



Idaho Safety and Security in K-12 Schools:

A Snapshot in Time

February 12, 2014

Contact:

Matt McCarter, Director

Student Engagement & Postsecondary Readiness

Idaho State Department of Education

(208) 332-6960

MAMcCarter@sde.idaho.gov

Introduction

Background

The State Department of Education Safe and Secure Schools Task Force (established in June, 2013 and completed its work in December, 2014) identified that the implementation of a valid, reliable, multi-hazard threat assessment among a sampling of Idaho schools is the most accurate method to capture a snapshot of school safety readiness throughout the state. The goals of this activity were to 1.) build local capacity to assess safety and security threats and, 2.) capture a real-time 'snapshot' of Idaho's school vulnerabilities to inform training, policy and funding priorities.

Safety Assessment Study Design

To achieve a reasonable level of statistical validity, a 10% sample of the approximately 730 public schools was required. A stratified random sample of **74 schools** was selected for inclusion in the study; enrollment was stratified to ensure equitable rural / urban representation. The 74 school assessments were conducted between September and December, 2013. Safe and Secure Task Force members Guy Bliesner and Brian Armes, administrators from the Bonneville School District, proposed the study design and it was accepted as a viable process by the SDE.

The Safety Assessment Instrument

The assessment instrument was adapted from the Texas School Safety Center, is holistic in nature, and considers most facets of school safety and security. The study assumed that those items evaluated within the tool contain value in making schools safer and more secure in a multi-hazard environment. The tool was altered to meet Idaho's schools needs by a team and reviewed and approved by the multi-disciplinary group assembled by the State Department of Education. A total of 45,806 data points were collected in the process of the study, which provides a rich data set for a representative statistical analysis of the current condition of school safety and security in Idaho. The following results align with the sections and questions within the tool, which are referenced in each area.

The Results

Intruder Assessment

Expected Standard of Care:

1. Limited access to the interior of a school through designated and monitored entrance/exit points (section A-2, E-6).
2. Staff awareness and training to route all visitors back to the school office for credentialing (section A-2, E-6).

Observed Standard of Care:

In 71 of 74 schools, unauthorized entrance to the school was achieved through other than the designated main entrance. In 66 schools multiple points of ingress were available. In 71 cases the kitchen door was not secured. In 29 secondary schools a gym door was propped open. The average amount of time in the interior of a school before being contacted and ask to report to the office was just under 10 minutes at 9.43 minutes. In 19 cases the assessment team member was not contacted and self-reported to the office

Instructional Facility Policy & Procedure Document Review: (instructional 1 of 2)

Grounds and Building Exterior (Section A)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Graffiti will be documented (q1).
2. A monitored intruder alarm will be in place (q2).

Observed Standard of Care

In 53 schools a Graffiti policy is in place. 32 schools had a monitored intruder alarm.

Busses and Parking (Section A-1)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Parking lot security protocol in place (qs3-5).
2. Bus security protocol in place (qs6-8).

Observed Standard of Care

In 10 of the sample schools staff members required to obtain and display a parking permit and 7 of the sample schools patrolled the parking area. Bus security showed all 74 sample schools requiring a pre-trip bus inspection.

Access Control/Visitor Procedures (Section A-2)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Visitor policy in place to assure identification and accountability for all visitors to a school (qs9-18).
2. Identification and accountability for vendors, contractors and non-building assigned school district staff (qs19-23).
3. Process in place to inspect and approve all deliveries to a school (qs24-30).
4. Policy on facility use during the school day (qs31-33).

Observed Standard of Care

Visitor policies show wide variance across the sample set. 12 schools in the sample required positive identification and 27 required a visible, dated visitor's pass be worn. 8 of the sample schools required vendors/contractors/district staff to follow the school visitor policy.

10 schools had policy/procedure in place to address unauthorized/suspicious packages/deliveries.

57 schools were used for civic activities (polling places etc.) during the school day and 27 of those had procedure in place to keep participants in the civic activity separate from the student population.

Keys and Identification (Section A-3)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Key and lock policies designed to maintain secure building (qs34-43).
2. Identification and credentialing policy for staff and students (qs44-48).

Observed Standard of Care

In 31 cases there was no master key control policy. In 45 cases keys could not be matched to the person issued the key. In 43 cases keys could be duplicated without great difficulty. In 65 cases policy had no provisions for when doors should be re-keyed.

Issuance of staff identification was almost universal. 28 schools required the wearing of identification and of those schools less than 50% of staff complied in 23 of the 28. Students were not required to wear identification in any school in the sample set.

Building Interior (Section B)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Locker policy and procedure (qs48, 49).
2. Policy on classroom doors locked (qs50, 51).
3. First aid kit policy (q52).
4. IFC policies (qs53, 54).

Observed Standard of Care

49 of the schools assessed made lockers available for student use. 18 of the 49 secured lockers that were unused/unassigned. Accordingly, 31 schools have no policy regarding the securing of unassigned lockers. 42 schools have a policy that requires classroom doors either locked or unlocked, 32 have no policy regarding such. Of the 41 schools that

had either portables or nonadjacent buildings, 20 have a policy that requires locked or unlocked doors, leaving 21 campuses with no policy.

22 of the schools assessed have policy for inspection and restocking of First Aid Kits. 52 schools have a policy regarding the displaying of artwork that meets fire code, and 46 schools have a policy regarding the use of extension cords and appliances in classrooms.

Monitoring and Surveillance (Section C)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Cameras are in key areas (qs56-58).
2. Facility has electronic security system (q58).
3. Alarm systems are connected to first responders (qs60, 61).
4. Staff members are assigned and available to monitor student areas (qs63-66).
5. Policy and procedure in place to secure facilities after regular school hours (qs67-68).
6. Communication network is established for parents and media (qs71-74).
7. Communication network is established for staff (q75).
8. Current list of Staff trained in CPR, AED is in place (q82, 83).

Observed Standard of Care

42 of the schools assessed have internal camera monitoring system. Camera systems on buses numbered 50. Though 32 of the schools assessed had security alarms, most did not have universal coverage throughout the building. 27 of those buildings with security alarms were connected to central reporting station. Conversely, 60 buildings are connected to local fire agencies, and 60 buildings contain ADA compliant fire alarm systems.

56 of the schools assessed have a policy or procedure that assigns hall monitoring duties to staff members. Of the 31 schools with stairs, 10 have assigned staff to monitor stairwells. Restroom monitoring is systematized in 42 schools. Students are not allowed in 37 of the schools unless monitored by direct staff supervision.

In 45 schools staff and/or security is present for after-school and weekend activities. In 64 of the schools assessed a specific person is designated to secure the building after activities.

65 schools have a means of communicating security instructions to staff in a rapid and clear fashion. 70 of the schools assessed have a method to communicate directions to contact parents and community in event of an emergency. 15 schools have a current list of staff trained in CPR and/or AED use.

School-Based Law Enforcement (Section C-1)

Expected Standard of Care

1. School resources officer is located on site, having visibility of entrance/halls (q84, 89).
2. School resource officer regularly makes presentation to students and staff (q85).
3. School resource officer is dedicated to a single campus (q86).
4. School has security officers (not sworn law enforcement) (q87).
5. Security personnel/school resource officer conduct daily inspections for suspicious packages, etc. (q91).
6. Local law enforcement provides after hours patrols of school site (q92).

Observed Standard of Care

School resource officers were found to be located on 19 of the assessed school campuses. However, in 20 schools Officers designated as "school resource officers" regularly presented to students. 11 schools had dedicated officers on their campus while 7 schools have non-law enforcement security people. 10 Schools have provided resource officers office space that faces the primary entrance and/or hall. In 4 of the 74 schools security personnel/law enforcement conduct inspections for suspicious packages and/or other items. After hours patrols are conducted at 57 of the schools assessed.

At End of School Day Staff Members are assigned to check facility (Section C-2)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Building is secured from intruders, all areas cleared of non-staff people, classrooms are locked, exterior is locked, and available security systems are set (qs93-97).

Observed Standard of Care

In all but 4 of the buildings a staff member is responsible for locking exterior doors at close of day. 60 of the schools assessed had a policy of classroom doors locked at end of day, and 56 of the schools have a systematic method of checking/securing bathroom spaces.

The Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) (Section D)

Expected Standard of Care

1. School has an EOP that is Multi-hazard, addresses the four phases of the emergency management cycle, contains ICS and is NIMS compliant (q98-100).
2. School EOP is developed by a school safety planning team, reviewed and updated annually (q101, 102).
3. Local first responder community (LE, EMS and Fire) have been an integral part of the planning (q103-105).
4. Contains updated maps, site plans, room numbers, utility shutoffs, along with other detailed information that pertain to site specific emergency operations (q106, 107).
5. School EOP contains an established chain of command, has a designated primary and alternative incident command post location (q108, 109).
6. School EOP addresses go kits, their content and usage (q110).

Observed Standard of Care

24 of the 74 schools assessed have an EOP that is multi-hazard. 13 have an EOP that addresses the four emergency response cycles, and 18 schools have an EOP that contains ICS and is NIMS compliant. 31 schools have used safety planning team to develop EOPs, yet 40 schools report integrating local law enforcement in their EOP planning. 39 schools have also included emergency management services in their planning. 25 schools include school floor plans, site plans, and utility location. 32 EOPs identify an established chain of command, 20 designate an incident command post with alternative location. 17 of 74 schools address classroom and facility emergency go kits.

School Climate and Culture (Section E-1, E-2)

Expected Standard of Care

1. School has a Student Code of Conduct (q141, 142).
2. Code of Conduct contains statements regarding anti-bullying, harassment, violence policies (q143).
3. Policies are in place for interviewing students, locker searches, dress code (q144-146).

Observed Standard of Care

36 of the schools assessed review and update codes of conduct annually. 66 schools have an available, published student code of conduct. 68 schools publish/promote statements regarding anti-bullying, harassment, violence; by board policy when not in school specific documentation. 48 of the schools have a written policy regarding the interview of students by outside agencies, and 46 publish a formal locker search policy.

Disciplinary Procedures (Section E-3)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Disciplinary Procedures focus on root causes, contain school wide problem solving strategies (q147).
2. Alternatives to suspension/expulsion are in place (q148).
3. Procedures used to make decisions regarding student behavior are well known to all (q149).

Observed Standard of Care

49 of the schools assessed have developed systematic problem solving strategies. 68 of the schools have alternatives to suspension and/or expulsion. 62 of the schools have procedures that are known throughout the system by students, parents and staff.

Parent and Student Involvement (Section E-4)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Parents are an integral part of the school's safety planning and policy development. Students are represented (q150, 151).

2. Students are actively involved with promoting a positive school climate, a large percentage are involved in extracurricular activities (q152, 153).

Observed Standard of Care

5 Schools include parents and/or students in safety planning and/or policy development. Student involvement in building positive climates and participating in extracurricular activities happens in 42 and 36 schools respectively.

Reporting (Section E-5)

Expected Standard of Care

1. School has anonymous reporting system for students and staff (q155).
2. Standard definitions and procedures for school crime are published (q156).
3. Process for collecting and reviewing discipline referral data (q157).

Observed Standard of Care

5 of the 74 schools have some type of anonymous reporting system. 53 schools have definitions and procedures for school crime included in student handbooks. 66 schools collect and review discipline data in a student data base.

Staff and Student Training (Section E-6)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Key staff are trained in NIMS/ICS procedures (q158, 159).
2. Administrators, teachers and staff receive annual training in conflict resolution, bullying prevention, suspicious packages or items, suspicious people and behavior (q160-163).
3. Staff has been trained to respond to threats from students; including threats in writing, work, notes, etc. (q164).
4. Office staff has been trained to respond to threatening/suspicious telephone calls, including bomb threats (q165).
5. Students receive training in social skills, violence prevention, conflict resolution, decision making, bullying prevention (cyberbullying), sexual harassment, gender respect, dating violence and Title IX (q168-172).
6. School has implemented a character education or social skills program (q173).
7. Substitute staff are trained in emergency operation procedures (175).
8. All student and staff trainings are documented (q166).

Observed Standard of Care

11 schools have key staff trained in NIMS/ICS procedures. 19 schools provide annual training in conflict resolution and problem solving, and 22 schools train annually for bullying prevention. According to school responses 6 buildings have received some level of training in recognizing suspicious packages and items, while 29 have received training in recognizing suspicious people and behavior on campus. 34 schools report that staff has been trained on recognizing student threats in notes, journals, classwork and conversation. 41 of the school's office staff has been trained in threatening suspicious phone calls/bomb threats.

52 schools report that students have received training on bullying, conflict resolution or similar programs. 29 schools report that students have been specifically trained on issues of sexual harassment and gender respect. 9 schools report that their students have received specific training on dating violence. 25 schools report Title IX coordination for students and staff. 54 schools have implemented a character education or social skills program school-wide.

19 schools have trained their substitute staff on emergency operations procedures. 16 schools document staff and student trainings in the fore-listed areas.

Health Practices (Section F)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Hand washing supplies are available, signs are posted, and hand sanitizer is available (q176-178).
2. Staff and students are trained on flu/pandemic prevention; school has policy and procedure to prevent the spread of infectious diseases (q179, 180).
3. School tracks student injury and illness incidents. (q181).
4. School has AED, has a policy for AED, conducts annual training (documented) and has policies for monitoring AED unit (q182-186).

Observed Standard of Care

72 of the schools assessed make hand washing supplies available in restrooms. 28 schools post hand washing signs in restrooms, and 65 have hand sanitizer available for students and staff. 25 schools have documented policies and procedures for the prevention of infectious diseases and 31 schools offer training for students and staff on flu/pandemic prevention. 33 Schools have some form of student injury and illness tracking.

30 schools have AEDs on site, 7 of those schools have written policies regarding AEDs, and 9 have documented training of staff. 14 of the 30 schools have a procedure to monitor expiration dates of AED equipment.

Food Service (Section F-1)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Food service staff are trained on school EOP (q187).
2. Food service staff are trained on health practices and flu/pandemic prevention (q188).
3. Food safety Program controls specific and non-specific hazards utilizing SOPs and HACCPs (q189).

Observed Standard of Care

26 of the schools assessed have food service staff trained in the school's EOP. Food service staff at 38 schools has received training regarding health practices and flu/pandemic prevention. Food service staff at 61 schools has received a level of training on hazard mitigation utilizing SOPs and HACCP controls.

Referral Resources (Section F-2)

Expected Standard of Care

1. School has a formalized Student Assistance Program (q190).
2. School has a process to identify and serve students with at-risk and disruptive behaviors (q191).
3. Staff are trained to identify and work with potentially dangerous students (q192).
4. School has a mental health threat assessment process in place (q193).
5. A well-developed network of service providers is available for student referral (q194).

Observed Standard of Care

50 of the schools assessed have a formalized Student Assistance Program. 63 schools have an internal process to serve the needs of high-risk, at-risk students. 39 schools have staff members who have been trained to identify and work with potentially dangerous students. 26 schools have some type of formal mental health threat assessment process. 36 Schools have a well-developed list of service providers for student referral.

Instructional Facility Observations: (instructional 2 of 2)

Grounds and Building Exterior (Section G)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Building exterior safety conditions (qs195 - 207).
2. Portable and classroom security and identification (qs208 - 218).

Observed Standard of Care

In most cases the general safety conditions were adequate. The notable exceptions include 43 cases of outdoor electrical panel enclosures were unlocked/open. Portables (where installed) are surrounded by fencing requiring use of the school's main entry in 5 of 23 cases. Classroom numbers were visible from the exterior (a law enforcement request) in 17 of 74 cases and exterior doors were visibly numbered in 11 of 74 cases.

Busses and Parking (Section G-1)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Marking and signage is adequate (qs219-225).
2. General safety and security (qs226 -230).

Observed Standard of Care

Marking and signage was inadequate or missing in a significant number of cases. Bus loading and drop off zones are not clearly marked in 17 of 74 cases. Student drop off and pick up areas are not clearly marked in 30 of 74 cases. Fire zones

are not clearly marked in 36 of the sample schools. Parking lots signs direct staff, students and visitors to designated parking areas in 42 of 74 cases. Parking lot lighting was less than adequate in 46 of the 74 sample schools.

Play and Outdoor Recreation Areas (Section G-2)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Playground security and access to assure student security (qs231-233,240,244).
2. Playground Condition (qs234-239).
3. Outdoor bleacher & ticket booth concession stand condition (qs241 -246).

Observed Standard of Care

Access to play/recreation areas was generally well controlled; specific exceptions were noted to individual schools. Playgrounds, where installed, failed to meet American Society for Testing and Materials safety standards in one or more area in 37 of 47 playgrounds.

Building Access (Section G-3)

Expected Standard of Care

1. School Building Access (qs247 -253).

Observed Standard of Care

The designated points of entry are monitored to control building access in 37 of 74 sample schools. School staff members monitor all entrances and exits during student arrival & departure in 40 of 74 schools. Doors required to be open for student passage are monitored in 28 of the 74 study schools.

Visitor Policies (Section G-4)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Visitor policy in place to assure identification and accountability for all visitors to a school (qs254 -262).

Observed Standard of Care

Visitor policies show wide variance across the sample set. 12 schools in the sample required positive identification and 27 required a visible dated visitor pass be worn. 19 more required a visitor's pass to be worn but no date or identification was required on the visitor pass.

Building Interior (Section H)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Building interior to be maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs263 -301).

Observed Standard of Care

The sample schools were generally well lit, clean and well maintained, specific exceptions were noted to individual schools. 40 of the schools in the sample had exit doors equipped with push bar exit devices that are flush to resist chaining. Classroom doors can be locked from the inside with hardware meeting fire code in only 29 of the sample schools. Of the 41 schools with lockers, 25 did not secure the lockers when not assigned to a student. In 56 of the sample set AED access was inadequate or completely lacking.

Areas Locked When Not In Use (Section H-1)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Areas not in use should not be available to students (qs302 -312).

Observed Standard of Care

(See aggregate instrument section H-1)

Building Interior (Section H-2)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Area restricted due to potential safety hazards should be locked and access controlled (qs313-318).

Observed Standard of Care

Electrical panels in the interior of schools were unlocked in the majority of schools assessed. Custodial closets were open in 20 schools of the sample.

Cafeteria (Section H-3)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Building cafeteria to be operated and maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs319- 329).

Observed Standard of Care

The sample school's cafeterias were generally well lit, clean and well maintained; specific exceptions were noted to individual schools. Only 12 of the sample schools maintained delivery logs. In 29 schools kitchen staff was not trained on school emergency procedures.

Gymnasium Area (Section H-4)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Building gymnasium to be operated and maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs330- 334).

Observed Standard of Care

The sample school's gymnasiums were generally well lit, clean and well maintained; specific exceptions were noted to individual schools.

Locker Room Weight/Exercise Areas (Section H-5)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Building locker room weight/exercise area to be operated and maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs335- 340).

Observed Standard of Care

The sample school's locker room weight/exercise areas were generally lacking both a hygiene and inspection protocol. Student training was documented in 3 cases.

Science Laboratory (Section H-6)

(Section specific to secondary schools in the study)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Building science laboratories are operated and maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs340- 334).

Observed Standard of Care

Chemical hygiene plan and proper storage of chemical inventory was inadequate in 11 of 34 cases. Documentation of student training in laboratory procedure was lacking in 23 of 34 cases. Current material safety data sheets were lacking in 7 of 34 cases. Mercury was present in 15 cases.

Auditorium (Section H-7)

(Section specific to 18 schools with such facilities in the study)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Building auditorium/stage facilities to be operated and maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs372- 380).

Observed Standard of Care

9 of 18 schools lacked a posted stage safety protocol. Student training in stage safety was not reported as documented in any of the sample study group. In the majority of cases the stage was disorganized and used as a storage area.

Vocational Training Area/ Welding Shop (Section H-8)

(Section specific to 5 schools with such facilities in the study)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Welding shop facilities to be operated and maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs381- 394).

Observed Standard of Care

Organization of tools and materials in 2 of 5 shops did not meet industry standard.

Vocational Training Area/ Wood Shop (Section H-9)

(Section specific to 10 schools with such facilities in the study)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Wood shop facilities to be operated and maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs395-409).

Observed Standard of Care

Organization of tools and materials in 1 of 10 shops did not meet industry standard.

Vocational Training Area/ Agricultural Shop (Section H-10)

(Section specific to 14 schools with such facilities in the study)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Agriculture shop facilities to be operated and maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs410-421).

Observed Standard of Care

Organization of tools and materials in 3 of 14 shops did not meet industry standard.

Vocational Training Automotive (Section H-11)

(Section specific to 5 schools with such facilities in the study)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Automotive shop facilities to be operated and maintained in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs381-394).

Observed Standard of Care

1 of 5 of the shops did not meet industry standard on any measure. Specific school notified of this finding.

Monitoring and Surveillance (Section I)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Schools to be monitored by electronic means in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs437-439, 443, 446, 449, 452, 455).
2. Schools to be monitored by staff members in a fashion to assure student safety and security (qs440-442, 444, 445, 447, 448, 450, 451, 453, 454, 456, 457).

Observed Standard of Care

Of the sample schools 44 had some exterior cameras in place and in 4 cases were all installed cameras functional on the date of observation. In 12 cases the installations adequately covered of the building exterior. In 33 cases the equipment would be considered obsolete. 44 schools in the sample had some interior cameras in place (it should be noted that while there is some overlap, this is not the same 44 cases as discussed above). In no case would the current installation be considered adequate coverage of the building interior. In only 1 case were all interior cameras functional on the date of observation (in this case the DVR was nonfunctional being without recording capability).

In 55 of the 74 cases the hallways and restrooms were monitored by staff. The 18 not monitored were in high school settings. As observed, a challenge to student monitoring in all settings is a consistent over-tasking of staff.

Communications (Section J)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Schools to provide communications sufficient to provide for both daily and emergency operations capabilities to assure student safety and security (qs458-462).

Observed Standard of Care

In 62 of 74 cases communications were sufficient for daily operations; however in most cases a power outage renders systems non-operational (includes public address systems and internet protocol based phone systems). In a number of schools PA systems did not reach all common spaces, outdoors, restrooms or hallways. The general lack of a comprehensive communications plan at both the school and district levels assure that communications will be a major impediment to effective emergency operations.

Health Practices (Section K)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Schools to provide practices sufficient to maintain a healthy environment for students, visitors and staff (qs463-465).

Observed Standard of Care

In all 74 cases hand washing supplies were available in all restrooms. In 70 of the sample schools hand sanitizer was generally available and in 27 cases hand washing signs were posted in the restrooms. It should be noted that in most cases elementary schools included hand washing training as a part of their curriculum.

Emergency Operations Plan (EOP)

Expected Standard of Care

1. Both the school and district EOP will meet the requirements of National Incident Management System (NIMS) (qs51).
2. Both the school and district EOP will meet the requirements compliance and utilize the Incident Command System (ICS) protocol (qs51).
3. Both the School and District EOP will be multi-hazard in nature (qs50).

Observed Standard of Care

10 of the 74 schools met the requirements noted in the EOP section of the assessment instrument. In all other cases schools demonstrated some level of planning and training but not meeting the level noted in the instrument. In most cases plan drills were completed for the purpose of completing a drill and not for the purpose of preparing an effective emergency response.

District/Campus Website

Expected Standard of Care

1. Website does not contain information that could be used to plan or execute harmful acts to students and staff on campus (school maps, floor plans, LE presence, etc...) (qs1-10).
2. School servers are protected from physical and online intrusion (qs11-13).
3. Website does not contain information that could be used to plan or execute harmful acts to students and staff off campus (individual photos with names, staff's personal phone/address) (qs14-18).

Observed Standard of Care

Across the first 10 questions in this section, 72 schools typically adhere to the practice of limiting infrastructure information, emergency planning documents, maintenance schedules, location of law enforcement, or safety and security audit details. Question #3 is an exception as it reflects information regarding alternative entrances into the school, information generally published in student handbooks (both printed and online) for student access.

Regarding subsection 2, practices within this section are reflective of districtwide policies regarding IT departments, along with location of servers.

General trending suggests that most districts are sensitive to posting individual specific information on website. In review of websites a single staff member out of compliance (qs11-18) could make it appear that an entire school is out of compliance, thereby skewing the study. This section suggests that districts review policies with staff members regarding the posting of individual specific information.

School Selection Process for Inclusion in the Initial Phase of the Idaho School Safety and Security Assessment

Based on the State Department of Education enrollment reporting for the 2012-2013 school year the nineteen (19) largest school districts by student population all have greater than 4,000 students. There appears to be a natural break in student populations at the 4,000 student level.

School districts with a student population of 4,000 or greater represent approximately 61% of the total student population of the state. Schools in those districts represent fewer than 34% of all Idaho schools and those same nineteen (19) school districts represent approximately 12% of the school districts in the state when charter schools are included in the calculation.

The sample was determined by random draw. The study design called for a total of 75 schools, 36 schools (18 elementary, 9 Jr. high/ middle schools and 9 high schools) from districts of 4,000 students or greater and the same from districts of 3,999 students or less in addition to three (3) K-12 schools. K-12 schools pose a unique set of safety and security concerns and need to be considered separately. This created three (3) distinct groups. Numbers were assigned to all the schools in each group and a computerized random number generator was used to select schools for inclusion in the assessment.

In keeping with the study design no school district was allowed to have more than one (1) school in any category for a total possible of three (3) schools from any one (1) school district to be included in the assessment.

Listed below are the participants, listed by school district and school name, chosen by random lot to be included in the Idaho School Safety and Security Assessment. 1 school chose not to participate for which a replacement could not be found resulting in a total of 74 schools included in the sample. All schools in the sample will receive their unique assessment data and executive summary to inform local safety improvement efforts.

**School Assessment Candidates
Elementary Schools
Districts over 4000 student population**

School District	School
Boise S.D. #001	Collister Elementary
Meridian Jt. S.D. #002	Paramount Elementary
Kuna Jt. S.D. #003	Hubbard Elementary
Pocatello S.D. #25	Syringa Elementary
Idaho Falls S.D. #91	Linden Park Elementary
Bonneville S.D. #93	Cloverdale Elementary
Nampa S.D. #131	Park Ridge Elementary
Vallivue S.D. #139	East Canyon Elementary
Jefferson Cty. Jt. S.D. #251	Midway Elementary
Coeur d'Alene S.D. #271	Dalton Elementary
Lakeland S.D. #272	Garwood Elementary
Post Falls S.D. #273	Mullin Trail Elementary
Madison S.D. #321	South Fork Elementary
Minidoka S.D. #331	Acequia Elementary
Lewiston S.D. #340	McGhee elementary
Caldwell S.D. #132	Van Buren Elementary
Twin Falls S.D. #411	Harrison Elementary
Blackfoot S.D. #55	Groveland Elementary
Cassia S.D. #151	Raft River Elementary

**School Assessment Candidates
Jr. High /Middle Schools
Districts over 4000 student population**

School District	School
-----------------	--------

Boise S.D. #001	Fairmont Jr. H.S.
Twin Falls S.D. #411	O'Leary Jr. H.S.
Cassia S.D. #151	Burley Jr. H.S.
Post Falls S.D. #273	River City M.S.
Coeur d'Alene S.D. #271	Lakes M.S.
Meridian Jt. S.D. #002	Lowell Scott M.S.
Bonneville S.D. #93	Sandcreek M.S.
Nampa S.D. #131	West M.S.
Lakeland S.D. #272	Lakeland M.S.

**School Assessment Candidates
High Schools
Districts over 4000 student population**

School District	School
Boise S.D. #001	Borah H.S.
Blackfoot S.D. #55	Blackfoot H.S.
Cassia S.D. #151	Oakley H.S.
Idaho Falls S.D. #91	Idaho Falls H.S.
Pocatello S.D. #25*	Pocatello H.S.
Coeur d'Alene S.D. #271	Lake City H.S.
Twin Falls S.D. #411	Canyon Rim H.S.
Meridian S.D. #002	Mountain View H.S.
Vallivue S.D. #139	Vallivue H.S.

*Pocatello S.D. #25 declined participation

**School Assessment Candidates
Elementary Schools
Districts under 4000 student population**

School District	School
Basin S.D. #72	Basin Elementary
St. Maries S.D. #41	UpRiver elementary
Lapwai S.D. #341	Lapwai Elementary
Kamiah S.D. #304	Kamiah Elementary
Camas County S.D. #432 (combined as K-12)	Camas Co. Elementary
Snake River S.D. #52	Moreland Elementary
Lake Pend Oreille #84	Kootenai Elementary
Salmon S.D. #291	Pioneer Elementary
American Falls #381	Hillcrest Elementary
Ririe S.D. #252	Ririe Elementary (grades 3-8)
Notus S.D. #135	Notus Elementary
Soda Springs S.D. #150	Thirkill Elementary
Challis S.D. #181	Clayton Elementary
Salmon River S.D. #243 (combined as K-12)	Riggins Elementary
Fremont S.D. #215	Henry's Fork Elementary
Wallace S.D. #393*	Silver Hills Elementary
Bear Lake S.D. #33	Paris Elementary
Emmett S.D. #221	Butte View Elementary

Alt. West Jefferson S.D. #253	Hamer Elementary
-------------------------------	------------------

*Wallace S.D. #393 declined participation; West Jefferson S.D. #253 was added as an alternate.

**School Assessment Candidates
Jr. High/Middle Schools
Districts under 4000 student population**

School District	School
Teton S.D. #401	Teton M.S.
Plummer/Worley S.D. #44*	Lakeside M. S.
Troy S.D. #257	Troy Jr/Sr H.S.
Shelly S.D. #60	Hobbs M.S.
Aberdeen S.D. #58	Aberdeen M.S.
Filer S.D. #413	Filer M.S.
Midvale S.D. #433	Midvale M.S.
Bliss S.D. #234	Bliss k-8
Moscow S.D. #281	Moscow M.S.
Jerome S.D. #261	Jerome M.S.

*Plummer/Worley #44 declined participation; Jerome MS S.D. #261 was added as an alternate.

**School Assessment Candidate
High Schools
Districts under 4000 student population**

School District	School
Mountain Home S.D. #193	Mountain Home H.S.
Nezperce S.D. #302	Nezperce Jr/Sr high
Oneida S.D. #351	Malad H.S.
Soda Springs S.D. #150	Soda Springs H.S.
Kellogg S.D. #391	Kellogg H.S.
West Bonner S.D. #83	Priest River Lamanna H.S.
Kimberly S.D. #274	Kimberly H.S.
Melba S.D. #136	Melba Jr/Sr H.S.
Weiser S.D. #431	Weiser H.S.
Salmon River S.D. #243	Riggins H.S.

**School Assessment Candidate
K-12 schools
Districts under 4000 student population**

School District	School
Valley S.D. #262	Valley k-12 school
Blaine Co. S.D. #61	Carey k-12 school
Genesee S.D. #282	Genesee k-12 school

*Results for (6) k-12 schools included Middleton, Camas and Salmon River as they were considered K-12.