney or his designee, the Rapid City Police Department Chief of Police or his designee, and the

Pennington County Sheriff or his designee.

Procedure: The following procedure is separated into several sections in order to reflect those instances where a threatened act of violence may be received by specific individuals.

- I. Any student, upon receiving information that a person is threatening to commit an act of violence, shall:
 - Assume threat is serious;
 - Immediately report the threat to a parent, guardian, school staff, administrator or law enforcement officer;
 - Be available and cooperative in providing a statement of information, with the understanding that the information source (student) will remain anonymous to the greatest extent possible.
- II. Any parent or guardian, upon receiving information that a person is threatening to commit an act of violence, shall:
 - Assume threat is serious;
 - Immediately report the threat to a school staff member, school administrator or law enforcement office;
 - Be available and cooperative in

providing a statement of information, with the understanding that the information source (parent or guardian) will remain anonymous to the greatest extent possible.

III. Any school staff member, upon receiving information that a person is threatening to commit an act of violence, shall:

- Assume threat is serious;
- Immediately report the threat to a school administrator or designee;
- Be available and cooperative in providing a statement of information, with the understanding that the information source (the staff member) will remain anonymous to the greatest extent possible.

IV. Any school administrator, upon receiving information that a person is threatening to commit an act of violence, shall:

- Assume threat is serious;
- Cause the student making the threat, if said student is on campus, to be immediately removed from the classroom and segregated into a secured area pending further investigation;
- Immediately notify the STAR Team Officer assigned to the school and provide the team member with complete information regarding the information received;
- Require the school staff member, if this is the source of the information, to provide immediate written statements regarding the information received.

V. The STAR Team Officer, upon notification that a threat to commit an act of violence has occurred, shall:

- Assume the threat is serious;
- Immediately conduct an assessment interview of the subject making the threat. The assessment interview will include at least one STAR Team Officer and the administrator or his designee.

NOTE: The primary purpose of the interview is to engage in an assessment of the available information, in an attempt to determine the veracity of the threat, in order to decide what level of follow-up action is needed and appropriate.

VI. Once the assessment is complete, the STAR Team Officer and administrator shall convene privately to discuss the threat and consider options for follow-up action:

A. If it is agreed the threat is credible, the STAR Team Officer shall immediately contact a STAR Team Prosecutor to discuss possible options for the subject making the threat. These options may include, but are not necessarily limited to:

1. Contacting subject's parent(s) or guardian for input and assistance, including potential voluntary committal of the subject making the threat or voluntary placement in a juvenile diversion program through the State Attorney's Office;
2. Application of the Child in Need of Supervision (CHINS) process through parental or guardian assistance, or through the State Attorney's Office Arrest and incarceration of the subject for Disturbance of School;
3. Communication between the STAR Team Prosecutor and the school administrator regarding school sanctions;
4. Arrest and incarceration of the subject for Disturbance of School;
5. Arrest and incarceration of the subject for Disorderly Conduct;
6. Arrest and incarceration of the subject for simple or aggravated assault;
7. Arrest and incarceration of the subject for probation violation, if the student is a court-ordered probationer;
8. Placement of the subject at the psychiatric unit on an involuntary mental hold.

B. If it is agreed that the threat is not credible, or does not require application of the options listed in section "A", the school administrator shall assume responsibility to institute any further action deemed necessary.

VII. Once an option is chosen and initiated, the STAR Team Members involved in the process shall engage in fulfilling the reporting requirements associated with the action taken:

- The STAR Team Member, upon exercising any of the aforementioned options, shall immediately complete reports relevant to the event and the action taken and assure that copies of these documents are provided to:
 - The State's Attorney's Office;
 - The school administrator involved;
 - The STAR Team Coordinators.
- Original reports are to be routed through the law enforcement records management system per usual procedure.

VIII. After-Action Considerations:

- Periodically, as deemed necessary by the STAR Team Coordinators, a meeting will be held to discuss recent STAR cases, in order to determine the effectiveness of this protocol. Meeting attendees should include:
 - The Pennington County State's Attorney or his designee;
 - The Rapid City Police Department Chief of Police or his designee;
 - The Rapid City Area School District superintendent or his designee;
 - The Chief Court Services Officer or his designee;
 - The Pennington County Sheriff or his designee;
 - Designated STAR Officers.

Alfred University survey says America's high schools are at risk for lethal violence

In the average high school of 800 students, nearly 100 kids have the potential for violence, and as many as 20 of them may be considered high-risk for shooting someone at school, according to an Alfred University survey.

Results of the survey, the first-ever to ask American high school students what they think about lethal violence in schools, were announced in August.

"While American public schools are safe overall, there have been apparently random and sometimes lethal outbreaks of violence," said Dr. Edward Gaughan, principal investigator and professor of psychology in Alfred University's Division of School Psychology. "To help us better understand why school shootings occur, and what we might do to stop them, we decided to tap a resource largely ignored until now: the students themselves."

Alfred University commissioned Harris Interactive to conduct a national survey of 2,017 students in grades 7-12. The margin of error is two percent or less.

"Students seem to know who in their schools have the potential for violence, and what might drive them to shoot someone in school," said Gaughan. Thirty-seven percent said they knew someone in their school who might shoot someone else. About 20 percent of the respondents said that they had actually heard others say they had plans to shoot someone, and an equal number said they had heard rumors of a student planning to shoot another student.

Students were asked if they had ever thought about shooting someone at school. Eight percent of the respondents said they had, and another 10 percent said they had thought about how they might carry out a shooting at school. In other words, they have actually planned how they might be able to do it.

By looking at the number of respondents who have either thought about shooting someone at school, or made a plan to shoot someone at school, the AU researchers determined that 12 percent of the student population has a propensity toward violence that might lead them to actually shoot someone at school.

"When we looked at the number who said that they had thought about shooting someone at school, had made a plan to shoot someone at school, AND had access to a gun, it came to 2.6 percent of the population," said Gaughan. "In a high school of 800 students (the average size of American high schools), that's 20 students we think are most likely to actually carry out a school shooting."

Those students are most likely to be boys, in 11th or 12th grade, who are highly alienated, meaning they do not feel valued at home or at school, and who have a perceived low quality of life, determined by their responses to questions such as "I get along well with my parents;" "I am often bored;" "I often feel sad and unhappy;" "I have been happy at school this past year;" and "I get in trouble at school a lot."

"The potential shooters tend to be those who are isolated from family and friends," said Gaughan. "They may be targets of ridicule or bullying by other students, and feel ignored by teachers."

While students say they can identify those among them most likely to commit violence, only half of them will tell an adult. If they do tell, they are most likely to confide in teachers and parents.

Revenge is the strongest motivation for lethal violence, kids told Alfred University researchers. Eighty-seven percent said school shootings are motivated by a desire to "get back at those who have hurt them," and 86 percent said they are caused by "other kids picking on them, making fun of them or bullying them."

Sixty-two percent said students shoot others "because they don't value life."

Students think being abused or mistreated is another major reason for school violence. Sixty-one percent said that being victims of physical abuse is a reason for kids to shoot other kids, and 54 percent said those who witness abuse at home are likely to be violent.

Teen-agers recognize that having psychological problems may be a cause, and an equal number (56 percent) blame easy access to guns as reasons for school shootings.

The survey results confirm the availability of guns. Sixty-one percent of the respondents said they knew someone who could bring a gun to school, and 24 percent said they could easily bring a gun to school themselves if they wanted to.

Students ranked violence in the media 11th among the 16 reasons for school shootings, with 37 percent saying that exposure to violence on TV, or in videos, movies, computer games and video games could be blamed for kids shooting kids.

Eleven percent of boys have thought about shooting someone at school, but only 5 percent of the girls said they have.

An open-ended question asked respondents what teachers or school staff could do to stop shootings at schools. Students reported that it matters what kind of relationships students have with adults; teachers need to care more about their students; they need to intervene when they see students being hurt or bullied by other students; and they need to listen more and pay more attention to their students.

More than 10 percent of the total sample, however, indicated that there is nothing that can be done to stop violence in schools. Of the 12 percent of students that were determined to have propensity for violence, 27 percent said nothing can stop it; of the 2.6 percent considered to be most dangerous, two of every five said nothing could be done. More chilling were their actual responses, which included such statements as, "Nothing... If we want to do something bad enough, we will find a way. No matter what."

Students recognize the potential for violence within their schools. One in four told researchers that their schools are only 'somewhat safe' or 'not at all safe.' Overall, students rated rural schools as more dangerous than urban schools. Suburban schools were generally perceived as being the safest.

"Lethal Violence in Schools," by Edward Gaughan, Ph.D., Jay D. Cerio, Ph.D., and Robert A. Myers, Ph.D., is available online at <http://www.alfred.edu/teenviolence>.

2001 NASRO survey validates the proactive roles of SROs

School-based police officers prevent a substantial amount of school violence, have exceptionally positive relationships with students and educators, and improve the reporting of school crimes that otherwise may go unreported to police, according to the nation's largest professional industry survey of school resource officers.

"This survey validates the proactive role of school resource officers," said Curt Lavarello, Executive Director of the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO), as he released the results of a national survey last month. "The survey also reinforces the fact that very few school-based officers view their primary work as involving arrests and investigations."

In the summer of 2001, a 61-question survey instrument was administered to attendees at the 11th Annual NASRO Conference held in Miami, Florida. Upon registration, 1,000 surveys were distributed to school-based police officer conference attendees. Of the 689 officers from 47 states and 9 international locations who responded to the survey:

- 83 percent were male, and 17 percent were female.
- 76 percent were SROs; 19 percent were SRO supervisors; and 1 percent had other related law enforcement titles.
- 56 percent were employed by city/township law enforcement agencies; 28 percent were employed by county agencies; 14 percent were from school district law enforcement agencies; 1.5 percent came from state and 0.5 percent from federal agencies.

This industry survey, the first and largest of its kind, introduces the insights of SROs—the men and women on the front lines of school safety in our schools and in our communities. While surveys of this kind are admittedly limited in their application and by their research methodology, the results provide significant data about the demographics, perceptions, design, operations, and impact of school resource officer (SRO) programs around the country. The information resulting

from this survey will help further improve our nation's understanding of the importance of the SRO's role in improving safety at our nation's schools.

The NASRO survey results reinforce the findings of a study of SRO effectiveness reported earlier this year by the Justiceworks program of the University of New Hampshire. The Justiceworks study found SRO programs to be effective based on student surveys that measured student behavior and perceptual and attitudinal responses in nine New Hampshire high schools.

Key survey results

- **Nearly all the SROs reported that their programs improve school safety and prevent crime and violence.** SROs report having very positive relationships with students, school administrators, teachers, and support personnel, while relationships with parents received average ratings. The majority of officers have direct contact with a significant number of students on a daily basis with 70 percent reporting that they have such contact with 31 or more students each school day.
- **SROs believe very strongly that the numbers of crimes that occur on school campuses nationwide are under-reported to police,** but that the presence of an SRO on school campuses improves the accuracy of school crime reporting.
- **More than 97 percent of the officers surveyed reported that they carry a firearm on campus while serving as SROs.** Nearly all the respondents indicated that they do not believe an armed SRO puts students at a greater risk of harm/injury with approximately 91 percent reporting the opposite—that they believe an unarmed SRO puts students at a greater risk of harm/injury.
- **SRO respondents clearly believe that, aside from school staff and students, the majority of individuals influencing school safety do not fully understand the roles and functions of school resource officers.** This is particularly the case for media, elected officials, other police officers, parents, and school violence researchers and academicians.

- **School resource officers report that their constituents view them in varying degrees as part of the overall school staff.** Eighty-one percent of the SROs believe that their students view them as a member of the overall school staff, while only 54 percent believe that school faculty and staff view them in such a manner. About 74 percent think that parents view them as a part of the overall school staff.

- **Only 7 percent of SROs describe their role as having a major emphasis on enforcement and investigative duties.** Individuals outside of the school community frequently view school resource officer programs as being reactive, punitive, and/or as creating a "prison-like environment" on school campuses. In contrast, 56 percent of the survey respondents reported that at least half of their job responsibilities consisted of preventative duties, with an additional 35 percent of officers indicating that the majority of their role deals with proactive, prevention duties.

- **A total of 92 percent of the respondents reported having prevented from 1 to 25 violent acts on campus in an average school year.** Approximately 67 percent stated that they have prevented assaults against school faculty and staff as well as other acts of school violence on campus. More than 94 percent of the officers also indicated that students have reported to them about violent acts or similar safety threats that they believed were going to occur. This fact suggests that students feel comfortable in reporting safety concerns to SROs.

- **Almost 72 percent of the respondents stated that the majority of their arrests on campus are for misdemeanor offenses.** Approximately 24 percent of the respondents have taken a loaded firearm from a student or other individual on campus and 87 percent stated that they have taken knives or bladed weapons from students or other individuals. In spite of these weapons incidents, approximately 83 percent stated that they have not had to pull their firearm from their holster in response to a perceived threat to their safety

or the safety of others at their school. About 95 percent of the surveyed officers have never had a student or other individual on campus attempt to disarm them.

- **While the majority of respondents had less than 10 years of experience as SROs, 67 percent had more than 10 years of total experience as police officers.** Although a high school diploma is the highest level of required education for a majority of respondents' departments, 85 percent of the SROs surveyed have a minimum of an associate degree or some college courses. Of this 85 percent, 30 percent hold bachelor degrees, 4 percent hold master's degrees, and 1 percent holds doctorate degrees.

- **The majority of represented states do not require specialized training (beyond standard police training) before an officer can work as a SRO.** However, the majority of respondents reported that local training is available and that they are able to attend specialized courses related to their duties during the course of the school year. SROs are most limited in obtaining additional training by time constraints (conflicts in leaving the school) and funding (inadequate funding for tuition, travel, and expenses). The majority of departments lack formal field training officer (FTO) programs to help SROs prepare for their roles. Overall, most officers feel that their training is adequate or more than adequate, although they indicate that would like additional ongoing, specialized training.

- **Nearly nine out of 10 the school resource officers volunteered for assignments as SROs.** For the majority of the SRO programs, school officials participated in the selection process for the SRO.

- **Within a large majority of the represented SRO programs, formal contracts or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) documents have been drawn between the law enforcement and school agencies.** The large majority of SROs have written job descriptions and the majority of those descriptions are accurate. Most of the SRO programs employ full-time officers. SROs are typically evaluated by their law enforcement su-

pervisor and/or by their law enforcement supervisor with school administrator input.

Other program design and operational aspects of SRO programs include:

- 51 percent of the surveyed SROs were responsible for one school; 11 percent were responsible for two schools, 9 percent for three schools, 6 percent for four schools, and 19 percent for five or more schools.
- 95 percent of the SRO programs assigned officers to high schools; 83 percent assigned SROs to middle/junior high schools; and 45 percent assigned offic-

office space.

- 53 percent of SROs wear full police uniforms the majority of time while working as a SRO; 30 percent sometimes wear full uniform and sometimes wear soft uniforms; 10 percent wear a soft uniform all the time; 3 percent wear a suit or business attire; and 3 percent wear casual/street clothes.
- 28 percent of police departments split the cost of SRO programs with their schools; 26 percent fund the program primarily from police department budgets; 21 percent fund the program primarily through the school district budget; and 24

Tasks Performed By School Resource Officers	Percent of Officers Reporting this Activity
One-on-one counseling with students	93%
Calls for service to classrooms	88%
Classroom instruction	87%
Crisis preparedness planning	83%
Security audits/assessments of school campuses	82%
Special safety programs/presentations	78%
Faculty/staff in-service presentations	75%
Truancy intervention	70%
Group counseling with students	69%
Supervising/coordinating non-athletic extracurricular activities	60%
Field trip chaperone	57%
Parent organization presentations	57%
Coaching athletic programs	30%

ers to elementary schools.

- 89 percent of SROs have been called off campus for administrative issues; 91 percent have been pulled away due to court appearances; 51 percent have been called from the school for community emergencies; and 34 percent have been pulled from school due to departmental manpower shortages.
- 64 percent of the responding SROs do not have substitutes to replace them when they are not on campus.
- 57 percent of SROs indicated that their school district also employs noncommissioned, non-peace-officer school district employees who perform security-related functions in addition to SROs.
- 88 percent of respondents report that school officials provide them with private

percent fund the programs primarily through grants.

- 54 percent of the respondents' receive federal COPS Office (U.S. Department of Justice) funding.
- 25 percent of the SRO programs are located in community policing-type units or divisions; 25 percent are specialized, independent departments, divisions, or units (including school police departments).
- 18 percent reported being housed in patrol/uniform divisions; 14 percent are located under criminal investigations divisions; another 14 percent are housed in juvenile bureaus, youth and family services bureaus, or similar units.

For additional information on the NASRO survey, visit www.nasro.org.

NSSC wishes to acknowledge and applaud the following governors who formally adopted resolutions and proclamations to promote America's Safe Schools Week 2001 within their states:

Don Siegelman, Governor of Alabama
Tony Knowles, Governor of Alaska
Jane Dee Hull, Governor of Arizona
Gray Davis, Governor of California
Bill Owens, Governor of Colorado
John G. Rowland, Governor of Connecticut
Roy E. Barnes, Governor of Georgia
Dirk Kempthorne, Governor of Idaho
George H. Ryan, Governor of Illinois
Frank O'Bannon, Governor of Indiana
Bill Graves, Governor of Kansas
Paul E. Patton, Governor of Kentucky
M.J. "Mike" Foster, Jr., Governor of Louisiana
Angus S. King, Jr., Governor of Maine
Parris N. Glendening, Governor of Maryland
John Engler, Governor of Michigan
Ronnie Musgrove, Governor of Mississippi
Bob Holden, Governor of Missouri
Mike Johanns, Governor of Nebraska
Jeanne Shaheen, Governor of New Hampshire
Donald T. DiFrancesco, Governor of New Jersey
Gary E. Johnson, Governor of New Mexico
John Hoeven, Governor of North Dakota
Bob Taft, Governor of Ohio
Frank Keating, Governor of Oklahoma
John A. Kitzhaber, Governor of Oregon
Tom Ridge, Governor of Pennsylvania
Lincoln Almond, Governor of Rhode Island
Jim Hodges, Governor of South Carolina
Rick Perry, Governor of Texas
Gary Locke, Governor of Washington
Scott McCallum, Governor of Wisconsin

America's Safe Schools Week, sponsored annually by the National School Safety Center and state governors, seeks to acknowledge and recognize that:

- schools make substantial contributions to the future of America and to the development of our nation's young people as knowledgeable, responsible and productive citizens;
- excellence in education is dependent on safe, secure and peaceful school settings;
- the safety and well-being of many students, teachers and school staff are unnecessarily jeopardized by crime and violence;
- it is the responsibility of all citizens to enhance the learning experiences of young people by helping to ensure fair and effective discipline, promote good citizenship, and generally make school safe and secure; and
- all leaders, especially those in education, law enforcement, government and business, should eagerly collaborate with each other to focus public attention on school safety and identify, develop and promote innovative answers to these critical issues.

School Safety Update is published by the National School Safety Center to communicate current trends and effective programs in school safety to subscribers and members of NSSC's **International Association of School Safety Professionals**. Annual subscription to *School Safety Update* is \$99. Annual **IASSP** membership is \$119. (Outside the United States, subscriptions are \$139 and memberships are \$159.) Correspondence should be addressed to: NSSC, 141 Duesenberg Drive, Suite 11, Westlake Village, CA 91362, telephone 805/373-9977, FAX 805/373-9277.

The National School Safety Center was established in 1984 by presidential directive under a grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, in partnership with the U.S. Department of Education. NSSC currently operates as a private, nonprofit corporation.

Points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National School Safety Center.

Copyright ©2001 by the National School Safety Center. ISSN 1094-9720

Ronald D. Stephens, Executive Director
June Lane Arnette, Associate Director
Bernard James, Special Counsel
Hilda Clarice Quiroz, Program Specialist
Michael G. Rivas, Program Specialist

Editorial Advisory Board

James E. Copple, Executive Deputy Director, National Crime Prevention Council
David S. Friedli, Former Project Director, Toward a Drug-Free Nebraska
Arnold P. Goldstein, Professor Emeritus, Syracuse University, School of Education, Center for Research on Aggression
Stuart Greenbaum, President, Greenbaum Public Relations
Curtis S. Lavarello, Executive Director, National Association of School Resource Officers
Pamela Riley, Executive Director, National Association of Students Against Violence Everywhere (S.A.V.E.)
William G. Scott, Director of School Safety and Student Support Services, Kentucky School Boards Association
Melvin T. Seo, Administrator, Safety and Security Services, Hawaii Department of Education
Mary Tobias Weaver, Program Administrator, School Safety and Violence Prevention Office, California Department of Education
Marleen Wong, Director, Mental Health Services/District Crisis Teams, Los Angeles Unified School District

America's Safe School Week 2002 will be October 20-26, 2002.