
2001-2002 MARIN COUNTY GRAND JURY

**TITLE OF REPORT: Emergency Preparedness and Security on
Public School Campuses in Marin County**

Date of Report: June 19, 2002

Reports issued by the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code Section 929 requires that reports of the Grand Jury not contain the name of any person, or facts leading to the identity of any person who provides information to the Civil Grand Jury. The California State Legislature has stated that it intends the provisions of Penal Code Section 929 prohibiting disclosure of witness identities to encourage full candor in testimony in Civil Grand Jury investigations by protecting the privacy and confidentiality of those who participate in any Civil Grand Jury investigation.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND SECURITY ON PUBLIC SCHOOL CAMPUSES IN MARIN COUNTY

SUMMARY

Prompted by a series of school shootings across the country, the Grand Jury, in the summer of 2001, launched an inquiry into school safety and security in Marin's public schools. The terrorist attacks of 9-11 broadened the scope of this investigation to include preparedness for terrorist attacks as well as devastation caused by accidents or natural catastrophes.

Grand Jury members visited public schools in Marin County and interviewed safety and emergency administrators to determine their state of preparedness. It was found that some of the recommendations from a 1995 Grand Jury report had not been implemented in the manuals of the Marin County Office of Education¹ or the individual schools. Conduct of drills was found to be inconsistent among schools and districts. As a result, eight recommendations are being made:

- Update emergency and safety manuals. Add information on how to deal with terrorism and intruders. At each school, merge all emergency and safety procedures into one manual.
- Provide signs at all school and district offices as required by law, directing visitors to register and telling them where to register. Enforce that legal requirement.
- Instruct employees to question strangers on campus and direct them to the office.
- Evaluate all emergency drills and persons involved in emergency actions.
- Ensure that the proper emergency materials, tools, equipment, and food for 72 hours are available and properly stored on campus.
- Locate designated Red Cross Shelters for each school and ensure proper interface with Red Cross officials.
- Provide adequate training for all persons who have responsibilities during emergencies.
- Review and update communications procedures.

¹ There are 20 school districts in Marin County. MCOE is one of those districts. They are all independent special districts that act through their own boards of trustees. The Marin Community College is another, but is not a subject of this report as are the other 19.

BACKGROUND

The 1995 Marin County Civil Grand Jury published a report on “Emergency Disaster Preparedness in Marin County Public Schools”. It recommended the development of a single, unified school safety plan for all schools in the County. It outlined specific items to be included in that plan.

The current Grand Jury decided to review the subject of school safety and security. A starting point was to see if the recommendations of the 1995 Grand Jury report had been implemented. After 9-11 the investigation was broadened to include preparedness for terrorism and major disasters.

METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire was prepared for use in obtaining information from the schools in the County. It was also used during interviews and was modified as the interviews proceeded. The final version is Appendix A. Responses to the questionnaire are recorded in Appendices B, C and D.

Eleven schools and two school district offices were chosen randomly for site visits and interviews. In most cases the questionnaire was forwarded to the schools and their districts prior to the interviews.

Interviews Conducted

Thirty-two persons were interviewed including:

- Officials of the Marin County Office of Education (MCOE)
- Persons responsible for safety and disaster preparedness at the school campuses and district offices visited
- Members of law enforcement and fire agencies in the County
- Parents who volunteer at schools
- Non-teaching staff who work at the schools and assist in the safety programs

Sites Visited

- The campuses of eleven public schools in Marin County (three high schools, two middle schools, three K-8 elementary schools, and three K-5 elementary schools). One school earthquake drill was attended.
- Two school district offices

- Two law enforcement agencies
- Two fire departments
- The Marin County Office of Education

Documents Read

- Emergency Disaster Preparedness in Marin County Schools, a 1995 Marin County Grand Jury Report
- Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) Guidelines, California Office of Emergency Services, 1994
- MCOE Model Emergency Disaster Incident Preparedness Plan, (The Model Plan) MCOE, undated *
- MCOE School Law Enforcement Partnership, MCOE, undated *
- MCOE Comprehensive School Safety Plan, MCOE, Revised 2000-2001
- Response to Active Shooter – County Protocol (rough draft), Marin County Sheriff's Department, 2001
- Marin Emergency Radio Authority (MERA), a 2000-2001 Marin County Grand Jury Report
- Emergency Shelters, American Red Cross, March 2002
- Eleven school safety and emergency disaster manuals
- The Marin County Office of Education Website, <http://mcoeweb.marin.k12.ca.us/>. One presentation on the website tracks construction and maintenance projects in Marin County Schools.

*An asterisk marks items that can be downloaded from the MCOE website and modified by schools for their individual use.

DISCUSSION

The Grand Jury attempted to address all types of emergencies and the full range of responses. Security issues include: intruders, firearms, knives, drugs, gangs, riot, and vandalism. Disaster events include: fire, earthquake, storm/flood, medical emergency, and bio-terrorism.

The following sections present the results of the Grand Jury's investigation for the key elements of emergency preparedness and security.

Manuals, Plans and Protocols

The State of California, as part of its Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS), includes a 100-page guideline for school security. This provides a basis for County school emergency plans.² It is available on the Internet.

The 1995 Grand Jury report, "Emergency Disaster Preparedness in Marin County Public Schools," offered nine Recommendations. First and foremost was that MCOE develop a "... single, unified school safety plan for all schools in the County." The plan, the report said, should contain:

- "...necessary legal requirements [and] staff responsibilities, communications, supplies, drill schedules, training and outreach efforts. The plan should be structured to allow schools to tailor the overall plan to their individual needs."

In response to the 1995 Grand Jury report, MCOE created two documents containing all of the elements of this segment of the Recommendation. They were: 1) MCOE Model Emergency Disaster Incident Preparedness Plan (The Model Plan);³ 2) The MCOE School Law Enforcement Partnership. A third plan, The MCOE Comprehensive School Safety Plan, was developed for use by County School District administered by MCOE. One of its chapters contains The Model Plan.

The Recommendation also stated that there should be:

- "...a timetable for schools to implement the safety program, and a performance/evaluation system established to gauge drills, training, supplies, communication functions on a regular basis."

The present Grand Jury has found no evidence that the MCOE acted upon this segment of the Recommendation.

² The MCOE coordinates contacts between school districts and the County's Office of Emergency Services (OES). One MCOE member is stationed in the Emergency Operations Center when it is activated. Individual school contact with OES is through fire and law enforcement agencies.

³ The Model Plan references a number of State codes relating to emergency preparedness:

Education Code § 3200-32004 (fire warning systems); § 32040 (first aid kits); § 3220 (liability of employees during drills); § 35295-25297 (earthquake emergency procedures); § 40041.5 (shelters); and § 46390-46392 (attendance in case of disaster).

California Administrative Code, Title 5, § 550 (fire drills) and § 560 (civil defense and disaster preparedness plans).

Government Code § 3100 (public employees as disaster service workers).

School districts develop general plans and protocols. The districts may use MCOE manuals as a basis to update and revise their plans. Schools within a district develop site-specific plans based on the district plan. Some school plans predate the latest MCOE manuals.

All of the sites visited have one or more manuals covering disasters and emergencies and/or safety. They are titled variously Emergency Plan, Disaster Plan, Safety Plan and/or Comprehensive Safety Plan. No references to biohazards were found. The better manuals conform to MCOE guidelines, with detailed check-off lists for persons to complete specific duties during a school emergency.

MCOE leads an organization, The Marin County Schools Preparedness Council, which meets quarterly to discuss these emergency planning issues. Every school district is represented by an administrator or someone involved in safety at that level. This appears to be a good device for sharing information.

School and District Office Security

Some school manuals do not include protocols for dealing with intruders. Grand Jury members visiting schools and district offices were almost never challenged by school employees, nor were there signs directing them to an office or advising them that it is a criminal offense to be on campus without permission (California Penal Code Title 15, Chapter 1.1, § 627).

During this investigation, eleven schools and two district offices were visited. In only one instance were the members of the Grand Jury stopped, questioned, and directed to the office. Two of the school campuses visited had signs at the entrances to the school to direct visitors to the office. Only one site referred to an ordinance requiring visitors to obtain permission to be on campus.

Law Enforcement and Fire Agencies

Personnel interviewed stated that they have frequent and cooperative contact with local fire and law enforcement agencies. For each school the proper contact for emergencies of all types, including countywide disasters, is the local 911 response jurisdiction. Since school district, fire district and city jurisdictions do not always coincide, some school districts have more than one contact.⁴

None of the schools in our survey were critical of the personnel assigned to their school from a fire or law enforcement agency. All schools have law enforcement officers assigned to schools. Except for thinly populated areas in West Marin, contacts are frequent. These contacts are important to school personnel because they help students

⁴ For example, a school in the Dixie School District may deal with either the San Rafael or Marinwood Fire Department, and with either the San Rafael Police Department or the County Sheriff's Department. Fortunately a school usually has to deal with only one responder for normal business. On the other hand, all four, plus the Highway Patrol, could arrive in a major emergency.

become comfortable around firefighters and police officers. At some schools, police and fire personnel teach or assist in classes on subjects within their professional expertise.

Interviews at schools indicated that fire and law enforcement agencies attend only a limited number of drills and are only infrequently present at safety orientations or classes. Interviews with a number of public safety personnel indicated an eagerness to cooperate with schools.

Emergency and Disaster Procedures

There are two basic actions a school takes to provide for the security of its students: they are evacuation and lockdown.⁵

- Evacuation occurs during fire and earthquake drills when students are directed to a safe area, clear of the buildings, to take roll and wait for further instructions. Evacuation is necessary whenever the structure of a building is believed to be unsound or otherwise unsafe to occupy. Causes are earthquake, fire, explosion, flood, or landslide. A responsible person, usually the principal, must communicate to teachers by voice or alarm to alert them when an emergency exists and if it is appropriate to evacuate. That person must also direct action when the threat has passed. Ultimately it may be necessary to take all or some of the students to a shelter within the school complex or at another location.
- An example of lockdown occurs when there is an outside threat from an intruder. The doors are locked, the blinds drawn, and the students directed to stay away from the windows by ducking and sheltering against the walls below the windows. Lockdown is necessary whenever there is a threat on campus in the form of intruders or contaminants in the atmosphere. Contaminants can result from terrorism or spills of hazardous materials. Airborne contaminants must be prevented from entering the building by shutting down the ventilation, closing all openings, and sealing all cracks by stuffing them with towels or rags. Again a responsible person must communicate with the teacher or person in charge of each class or group.

The Model Plan does not specifically deal with terrorism, biological hazards and lockdowns. Reference to these procedures is contained in the MCOE School Law Enforcement Partnership under “Emergency Procedures: Guns Fired or Intruder on Campus”. The Grand Jury found it confusing that emergency procedures are in two different manuals.

Drills

All of the schools visited conduct fire and earthquake drills, and most do them as frequently as required by law (monthly for fire drills, twice a year for earthquake drills).

⁵ The Model Plan provides for eight specific “Emergency Actions” that can be signaled and acted on by the school staff. All are embraced by the two basic actions of evacuation and lockdown.

During one of the Grand Jury school visits, an earthquake drill was in progress. Teachers, other staff, parent volunteers and students performed well. Key administrators, teachers, and responsible staff from other schools and districts could learn from observing drills at that particular school or just from observing a school other than their own. Similarly, schools with programs that are not well developed could benefit from evaluations by experienced observers.

Lockdown drills are not conducted on some campuses. One of the interviewees stated that lockdown drills were not being conducted because learning about the potential danger may traumatize young elementary school children. Other campuses reported that procedures and drills had been properly conducted and understood. Records and evaluations were not available at the sites visited. Some reported that records were maintained in the District Office.

Several schools indicated that they conduct "intruder" drills by broadcasting code signals so that teachers can secure their rooms while not panicking the children. However, this is the extent of the drill. While this procedure may be an effective way to alert teachers, it does not help them or their students practice getting out of sight.

Most drills are not viewed or evaluated by outside observers. Instead, evaluations are made by school staff members. Debriefings are held and corrections are made where indicated. Records of drills are logged but evaluations are not recorded. There is no standard way of recording recommendations and corrections. When asked, responsible persons were not able to produce such records. Law enforcement and fire department personnel indicated that they occasionally observe drills. They do not formally evaluate them.

Communications

Internal communications in the schools are not consistent and vary from one regular phone in each classroom to bull horns to intercom systems of varied vintages to modern sophisticated alarm and intercom systems. These systems are typically updated to current code requirements only as major renovations occur.

Communications with outside agencies are normally handled by an installed hard-wired telephone system. Most, if not all, schools have cell phones that can serve as a back up and can also be used in an emergency. Some districts provide a two-way radio system for use around campus and during emergencies.

Currently, some schools are located in places not served by adequate antennas for reliable cell phone use. Walkie-talkie type systems do not cover a sufficient area to reach vital school areas for reliable support in case of power failures or telephone system outages. Some interviewees expressed concern that lines of contact with the local 911 response agencies may not be available when power and/or phone lines are out.

Agreements have been made to include schools in the Marin Emergency Radio Authority (MERA) system when it becomes operable. All schools are supposed to be included. Some will be on line as soon as the system is installed. Others will have to wait until funding is available to purchase the equipment.

Supplies

Some schools interviewed did not have a plan to be self-sufficient for food and shelter for a minimum of 72 hours, as recommended by The Model Plan. Where there appeared to be sufficient supplies, the quantities available were established by locally prepared inventory lists. The Model Plan has guidelines for developing the protocol and inventories. In some cases school maintenance staff obtain, store, and maintain supplies.

Where there appeared to be adequate emergency supplies, much of the work in acquiring, storing and inventorying them is done by parent volunteers. One school has a program in which parents are asked to supply food and water packages (suitable for long term storage) for their children in the quantities required. This is done annually. At the end of the school year the students get the packages back. Packages are made up by the school when parents do not respond.

A preferred method to safeguard supplies is to store food, water, tools, equipment and materials in metal cargo containers, away from buildings that may become inaccessible in a crisis. All of the elementary schools visited are doing this. Curiously, none of the high schools and only one of the middle schools visited uses outside containers. All have emergency kits in duffel bags or knap sacks in the buildings.

Shelters

Emergency shelters are located throughout Marin County, designated and supplied by the American Red Cross. Many of these are housed within public school buildings. At more than one school site, the persons interviewed did not know that their school is a designated shelter. Others did not know the location of the nearest designated shelter. It is important for all persons in authority at schools to know these locations so that evacuated students and school employees have a place to retreat to if it is necessary, and so that parents can know in advance where their children will be taken in the event of an emergency requiring shelter.

Building & Fire Codes

State law dictates fire and seismic standards for school buildings. In addition, there are requirements for fire fighting equipment, lighting, water supplies and access for firefighters and their vehicles. The law does not, however, require bringing existing buildings into compliance until there are major renovations. Most of the schools we visited are scheduled for major renovation in the near future.

Our interviews revealed that some local school administrators are not aware of the current status of code compliance for their schools. Instead they rely on District personnel to keep that knowledge and plan the upgrades. The interviewees expect that these renovations will correct any shortcomings in code compliance. Major efforts by all parties to the renovations are usually necessary to ensure that the upgrades are included and properly installed.

Some improvements are desirable even if they are not required, and should be completed as soon as practicable. For example, older alarm and public address systems can be modernized to improve reliability and ease of use.

Safety and Disaster Preparedness Training

At all sites visited the person in charge of safety and emergency procedures was a professional educator. In many cases, he/she was the only one who seemed to have a complete grasp of the emergency/disaster protocols. For three of them, this was their first year with this responsibility. All rely on district staff for advice and help. Several asked the Grand Jury for advice on training aids. They were interested in obtaining short videos and lesson plans on appropriate subjects. They are concerned that they will not be able to travel to, or have time for, long training sessions. It was unclear if they realize that their school districts, the Internet, the County Office of Emergency Services (OES), MCOE staff, and local law enforcement and fire agencies all have information to impart, and many are available to assist.

One of our school contacts was searching for ways to improve the qualifications of the staff in first aid, CPR and other safety subjects. That district apparently does not consider these to be items of curriculum and so cannot provide them during teacher Professional Development days. Other districts do provide this training. The Grand Jury believes these subjects should always have high priority. Safety and preparedness taught to school students has been proven to save lives in the home and community. Fire and law enforcement agencies, the Federal Government, and the Marin County Office of Education have training programs and written materials.

Training of parents is done within school teacher-parent organizations. Letters, pamphlets and newsletters from some the schools appeared to the Grand Jury to be effective in imparting safety and emergency information to parents and the community.

COMMENDATION

All of the persons interviewed for this report are professionals who showed an interest and dedication to their responsibilities. All expressed an interest in the safety and security of their charges and the properties in which they work. They were generous in their willingness to be interviewed. We are grateful for their cooperation and commend them for their knowledge and dedication.

FINDINGS

1. The School Emergency Disaster and Incident Preparedness Plan (The Model Plan) produced by the Marin County Office of Education (MCOE) and the manuals produced by the schools interviewed do not have a performance/evaluation system to rate the effectiveness of drills, training, or communications. There are no forms included to record such evaluations, nor does The Model Plan recommend evaluation by personnel from outside the school staff. The "Intruder on Campus" protocol is not in The Model Plan.
2. The Model Plan and the manuals produced by the schools interviewed have no language covering terrorism. However, the procedures in The Model Plan can be used for that coverage. The procedure for Chemical Accident could be expanded to include biological and chemical threats caused by terrorism. Terrorist attack by other means can be incorporated into The Model Plan along with intruder protocols now located in MCOE "School Law Enforcement Partnership". "Existing Actions" in the Model Plan appear to cover the other threats.
3. Most of the schools visited did not have adequate signage to direct visitors on campus. Grand Jury members were challenged at only one of the schools visited.
4. While all school personnel interviewed indicated that they consult with responsible district administrators, district personnel do not attend or evaluate drills. Occasionally drills are observed by law enforcement and fire department personnel. There were no performance/evaluation systems in evidence during these interviews. All persons interviewed reported evaluations being made by school staff and discussed in a debriefing in which improvements and corrections were handled without formal records being maintained.
5. Many of the schools' personnel interviewed did not have a plan to be self-sufficient for food and shelter for a minimum of 72 hours. Where there appeared to be sufficient supplies, the quantities available were established by locally prepared inventory lists. The Model Plan has guidelines for producing the protocol and inventories.
6. Many of the school personnel interviewed did not know the location of the nearest Red Cross designated shelters. When a shelter is on a school campus, interaction with the Red Cross by school authorities is a necessity.
7. Direction and/or assistance from district offices are insufficient in some cases. School personnel appeared to be confused on areas of safety and emergency procedures. New and inexperienced school administrators are the most obvious examples.
8. None of the schools visited have formal training requirements beyond the training accomplished during drills, except that current CPR and First Aid certificates are

required for PE teachers and coaches. At the school level, the responsible staff was not aware of any minimum requirements or systems to require certification and training records. School districts, the Internet, the County OES, MCOE staff, and local law enforcement and fire agencies can provide information and training.

9. Communications capabilities varied depending on district and location. Some schools had cell phones and 2-way radios in addition to regular landline and some relied on personal cell phones. Many of the schools have poor cell phone reception and cannot rely on anything but regular hard-wired phone systems. Unfortunately, there appears to have been little thought about a situation where power and/or phones will be out. Plans have not been made for a major disaster no matter what the cause. The addition of the schools to the MERA network is planned. This could solve most of the external communications problems noted during this survey.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. All public school districts should review their emergency, safety, and/or disaster manuals and protocols in each of their schools and in the district office (including MCOE) to ensure that they are in compliance with the law. These plans should be updated to include the latest information and requirements pertaining to hazardous materials, intruders and terrorism. They should coordinate with each other, with the MCOE taking the lead. The "Intruder on Campus" procedure should be merged into The Model School Emergency Disaster and Incident Preparedness Plan. A single manual should incorporate all emergency safety and security procedures at each school.
2. As required by California Penal Code Title 15, Chapter 1.1, § 627, all schools and district offices (including MCOE) should post signs at all points of entry to their campuses or buildings from streets and parking lots. These signs should direct outsiders to the reception point. The signs should indicate that failure to register subjects visitors to prosecution for trespass.
3. All school personnel should be directed to question strangers and visitors on campus to ensure that procedures are followed.
4. All school districts should provide knowledgeable evaluators at every drill conducted by their schools. These could be district staff, firefighters, law enforcement officers, County safety personnel and experienced school administrators from other schools. Inexperienced persons in responsible positions should be sent to observe programs and drills at schools where programs and drills are considered to be good.
5. Appropriate emergency materials, equipment and food for 72 hours should be acquired, inventoried and stored in a suitable location. Supplies not required in the classroom emergency kits should be stored away from buildings.

6. Each school administration should determine the closest designated shelters and provide this information in its plans, along with directions to the shelters and contact information for the people responsible for the shelters. Parents should be informed. Every responsible person on campus should have this knowledge or immediate access to it. The Red Cross should be contacted annually to update procedures.
7. School district administrators should review the emergency preparedness knowledge and experience of responsible school staff. Site and classroom training should be scheduled as soon as practicable where needed and conducted annually thereafter. Available self-study materials and videos should be provided.
8. School Districts should evaluate the communication requirements and procedures of each school to ensure that procedures are in place for the possibility that all power and phone systems are out.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05, the Grand Jury respectfully requests responses as follows:

From the Marin County Superintendent of Schools to all of the findings and recommendations.

From all Public School Boards in Marin County to all of the findings and recommendations.

APPENDIX A.

SCHOOL PREPAREDNESS QUESTIONNAIRE

I. School and Office Security

1. Are there signs directing visitors to a specific entrance or check-in place?
2. Do you have an Intruder on Campus Procedure in use?
 - a. Who is responsible for this Procedure?
 - b. Date that the Procedure was last updated?
 - c. Who has copies of this policy?
 - d. Number of intruders during school hours in the last 5 years?
 - e. Was any harm done to students, staff, or school property?
 - f. Describe security procedures during school and work hours?
 - g. Describe security procedures during evening and non-working hours?
 - h. Describe security procedures during special events?
3. Do you use a private security agency?
 - a. If so, how many people are assigned to the campus?
 - b. What are their duties?
 - c. How often is the contract renewed?
 - d. Are you satisfied with the performance of the agency?
 - e. Do you conduct performance reviews of the agency?

II. Emergencies and Disasters

1. Do you have a Threat Assessment Template in use?
2. Do you have an Emergency/Disaster Plan?
3. Date last reviewed?
4. Date last updated?
5. Responsible party (name/title)?
6. Alternate?

7. <u>Security Issue</u>	8. <u>Firearms</u>	9. <u>Knives</u>	10. <u>Drugs</u>	11. <u>Gangs</u>	12. <u>Riot</u>	13. <u>Vandalism</u>
a. Is there a policy?						
b. No. of incidents in last 5 yrs						
c. No. times called Police						
d. No. times called Fire Department						
e. No. incidents not satisfactorily resolved?						

14. Event	15. <u>Fire</u>	16. <u>Earthquake</u>	17. <u>Storm/Flood</u>	18. <u>Med. Emerg./ Bio-Terrorism</u>	19. <u>Intruder</u>
a. Is there a policy?					
b. No. of drills conducted/yr					

20. <u>Drills-Evaluated by:</u>	22.	23.	24.	25.	26.
a. Fire Department					
b. Police Dept.					
c. School Staff					
d. District Staff					
e. Other					

27. Training	28. <u>Communi- cations</u>	29. <u>Guns / Gangs</u>	30. <u>Emergency Disaster</u>	31. <u>Bio- Terrorism</u>	32. <u>Intruder</u>
a. frequency/yr					
b. No. of teachers trained?/total					
c. No. other staff trained?/total					
d. Parent education classes/year					

33. Do you maintain records of drills, training and evaluations?

35. Does the District maintain these records?

III. Other

1. Is the Marin Schools Emergency Radio Network on campus?
 - a. Who is in charge?
 - b. To whom does that person report?
 - c. Who reports to him / her?
 - d. Are the persons in responsible positions adequately trained?
 - e. How are they chosen and how is the roster maintained and updated?
 - f. Where are the records maintained?
2. Do you have a communication system to notify parents in an emergency?
3. Are your buildings up to code for:
 - a. Fire alarms and equipment?
 - b. Seismic safety?
 - c. If not, what are the schedules for bringing them into compliance?
 - d. Who is responsible for keeping these items in working order and in place?
 - e. How often are they inspected by the fire department?
4. Does your district have a police or sheriff's representative assigned to your schools?
 - a. How often do they visit the district?
 - b. The schools?
5. Are any of your buildings designated as shelters for major disasters?
 - a. Are they properly equipped?
 - b. Who is responsible for the maintenance and inspection of the equipment?
 - c. When was it last inspected?
6. Please give us your ideas on how to improve these issues.

APPENDIX B

Responses to School Security Questionnaire-Section I.

High Sch 9 thru 12 High Sch 9 thru 12 High Sch 9 thru 12 Middle 6 thru 8 Middle 6 thru 8 Elem. K thru 8 Elem. K thru 8 Elem. K thru 5 Elem. K thru 5 Elem. K thru 5 Elem. K thru 8

1	yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	no
2	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
2a	Prin	Prin	VP	VP	AP	Prin	Prin	Prin	Prin	Prin	Prin
2b	Feb	Fall	Oct	Oct.	Fall	Fall	Fall	2000	Oct	Fall	Fall
2c	Normally 1 to 3 administrators have full copies. Applicable portions are given to responsible staff.										
2d	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2e	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2f	Staff	Staff	Staff+	Staff							
2g	There is no one on site when there are no activities. Alarms are used at some locations.										
2h	See the answers to 3 through 3e below										
3	One high school hires private agency to supplement staff during the last week of school and for special events. Others use local police to supplement school staff when necessary.										
3a	events. Others use local police to supplement school staff when necessary.										
3b	Duties are as assigned at the time.										
3c	Contracts are on single events.										
3d	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
3e	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no

Prin – Principal
VP – Vice principal
AP – Assistant Principal

APPENDIX C

Responses to School Security Questionnaire-Section II.

High Sch 9 thru 12 High Sch 9 thru 12 High Sch 9 thru 12 Middle 6 thru 8 Middle 6 thru 8 Elem. K thru 8 Elem. K thru 8 Elem. K thru 5 Elem. K thru 5 Elem. K thru 5 Elem. K thru 8

1	?	Yes	?	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	?	No	No
2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Feb	Fall	Oct	Oct	March	Oct	Nov	Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall
4	Feb	Fall	Oct	Oct	March	Oct	Nov	Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall
5	AP	Prin	VP	VP	AP	Prin	Prin	Prin	Prin	Prin	Prin
6	AP	appoint	Prin	Prin	Prin	appoint	VP	appoint	Maint	appoint	T in Ch
Items 7 through 19a are discussed under Manuals in the DISCUSSION section of the text											
15b	3	3+	10	10	2	5	10	10	10	10	10
16b	3	1+	2	2	2	1	1	2	?	2	2
17b	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
18b	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
19b	2	1+	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
20-26 All <u>Drills</u> are evaluated by staff and sometimes by police or fire department. See DISCUSSION.											
27-32 See DISCUSSION in text under <u>Training</u> .											
33	Yes	?	?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
35	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

?--The person interviewed did not have knowledge of the subject when questioned.

AP – Assistant principal

Prin – Principal

VP – Vice principal

appoint – an appointed staff member

T in Ch – the Teacher in Charge

APPENDIX D

Responses to School Security Questionnaire-Section III.

	High Sch 9 thru 12	High Sch 9 thru 12	High Sch 9 thru 12	Middle 6 thru 8	Middle 6 thru 8	Elem. K thru 8	Elem. K thru 8	Elem. K thru 5	Elem. K thru 5	Elem. K thru 5	Elem. K thru 8
1	This system is designed for School Districts and does not apply to schools.										
2	tree	no	no	tree	no	tree	tree	no	tree	tree	tree
3a	?	?	yes	yes	yes	?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
3b	?	?	?	yes	yes	?	?	?	?	?	?
3c	All items are expected to be corrected during major renovations										
3d	School administrators and maintenance staff										
3e	Annual inspections were made in all cases.										
4	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4a	The question applies only to school districts.										
4b	daily	on call	daily	on call	2/wk	on call	frequent	often	on call	often	on call
5	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	?	no	no	no	no
5a	Respondent did not know. Red cross had not been contacted.										
5b	The American Red Cross										
5c	Respondent did not know.										
6	none	none	none	none	Note 1	Note 2	none	Note 3	Note 4	none	none

tree – A telephone tree begun at the school office.

? – Respondent did not know.

Note 1 – MERA can make the largest improvement to the school's program

Note 2 – Improve electronic communications in all areas

Note 3 – Parent involvement is necessary for optimum program success.

Note 4 – Respondent concerned with training that can be brought to school site.