AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

PROTECTING STUDENTS AND TEACHERS: A DISCUSSION ON SCHOOL SAFETY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, FEBRUARY 27, 2013

Serial No. 113–6

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and the Workforce

Available via the World Wide Web:
www.gpo.gov/fdsys/browse/committee.action?chamber=house&committee=education
or
Committee address: *http://edworkforce.house.gov*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

78–990 PDF WASHINGTON : 2013

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

JOHN KLINE, Minnesota, *Chairman*

Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin
Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, California
Joe Wilson, South Carolina
Virginia Foxx, North Carolina
Tom Price, Georgia
Kenny Marchant, Texas
Duncan Hunter, California
David P. Roe, Tennessee
Glenn Thompson, Pennsylvania
Tim Walberg, Michigan
Matt Salmon, Arizona
Brett Guthrie, Kentucky
Scott DesJarlais, Tennessee
Todd Rokita, Indiana
Larry Bucshon, Indiana
Trey Gowdy, South Carolina
Lou Barletta, Pennsylvania
Martha Roby, Alabama
Joseph J. Heck, Nevada
Susan W. Brooks, Indiana
Richard Hudson, North Carolina
Luke Messer, Indiana

George Miller, California,
Senior Democratic Member
Robert E. Andrews, New Jersey
Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Virginia
Rubén Hinojosa, Texas
Carolyn McCarthy, New York
John F. Tierney, Massachusetts
Rush Holt, New Jersey
Susan A. Davis, California
Raúl M. Grijalva, Arizona
Timothy H. Bishop, New York
David Loebsack, Iowa
Joe Courtney, Connecticut
Marcia L. Fudge, Ohio
Jared Polis, Colorado
Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan,
Northern Mariana Islands
John A. Yarmuth, Kentucky
Frederica S. Wilson, Florida
Suzanne Bonamici, Oregon

Barrett Karr, *Staff Director*
Jody Calemine, *Minority Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on February 27, 2013	1
Statement of Members:	
Kline, Hon. John, Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce	1
Prepared statement of	2
Miller, Hon. George, senior Democratic member, Committee on Education and the Workforce	3
Prepared statement of	5
Statement of Witnesses:	
Bond, Bill, former principal; specialist for school safety, National Association of Secondary School Principals	7
Prepared statement of	8
Bontrager, Brett, senior vice president and group executive, Stanley Black & Decker Security Systems Division	16
Prepared statement of	17
Canady, Mo, executive director, National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO)	10
Prepared statement of	12
Ellis, Frederick E., director, office of safety and security, Fairfax County Public Schools, VA	22
Prepared statement of	24
Osher, Dr. David, vice president, American Institutes for Research	19
Prepared statement of	21
Pompei, Vincent, school counselor	13
Prepared statement of	15
Additional Submissions:	
Bonamici, Hon. Suzanne, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon, questions submitted for the record to:	
Mr. Bond	76
Mr. Bontrager	77
Mr. Canady	79
Mr. Ellis	80
Dr. Osher	81
Mr. Pompei	82
Holt, Hon. Rush, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey, questions submitted for the record to:	
Mr. Bond	76
Mr. Bontrager	77
Mr. Canady	78
Mr. Ellis	79
Dr. Osher	80
Mr. Pompei	81
Hudson, Hon. Richard, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Carolina, questions for the record submitted to Mr. Canady	78
Mr. Miller, statements for the record:	
The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD)	45
The NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.	47
The National Disability Rights Network (NDRN)	51
Mr. Osher:	
"How Can We Improve School Discipline"	55
Statement: the Interdisciplinary Group on Preventing School and Community Violence	66

Page

Additional Submissions—Continued
Wilson, Hon. Frederica S., a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, questions submitted for the record to:
Mr. Bond 76
Mr. Bontrager 77
Mr. Canady 78
Mr. Ellis 79
Dr. Osher 80
Mr. Pompei 82
Responses to questions submitted from:
Mr. Bond 82
Mr. Bontrager 84
Mr. Canady 85
Mr. Ellis 86
Dr. Osher 89
Mr. Pompei 91

PROTECTING STUDENTS AND TEACHERS: A DISCUSSION ON SCHOOL SAFETY

Wednesday, February 27, 2013
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Education and the Workforce
Washington, DC

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 12:31 p.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Kline [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Kline, Wilson, Roe, Walberg, Salmon, Guthrie, DesJarlais, Rokita, Gowdy, Roby, Heck, Brooks, Hudson, Miller, Andrews, Scott, McCarthy, Tierney, Holt, Grijalva, Loebsack, Courtney, Yarmuth, Wilson, and Bonamici.

Staff present: Katherine Bathgate, Deputy Press Secretary; James Bergeron, Director of Education and Human Services Policy; Cristin Datch, Professional Staff Member; Lindsay Fryer, Professional Staff Member; Barrett Karr, Staff Director; Nancy Locke, Chief Clerk/Assistant to the General Counsel; Krisann Pearce, General Counsel; Mandy Schaumburg, Education and Human Services Oversight Counsel; Dan Shorts, Legislative Assistant; Nicole Sizemore, Deputy Press Secretary; Alex Sollberger, Communications Director; Alissa Strawcutter, Deputy Clerk; Tylease Alli, Minority Clerk/Intern and Fellow Coordinator; Jeremy Ayers, Minority Education Policy Advisor; Meg Benner, Minority Education Policy Advisor; Kelly Broughan, Minority Education Policy Associate; Jody Calemine, Minority Staff Director; Tiffany Edwards, Minority Press Secretary for Education; Jamie Fasteau, Minority Director of Education Policy; Brian Levin, Minority Deputy Press Secretary/New Media Coordinator; Megan O'Reilly, Minority General Counsel; Rich Williams, Minority Education Policy Advisor; and Michael Zola, Minority Senior Counsel.

Chairman KLINE. A quorum being present, the committee will come to order.

I want to welcome everybody this afternoon to the hearing. A couple of administrative notes, we are starting late today because of the historic statue dedication, Rosa Parks, in Statuary Hall. So I appreciate the witnesses understanding of the change in time and my colleagues.

Well again, thank you for joining us for what is an important hearing but one I wish weren't tied frankly to such an awful event. Two months have passed since the Sandy Hook Elementary School tragedy. Families across America continue to grieve with the New-

town community. The sorrow we felt on that day remains fresh in our minds and our hearts.

No one in this room needs me to recount what happened on December 14th. Nor do you need a description of what happened in Paducah, Kentucky; Littleton, Colorado; or Blacksburg, Virginia. We saw the news coverage, we read the stories, we watched the interviews.

While the initial shock may have begun to subside, the questions remain. Like many of you, I am angry that such a terrible act hasn't come with an explanation. Without such answers, how can we work with states and schools to develop a solution that will help us move forward? How can we be confident something like this can't happen again?

The purpose of today's hearing is not to assign blame. This isn't about us. It isn't about a press release or a bill introduction or a media opportunity. This is about students. Teachers. Families. Communities. This hearing is about learning what goes into protecting our schools and preventing violence. This is about ways we can work together to help students feel safe.

Today's hearing stems from a heartbreaking event, but in order to have a productive conversation, we must try to focus on matters under this committee's jurisdiction. Members on both sides of the aisle have offered ideas about how to protect students in the classroom. The Obama administration has also put forth a series of proposals.

Last week when I was in my district in Minnesota, I traveled, I went to schools, public and private, and had meetings with school leaders, the teachers' unions, superintendents, school board members, and I discussed and looked at what they were doing and how they were addressing school safety—everything from lockdown procedures and locking doors, and I listened to their concerns. They have ideas; I am not sure they have solutions.

Our witnesses today will share their experiences with policies and programs intended to secure schools. I propose we come together, just as the families are in every school district and community nationwide, to have a comprehensive discussion on school safety; one that explores policy ideas on state and local actions and will inform how we move forward.

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to our witnesses for joining us today. We have assembled a panel, a fantastic panel, that will offer valuable insight and help us understand what state and local school leaders go through as they work to keep schools safe.

I would now recognize the distinguished senior democratic member, George Miller, for his opening remarks.

[The statement of Chairman Kline follows:]

Prepared Statement of Hon. John Kline, Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce

Two months have passed since the Sandy Hook Elementary School tragedy. Families across America continue to grieve with the Newtown community. The sorrow we felt on that day remains fresh in our minds and hearts.

No one in this room needs me to recount what happened on December 14. Nor do you need a description of what happened in Paducah, Kentucky; Littleton, Colorado; or Blacksburg, Virginia. We saw the news coverage, we read the stories, we watched the interviews.

While the initial shock may have begun to subside, the questions remain. Like many of you, I am angry that such a terrible act hasn't come with an explanation. Without such answers, how can we work with states and schools to develop a solution that will help us move forward? How can we be confident something like this can never happen again?

The purpose of today's hearing is not to assign blame. This isn't about us. It isn't about a press release or a bill introduction or a media opportunity. This is about students. Teachers. Families. Communities. This hearing is about learning what goes into protecting our schools and preventing violence. This is about ways we can work together to help students feel safe.

Today's hearing stems from a heartbreaking event. But in order to have a productive conversation, we must try to focus on matters under this committee's jurisdiction. Members on both sides of the aisle have offered ideas about how to protect students in the classroom. The Obama administration has also put forth a series of proposals. And our witnesses will share their experiences with policies and programs intended to secure our schools.

I propose we come together, just as families are in every school district and community nationwide, to have a comprehensive discussion on school safety—one that explores policy ideas and state and local actions, and will inform how we move forward.

I'd like to extend my sincere appreciation to our witnesses for joining us today. We have assembled a panel that will offer valuable insight and help us understand what state and local school leaders go through as they work to keep schools safe. I will now recognize my distinguished colleague George Miller, the senior Democratic member of the committee, for his opening remarks.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for agreeing to hold this hearing on such an important topic. The horrific events at Newtown, Connecticut shook our nation's conscience and continue to do so today. Nothing can be more disturbing. Nothing can be more enraging, or more despairing than the mass execution of little children.

To call what happened at Sandy Hook a tragedy is not to do it justice. It is beyond tragedy. We will forever search for the words that capture this event, the horror of this event, the grief of the families, the community, our nation is indescribable.

It is an event that has finally pushed our country to a long overdue national debate about mental health, about gun violence, about the safety of our children. It is also an event that in its magnitude reminds us that violence against children is an everyday occurrence in this country.

Entire classrooms were attacked at Sandy Hook, but children one by one are gunned down outside of schools in Chicago and in my congressional district. Children in Arizona or Indiana or South Carolina go to school every day worrying about the bullies and the harassment.

Sandy Hook is an event that calls on us as policymakers to do something not just to prevent the next mass murder but to make sure that every school is genuinely a safe place. A school must be a place where children feel secure so that they can focus on learning, growing, and being kids.

Stopping an outside intruder from attacking students is only the last line of defense when it comes to school safety. We need to recognize that violence or the fear of violence does not begin or end at the schoolhouse door nor does violence necessarily occur during normal school hours or from an outsider. We know children in many of the urban areas feel unsafe walking to or from school.

Many students and teachers are aware of the threats of bullying on school property, not just during the school day, but during off

hour activities. A child is vulnerable on so many fronts; vulnerable from a madman with a gun, vulnerable from school employees whose criminal background has never been checked, vulnerable from fellow students whose mental health may have never been addressed, vulnerable to gangs who may have infiltrated the student body.

With all of these vulnerabilities, our gut instinct may be to turn schools into bank vaults with each student as physically secure as gold in Fort Knox, but research is clear that simply turning schools into armed fortresses is not the answer nor is the answer to turn every potentially wayward student into a criminal suspect.

School safety policies must not be driven by gut instincts but by sound evidence of what works. They require the comprehension and understanding of physical and emotional needs of students, not just the particular hardware or security procedures in a building.

Part of the answer is providing better access to mental health services and anti-bullying interventions, and when problems do arise from students, disciplinary policies must be thoughtful and productive and foster trust between teachers and students. Part of the answer is recognizing that the emotional and physical needs of our children inside and outside of school is a shared responsibility.

Keeping kids safe requires a coordinated effort from teachers, principals, superintendents, community partners, and parents, and protecting children from violence and freeing students to learn more means insuring the states, districts, schools, and communities have the resources and the support needed to implement the evidence-based approaches that are tailored to the unique needs of students in that area. Doing all this is a tall order, but to ask any parent waving goodbye to their son or daughter at the bus stop if there is a more important work than this.

We place extraordinary responsibility on schools to meet academic, emotional, and physical needs of students. Educators repeatedly rise to the occasion. Among the heroes of Sandy Hook were a principal, a school psychologist, a classroom teacher who gave their lives to protect the young charges. We cannot ask them to stand alone. Schools cannot be expected to provide a quality education in a safe and secure environment for all of the children without support including from us in the Congress.

So today, I hope we will look at what works for school safety, how we can provide a better support of what works; however, I want to make it clear when it comes to gun violence, the onus should not fall solely on schools to protect children. Any school safety changes in the wake of Sandy Hook must be implemented in tandem with comprehensive gun violence prevention. Common sense strategies are needed to keep guns out of the hands of those who intend harm.

Once a madman with a gun shows up at a schoolhouse door or at an office or reception desk or at an Army base, our safety policies will have already failed. So what we are looking at today is only a small piece of puzzle, but it is an important piece.

And I look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee on sensible steps to protect children from violence both inside and outside of the school, and I want to join you in thanking our witnesses. It is an incredible panel that

you have assembled for joining us today and we look forward to their testimony and their insights. Thank you.

[The statement of Mr. Miller follows:]

Prepared Statement of Hon. George Miller, Senior Democratic Member, Committee on Education and the Workforce

Chairman Kline, thank you for agreeing to hold this important hearing.

The horrific event in Newtown, Connecticut shook our nation's conscience and continues to do so today. Nothing can be more disturbing, nothing can be more enraging or more despairing than the mass execution of little children.

To call what happened at Sandy Hook a tragedy is to not do it justice. It is beyond tragedy. We will forever search for the word that captures this event. The horror of the event, the grief of the families, the community, and our nation is indescribable.

It is an event that has finally pushed our country into a long overdue national debate about mental health, about gun violence, and about the safety of our children. It is also an event that, in its magnitude, reminds us that violence against children is an everyday occurrence in this country. Entire classrooms were attacked at Sandy Hook.

But children, one by one, are gunned down outside of school in Chicago and in my congressional district. Children in Arizona, or Indiana, or South Carolina, go to school every day worrying about bullies and harassment.

Sandy Hook is an event that calls on us as policymakers to do something—not just to prevent the next mass murder but to make sure every school is a genuinely safe place. A school must be a place where children feel secure so that they can focus on learning, growing, and being kids.

Stopping an outside intruder from attacking students is only the last line of defense when it comes to school safety.

We need to recognize that violence—or the fear of violence—does not begin or end at the school house door. Nor does violence necessarily occur during normal school hours or from an outsider. We know children in many urban areas feel unsafe walking to and from school. Many students and teachers are aware of threats of bullying on school property, not just during the school day, but during off-hour activities.

A child is vulnerable on so many fronts:

- Vulnerable to a mad man with a gun.
- Vulnerable to a school employee whose criminal background was never checked.
- Vulnerable to a fellow student whose mental health issues are never addressed.
- Vulnerable to gangs who may have infiltrated the student body.

With all of these vulnerabilities, our gut instinct may be to turn schools into bank vaults, with each student as physically secure as the gold in Fort Knox. And yet research is clear that simply turning schools into armed fortresses is not the answer. Nor is the answer to turn every potentially wayward student into a criminal suspect

School safety policies must not be driven by gut instincts, but by sound evidence of what works. They require a comprehensive understanding of the physical and emotional needs of students, not just the particular hardware and security procedures in a building.

Part of the answer is providing better access to mental health services and anti-bullying interventions. And when problems do arise from students, disciplinary policies must be thoughtful and productive and foster trust between teachers and students. Part of the answer is recognizing that the emotional and physical needs of our children inside and outside of school is a shared responsibility.

Keeping kids safe requires a coordinated effort from teachers, principals, superintendents, community partners, and parents. And protecting children from violence and freeing students to learn means ensuring that states, districts, schools and communities have the resources and supports needed to implement evidence-based approaches that are tailored to the unique needs of students in that area.

Doing all of this is a tall order. But ask any parent waving good-bye to their son or daughter at the bus stop if there is more important work than this. We place extraordinary responsibility on schools to meet the academic, emotional and physical needs of students.

Educators repeatedly rise to the occasion. Among the heroes of Sandy Hook were a principal, a school psychologist, and classroom teachers who gave their lives to protect their young charges. We cannot ask them to stand alone. Schools cannot be expected to provide a quality education and a safe, secure environment for all children without support, including from us in Congress.

So today, I hope we'll look at what works for school safety and how we can provide better support for what works. However, I want to make clear that, when it comes to gun violence, the onus should not fall solely on schools to protect children.

Any school safety changes in the wake of Sandy Hook must be implemented in tandem with comprehensive gun violence prevention. Commonsense strategies are needed to keep guns out of the hands of those who intend harm.

Once a mad man with a gun shows up at the school house door, or at an office reception desk, or on an army base, our safety policies will have already failed. So what we are looking at today is only a small piece of the puzzle. But it is an important piece.

I look forward to working with Chairman Kline and members of this committee on sensible steps to protect children from violence, both inside and outside of school. And I thank all the witnesses for appearing today. I look forward to your testimony.

I yield back.

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

Pursuant to committee Rule 7C, all committee members will be permitted to submit written statements to be included in the permanent hearing record. And without objection, the hearing record will remain open for 14 days to allow statements, questions for the record, and other extraneous material referenced during the hearing to be submitted in the official hearing record.

It is now my pleasure to introduce our very distinguished panel of witnesses.

First, Mr. Bill Bond serves as a school safety specialist for the National Association of Secondary School Principals. He served as principal of Heath High School in Paducah, Kentucky at the time a school shooting tragedy occurred at Heath.

Mr. Mo Canady serves as executive director for the National Association of School Resource Officers and is past president of the Alabama Association of School Resource Officers.

Mr. Vinnie Pompei is a school counselor in Val Verde Unified School District located in Merino Valley, California. He is the president-elect of the California Association of School Counselors.

And now I would like to turn to my colleague, a new member of the committee, Mrs. Brooks, to introduce our next witness, turns out, from her home district.

Mrs. Brooks?

Mrs. BROOKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have the privilege of introducing someone who brings valuable, real-world experience. That is Mr. Brent Bontrager. He is a senior vice president and group executive for Stanley Security Solutions, a division of Stanley Black & Decker located in Fishers, Indiana with other facilities throughout my district, and they do focus on such issues as security site surveys, they have worked mass notification systems, lock down solutions. They have worked with over 10,000 schools throughout the country, and I am honored that he is here today.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you. We are honored that he is here today as well.

Dr. David Osher is the vice president in the Education, Human Development, and the Workforce Program and co-director of the Human and Social Development Program at the American Institutes for Research.

And Mr. Fred Ellis is the director of Office of Safety and Security with the Fairfax County Public Schools in Fairfax, Virginia. He is a retired major with the Fairfax County Police Department.

Welcome, all.

Before I recognize each of you to provide your testimony, let me briefly explain our lighting system. It is pretty sophisticated. You will each have 5 minutes to present your testimony. When you begin, the light in front of you will turn green. When 1 minute is left, the light will turn yellow. When your time is expired, the light will turn red; pretty sophisticated.

However, the trick comes in in recognizing that red light. When the red light comes on, I would ask you to wrap up your remarks as best you are able. After everyone has testified, members will each have 5 minutes to ask questions of the panel. While I am reluctant to drop the gavel after the light turns red for the witness, I will because we are pretty pressed for time today.

As sort of an administrative announcement, I have been advised by the majority leader's office that we are probably going to expect votes around 2:15 or 2:30, so we are going to try to keep this moving along, and I would remind my colleagues that we also are limited to 5 minutes, and I will be less reluctant to tap the gavel and keep that moving.

I would now like to recognize Mr. Bond for 5 minutes. Your microphone, please. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF BILL BOND, SCHOOL SAFETY SPECIALIST, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Mr. BOND. Chairman Kline, Ranking Member Miller, and members of the committee, thank you for inviting me here today to testify on how we can better protect our students, teachers, and staff.

My name is Bill Bond, I am the former principal of Heath High School in Paducah, Kentucky. When I was the principal of the high school, I had the first of the high-profile school shootings, and I had eight kids shot and three girls died. The student had five guns and 1,000 rounds of ammunition.

That event profoundly transformed everyone involved and the experience prompted me to reach out to other schools that are going through the same situation. After the students who were freshman at the time of the incident graduated, I retired from the principalship, and for the past 12 years have served as a safe school specialist for the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

The shooting at my school was the first high-profile mass school shooting, and it was followed rapidly by several others. In working with NASSP, I have assisted 12 other schools where kids have died. My role is to focus the principal on the decisions they will need to make to get the school back functioning and to be a resource and to assure them that they are on the right path, and to help with the flood of media and to respond immediately to the word of a tragedy and to just let them deal with the crush of media that they are not used to dealing with. I often say to principals, if you have 12 microphones, you had a bad day.

To be effective, schools must operate and be perceived as safe havens. When parents send their kids to school, they believe that the

school has thought of and planned for every possible situation, and that is a reasonable expectation for parents, but it is very hard to meet.

To be prepared, principals must meet with local responders; police, firemen, ambulance drivers, transportation, and define everyone's role and to examine the traffic flow around the buildings to see where emergency entrance is for vehicles, buses, so forth. They need to create lockdown procedures, evacuation procedures, unification procedures.

The good news is that most schools have done this, but the document must be a living document. Very often they are mandated to do this by the state, they do it, and they don't look at the document again. It has to be a living document that is constantly evolved and changed.

Communicating with teachers and staff and parents is the hardest part during a crisis, but it is the most important part in the recovery process. Angry, uninformed parents will break any crisis plan, but most plans were written the months following Columbine when expectations for communications were different.

Most schools have not gone back to update that part of the plan; to give just one example when a high school student was shot a few months ago on the first day of school in Maryland, parents got the word from their kids so fast they actually showed up before the police.

That is not a situation you want during a crisis, but it shows that parents expect instant communication. When they hear nothing from the school they get anxious, they fill that gap of information from the news, from text, from their kids, from rumors, from social media, and the information may not be correct.

Parents want to know two things. Is my child okay? And when can I pick my child up? As we go through this about talking about safe schools, I have talked only about school shootings, but we are talking about all issues that could happen in a school, tornadoes, earthquakes; any disaster affects kids, affects those students, and affects those parents. Thank you.

[The statement of Mr. Bond follows:]

Prepared Statement of Bill Bond, Former Principal; Specialist for School Safety, National Association of Secondary School Principals

Chairman Kline, Ranking Member Miller, and members of the committee, thank you for inviting me here today to discuss school safety and how we can better protect our students, teachers, and staff. My name is Bill Bond, and I am the former principal of Heath High School in Paducah, KY. In December 1997, one of my own students brought 5 guns and 1,000 rounds of ammunition into the school and shot 8 students; 3 girls were killed. That event marked a profound transformation for everyone involved. And that experience prompted me to reach out to other schools that were going through the same situation. After the students who were freshman at the time of the incident graduated, I retired from the principalship. For the past 12 years, I have served as the specialist for school safety at the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP).

The shooting at my school was the first of the high-profile mass school shootings. It was followed rapidly by several others. In working with NASSP, I've assisted at 12 other schools where kids have died. My role is to focus the principal on the decisions they'll need to make to get the school back up and functioning—to be a resource and reassure them that they're on the right path. And to help with the flood of media that respond immediately to word of a tragedy. I often tell audiences: what's the definition of a bad day for a principal? More than 12 microphones.

To be effective, schools must be operated and perceived as safe havens. When parents send their kids to school, they believe the school has thought of and planned for every possible situation—and that's a reasonable expectation, but one that's very hard to meet.

So to be prepared, the principal must meet with local responders—police, firemen, ambulance drivers—and the district transportation to look at facilities, define people's roles and examine how the traffic flows around the school. They need to create lockdown procedures, and evacuation and reunification procedures. Now, the good news is that most everyone has a good crisis plan that includes these things. But that plan must be a living document—it must be adjustable. One huge area where most plans have not adjusted is in the area of crisis communications.

Communicating with teachers, staff, and parents is the hardest part of a crisis, but it is extremely important and it's the key to recovery. Angry, uninformed parents will break any crisis plan. But most plans were written in the months following the Columbine shooting in April 1999, when expectations for communication were different. Most schools have not gone back to update that part of the plan. To give just one example, when a high school student was shot a few months ago on the first day of school in Maryland, parents got word from their kids so fast they actually showed up before the police. That's not a situation you want, but it shows that parents expect instant communication today. When they hear nothing from the school, they get anxious and they fill that gap with other information—from the news, texts from their kids, the rumor mill, and social media. That information may not be correct. Parents want to know two things. Is my child ok? And when can I get him? And the more parents can hear from the school that at least makes progress toward those answers, the more it relieves their emotions.

Security Procedures and Equipment

I'm often asked if school shootings can be prevented with more security—cameras and metal detectors, and the like. While they may deter some intruders and prevent more weapons from entering our schools, that equipment can only go so far. If they really want to, kids will find a way around all your security equipment. It's based on the notion that: "We can deter you because our force is greater than your force and we will ultimately imprison you or we will kill you." But that was not a deterrent in most of the school shootings that have occurred since Paducah. Those kids already made the decision to die on that day, so rational deterrents had no effect on them. Your best protection is a trusting relationship between adults and students that encourages kids to share responsibility for their safety and share information. Kids very often know what's going on in the school and what might cause a crisis. So information from students is more valuable than any camera or locked door. And kids will give that information to an adult they know well and trust. If they don't trust you and someone is planning something destructive, it's difficult to avoid the tragedy. It's a matter of how many will be killed before he stops or kills himself.

School Resource Officers

The presence of a school resource officer (SRO) can be beneficial to the school. An SRO is a law enforcement officer who is also specially trained in working with students in a school environment. Yes, the SRO is armed, but the benefit of the SRO has little to do with the gun on his hip. The SRO is an active member of the school community and serves as part of the school leadership team. In many cases, the SRO assists the school in crisis planning and personalizing the district's emergency management plan to that school. They assist in training staff and conducting walkthroughs of the emergency management plan and lockdown drills. Some teach classes on the law and drug and alcohol prevention. But the most important SRO function is to build trusting relationships with the students. The school resource officer can (and should) be another adult in the building who will be an advocate for the students and help to personalize the learning experience for those students. Again, students are much more inclined to come forward with information about potential threats if that relationship is in place.

Mental Health

Most educators, particularly principals and teachers, are able to recognize in troubled students the signs and symptoms that are known to lead to violent behavior, and pinpoint interventions working with their colleagues in mental health. More and more, principals are identifying students who may need intervention in the earliest grades, often with an overwhelming number of cases as early as kindergarten.

Unfortunately, principals and other school personnel find themselves hampered by inefficient systems that prevent them from helping students and families access appropriate mental health and well-being services. Principals need to be able to maintain relationships that are essential to keeping students safe, and they must be able

to hire appropriate mental health personnel in the school, such as guidance counselors, psychologists, and social workers.

Sadly, there is no simple solution to this complex problem of violence directed at schools, regardless of whether the perpetrator is a student or an outsider. But we know that there is something schools and communities can do. It has been identified time and again by the Secret Service, the FBI, and numerous researchers: The most effective way to prevent acts of violence targeted at schools is by building trusting relationships with students and others in the community so that threats come to light and can be investigated as appropriate. The solution is a matter of school culture. It's a matter of community engagement. It's a matter of public health. The real solution is multifaceted and complex, but as each act of violence on a school reminds us, it is work we must undertake.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Bond.

Mr. Canady?

STATEMENT OF MO CANADY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS

Mr. CANADY. Chairman Kline, Ranking Member Miller, and members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to testify on behalf of the National Association of School Resource Officers.

It is my honor to serve as the executive director for this outstanding group of law enforcement and education professionals. NASRO is a not-for-profit association founded in 1991 with a solid commitment to our nation's youth.

NASRO is comprised of school-based law enforcement officers, school administrators, and school security and safety professionals working as partners to protect students, faculty, and staff and their school community.

The school resource officer refers to a commissioned law enforcement officer selected, trained, and assigned to protect and serve the education environment. I cannot emphasize enough how critical it is for officers to be properly selected and properly trained to function in the school environment. This is always a factor in the success or failure of the SRO program.

The SRO program is most effective when it is built on the foundation of interagency collaboration. There should always be a formal memorandum of understanding between the law enforcement agency and the school district. The role of the SRO should be based on the Triad concept of school-based policing.

This encompasses the strategies of law enforcement and formal counseling and education. A typical day for an SRO may include traffic direction, problem solving with a student, or making a presentation on distracted driving to a classroom of high school students.

Relationship building is certainly an important factor in the success of an SRO program. The SRO must strive to build positive working relationships with the school administration. One way of helping to build these relationships can be through the SRO's role on the school safety team.

Properly trained SRO's are prepared to be a member of safety teams and can also take a leadership role in helping to develop teams where none exist.

I spent nearly half of my law enforcement career in school-based policing. It was without a doubt, the most rewarding period of my career. It was more than just a job. It became my life's work. I de-

veloped positive relationships with administrators, faculty members, students, and parents.

I became an integral part of the Hoover City Schools District Crisis Team. By being a part of the school safety team, the SRO becomes fully engaged in crisis planning to include prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery. SROs can provide value to the written plans for a school district. They can also assist with campus site assessments as well as conducting safety drills.

The aspect of recovery was one that I had not given a great deal of thought to during the early phase of my career in school-based law enforcement. It was not until the days following November 19, 2002, that it became clear to me the importance of the role that a school resource officer can play in the recovery portion of a critical incident.

The unthinkable had happened at our largest high school. One student had taken the life of another in the hallway during the change of class periods. This resulted in a very large crime scene that took some time to secure. The students had to remain in a modified lockdown for several hours. We all knew that this was putting quite a burden on teachers in particular, however they did exactly what they were supposed to do as they had been trained.

The principal asked me to join him in a faculty meeting after the students were released. I took the opportunity to praise the staff for their good work. One of the reasons that faculty members were so well-prepared for an incident such as this was due to the school's commitment to maintaining a solid school safety team.

I believe that this faculty meeting was actually the beginning of the recovery process. Plans were developed for the next day. We thought that our most important job on November 20 would be to keep this from happening again, to keep weapons out of school, to make sure that no retaliation occurred.

While all of these things were important, it paled in comparison to the need of the student body to be comforted and reassured. The need for trusted and caring adults became the more important issue in this recovery process.

The school resource officers were certainly still focused on security, but we were most definitely more engaged in the mental and emotional recovery process.

The reason for this is because we were much more than just a law enforcement presence. We were trusted adults and we helped to make a difference in the lives of children during the days prior to and most definitely following November 19, 2002.

Trained and committed police officers are well-suited to effectively protect and serve the school community. School resource officers contribute too by ensuring a safe and secure campus, educating students about law related topics, and mentoring students as informal counselors or role models.

Over the last 23 years of the National Association of School Resource Officers has become the world leader in school-based policing. We have trained thousands of officers based on the Triad model of school-based policing and these officers are having a positive impact on the lives of children every day. Thank you.

[The statement of Mr. Canady follows:]

Prepared Statement of Mo Canady, Executive Director, National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO)

Chairman Kline, Ranking Member Miller, and members of the Committee: Thank you for inviting me to testify on behalf of the National Association of School Resource Officers. It is my honor to serve as the Executive Director for this outstanding group of law enforcement and education professionals. NASRO is a not-for-profit association founded in 1991 with a solid commitment to our nation's youth. NASRO is comprised of school-based law enforcement officers, school administrators and school security and safety professionals working as partners to protect students, faculty and staff, and their school community. The "school resource officer" (SRO) refers to a commissioned law-enforcement officer selected, trained and assigned to protect and serve the education environment. I cannot emphasize enough how critical it is for officers to be properly selected and properly trained to function in the school environment. This is always a factor in the success or failure of the SRO program.

The SRO program is most effective when it is built on the foundation of interagency collaboration. There should always be a formal memorandum of understanding between the law enforcement agency and the school district. The role of the SRO should be based on the triad concept of school based policing. This encompasses the strategies of law enforcement, informal counseling and education. A typical day for an SRO may include traffic direction, problem-solving with a student or making a presentation on distracted driving to a classroom of high school students.

Relationship building is certainly an important factor in the success of an SRO program. The SRO must strive to build positive working relationships with the school administration. One way of helping to build these relationships can be through the SROs role on the school safety team. Properly trained SRO's are prepared to be a member of safety teams and can also take a leadership role in helping to develop teams where none exist.

I spent nearly half of my law enforcement career in school based-policing. It was without a doubt the most rewarding period of my career. It was more than just a job. It became my life's work. I developed positive relationships with administrators, faculty members, students and parents. I became an integral part of the Hoover City Schools District Crisis Team. By being a part of a school safety team, the SRO becomes fully engaged in crisis planning to include Prevention, Preparedness, Response and Recovery. SRO's can provide value to the written plans for a school district. They can also assist with campus site assessments as well as conducting safety drills.

The aspect of "Recovery" was not one that I had given a great deal of thought to during the early phase of my career in school-based law enforcement. It was not until the days following November 19, 2002 that it became clear to me the importance of the role that a school resource officer can play in the recovery portion of a critical incident. The unthinkable had happened at our largest high school. One student had taken the life of another in the hallway during the change of class periods.

This resulted in a very large crime scene that took some time to secure. The students had to remain in a modified lockdown for several hours. We all knew that this was putting quite a burden on teachers in particular. However, they did exactly what they were supposed to do, as they had been trained. The principal asked me to join him in a faculty meeting after the students were released. I took the opportunity to praise the staff for their good work. One of the reasons that faculty members were so well prepared for an incident such as this, was due to the schools commitment to maintaining a solid school safety team.

I believe that this faculty meeting was actually the beginning of the recovery process. Plans were developed for the next day. We thought that our most important job on November 20th would be to keep this from happening again. To keep weapons out of the school. To make sure that no retaliation occurred. While all of those things were important, it paled in comparison to the need of the student body to be comforted and reassured. The need for trusted and caring adults became the more important issue in this recovery process. The school resource officers were certainly still focused on security but we were most definitely more engaged in the mental and emotional recovery process. The reason for this is because we were much more than just a law enforcement presence. We were trusted adults and we helped to make a difference in the lives of children during the days prior to and most definitely following November 19, 2002.

Trained and committed police officers are well-suited to effectively protect and serve the school community. School resource officers contribute by ensuring a safe

and secure campus, educating students about law-related topics, and mentoring students as informal counselors and role models. Over the last 23 years, the National Association of School Resource Officers has become the world leader in school based policing. We have trained thousands of officers based on the Triad model of school based policing and these officers are having a positive impact on the lives of children every day.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you.

Mr. Pompei, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF VINCENT POMPEI, SCHOOL COUNSELOR, VAL VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. POMPEI. My name is Vincent Pompei. I am a school counselor in southern California. I started out as a middle school teacher and became a school counselor to pursue my passion—making school a safe and inclusive place for every student.

My story is the story of millions of students across America. By 5th grade, I had been targeted and labeled as gay. I was teased, pushed, spit on, knives were pulled on me, my bike was stolen. I became depressed, considered dropping out of school, and by 11th grade, had already attempted suicide twice.

My teachers looked on as I endured bullying and homophobic slurs. I honestly don't think they knew how to intervene appropriately. I didn't feel safe, because I wasn't safe.

I desperately needed an adult I could trust, but it was far too risky to seek out support. And I had no idea how to go about finding help; there was no information, not even a sticker or poster with a phone number to call.

All through those years, I searched and prayed for just one person to make me feel safe. I never found that person during those years, but it drove me to want to become a teacher, and then a school counselor, to be that person for my students.

Mass shootings like the one at Sandy Hook Elementary School make headlines, but they are rare. Students are far more likely to encounter gang violence, bullying, and harassment in everyday life. They need access to counseling, support, and other mental-health services to cope with those kinds of experiences and much more. For example, when dad is beating mom, when they become homeless, when they are thinking of dropping out, when their parents are deported.

By now, caseloads have grown so much that counselors have no time to put out fires when we should be preventing them from igniting in the first place. The situation is the same for school nurses, psychologists, social workers, and other school-based mental health professionals.

The recommended ratio for school students to counselors is 250:1. In California, where I live, the ratio is more than 1,000:1; a caseload not even Superman could handle. In Minnesota, it is nearly 800:1 and nationwide, nearly 500:1.

For some of our students, especially the most vulnerable, the resulting loss of services will have lifelong consequences. In the short run, an emotional wound may be less visible than a physical injury. Over the long run, it can fester and become crippling, like a cut in the skin or a broken bone that is not cared for properly.

Meanwhile, evidence mounts that mental well-being and academic success go hand in hand. A recent meta-analysis of school-based social and emotional learning programs—more than 270,000 K-12 students were involved—showed participation in such programs improved grades and standardized test scores by 11 percentile points, compared to the control groups.

When students feel safe and connected at school, they are more likely to learn. Yet most educators get no training—we call it "professional development,"—in what it takes to create a school climate that nourishes the mental well-being as well as academic success.

If our nation is serious about keeping students safe, that has got to change. We must do more than react after the damage has been done. We must invest in professional development that acknowledges the need for preventive care; a healthy, safe, and inclusive school.

Every member of the school staff needs to know the basics. Who is statistically most likely to be the target of bullying, harassment, or violence? What to expect when a kid has a traumatic experience—whether it is a hurricane, violence at home, a shooting, or bullying. How to counsel and change the behavior of those who bully or those who behave violently.

Every member of the school staff must be equipped to respond appropriately and effectively to students who is troubled or potentially violent. Instead of playing a guessing game, it should be routine for educators to receive instruction in creating a healthy, safe, and inclusive school climate; just as it is routine to receive instruction on first aid for cuts and bruises, and what to do when someone chokes on a piece of food, or struggles to learn algebra.

Instead of standing silently by when students shun or ridicule someone who is different, school staff should lead by example. Embrace diversity. Address problems before they escalate. Show students how to resolve conflict in non-violent ways using research-proven strategies.

In short, we need to take teaching students to be good citizens as seriously as we take academics. To help keep schools and students safe, we must encourage professional development in cultural competence, conflict management, and anti-bullying initiatives.

Above all, America must act on what we know to be true. Our mental health system is broken and underfunded. Between 2009 and 2012, the states slashed mental-health spending by $4.3 billion; the largest reduction since de-institutionalization in the 1960s and 1970s.

Now, there is widespread agreement that mental-health services need to be expanded and improved. To keep our students safe, we have got to act on what research shows—mental well-being is critical to academic success. We have got to provide visible signs that school is a safe place not for just some, but for all. We have got to spend more, not less, to educate and care for the whole child.

On behalf of all school-based mental-health professionals, I thank you for this opportunity to present this testimony. Thank you.

[The statement of Mr. Pompei follows:]

Prepared Statement of Vincent Pompei, School Counselor

My name is Vincent Pompei. I am a school counselor in southern California. I started out as a middle school teacher and became a school counselor to pursue my passion: making school a safe and inclusive place for every student.

My story is the story of millions of students all across America.

By 5th grade, I had been targeted and labeled as gay. I was teased, pushed, and spit on. Knives were pulled on me and my bike was stolen. I became depressed, considered dropping out, and by the 11th grade, had already attempted suicide twice.

My teachers looked on as I endured bullying and homophobic slurs. I honestly don't think they knew how to intervene appropriately.

I didn't feel safe—because I wasn't.

I desperately needed an adult I could trust, but it was far too risky to seek out support. And I had no idea how to go about finding help—there was no information, not even a sticker or poster with a phone number to call.

All through those years, I searched and prayed for just one person to make me feel safe. I never found that person during those years, but it drove me to want to become a teacher, and then a school counselor—to become that person for my students.

Mass shootings like the one at Sandy Hook Elementary School make headlines, but they are rare. Students are far more likely to encounter gang violence, bullying, and harassment in everyday life. They need access to counseling, support, and other mental-health services to cope with those kinds of experiences and much more—for example, when Dad is beating Mom, when they become homeless, when they're thinking of dropping out, when a parent is deported.

But now, caseloads have grown so much that counselors only have time to put out fires—when we should be preventing fires from igniting in the first place. The situation is the same for nurses, psychologists, social workers, and other school-based mental health professionals.

The recommended ratio of students to counselors is 250-to-1. In California, where I live, the ratio is more than 1,000-to-1—a caseload not even Superman could handle! In Minnesota, it's nearly 800-to-1 and nationwide, nearly 500-to-1. (Source: American School Counselor Association).

For some of our students, especially the most vulnerable, the resulting loss of services will have lifelong consequences. In the short run, an emotional wound may be less visible than a physical injury. Over the long run, it can fester and become crippling, like a cut in the skin or a broken bone that is not cared for properly.

Meanwhile, evidence mounts that mental well-being and academic success go hand in hand. A recent meta-analysis of school-based social and emotional learning programs—more than 270,000 K-12 students were involved—showed participation in such programs improved grades and standardized test scores by 11 percentile points, compared to control groups. (Source: National Association of School Psychologists)

When students feel safe and connected at school, they are more likely to learn. Yet most educators get no training—we call it "professional development"—in what it takes to create a school climate that nourishes mental well-being as well as academic success.

If our nation is serious about keeping students safe, that has got to change. We must do more than react after the damage has been done. We must invest in professional development that acknowledges the need for "preventive care"—a healthy, safe, and inclusive school climate.

Every member of the school staff needs to know the basics: Who is statistically most likely to be a target of bullying, harassment, or violence. What to expect when a kid has a traumatic experience—whether it's a hurricane, violence at home, a shooting at school, or bullying. How to counsel and change the behavior of bullies or those who behave violently.

Every member of the school staff must be equipped to respond appropriately and effectively to a student who is troubled or potentially violent. Instead of playing guessing games, it should be routine for educators to receive instruction in creating a healthy, safe, and inclusive school climate—just as it is routine to receive instruction in first aid for cuts and bruises, in what to do when someone chokes on a piece of food or struggles to learn algebra.

Instead of standing silently by when students shun or ridicule someone who is different, school staff should lead by example. Embrace diversity. Address problems before they escalate. Show students how to resolve conflicts in non-violent ways using research-proven strategies.

In short, we need to take teaching students to be good citizens as seriously as we take academics.

To help keep schools and students safe, we must encourage professional development in cultural competence, conflict management, and anti-bullying initiatives.

Above all, America must act on what we know to be true. Our mental health system is broken and underfunded. Between 2009 and 2012, the states slashed mental-health spending by $4.3 billion—the largest reduction since de-institutionalization in the 1960s and 70s. (Source: National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors)

Now, there's widespread agreement that mental-health services need to be expanded and improved.

To keep our students safe, we've got to act on what the research shows: mental well-being is critical to academic success. We've got to provide visible signs that school is a safe place not just for some, but for all. We've got to spend more, not less, to educate and care for the whole child.

On behalf of all school-based mental-health professionals, I thank you for the opportunity to present this testimony.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Bontrager, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF BRETT BONTRAGER, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND GROUP EXECUTIVE, STANLEY BLACK & DECKER

Mr. BONTRAGER. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Miller, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the critical issue of school safety. My name is Brett Bontrager. I am the Senior Vice President and Group Executive of Stanley Security Solutions, which is a division of Stanley Black & Decker.

Stanley Security Solutions is headquartered in Indianapolis in Congresswoman Brooks' congressional district. While many of you know Stanley Black & Decker for its construction and do-it-yourself products, our company has also been in the security business for many decades.

It is because of this expertise, decades of school experience, and the proximity of our world headquarters in Connecticut, in relation to the tragedy in Newtown, that led us to be able to immediately play a role in helping the students and faculty of Sandy Hook.

After the decision was made by the town to move the students to a decommissioned school, Chalk Hill, our team was called in to perform a comprehensive security survey and determine what was needed in the building to allow the students to move in and be safe and we subsequently installed certain products and services to do just that.

While there is certainly some information on Web sites and in other literature regarding school safety, and products do exist and are on the market to secure our nation's schools, we have not been able to find in our research a Web site or other single source of information that comprehensively integrates all security needs together.

For school administrators, board of education members, and superintendents, the daily challenges that come with educating our children and running a school district are all-consuming. Today, these same officials are being asked to become experts in security and it is important to know they don't have to be.

So what is school safety? Certainly, no single lock or system. Instead, a comprehensive, integrated security package, and long-term roadmap should be designed and implemented at each school,

which would take into account the unique physical nature of that particular school.

Upon completion of the site evaluation and risk assessment, decisions must be then made on the level of security needed, but at its core, the integrity of the mechanical solution must be maintained. By levels of security, I am referring to security products that range from essential hardware and mechanical access equipment to wireless situational awareness monitoring and every solution in between.

One clear trend that security providers see is the strong need to tie mass notification via an intercom system to a school's access control, intrusion monitoring system, and security cameras. This allows for coordination and visibility for response teams both inside the school as well as from local law enforcement or fire personnel in the case of an emergency. Lack of integration with the local first responder team can be a critical flaw in the school security process.

One specific example of a school district where we have worked with the administration to customize the best solutions is one of the largest school districts in Louisiana which included 6,000 employees, 42,000 students from pre-K to 12th grade, and 66 different schools.

The district encompassed urban centers, suburban neighborhoods, rural towns, and communities. In reviewing efficiencies and cost saving measures, the district determined that several of their high school campus locations were underutilized. It was decided that to fully utilize their available space and to reduce overhead costs, each facility would integrate seventh and eighth graders.

This idea however did not come without security challenges. It was important that each of these locations be able to isolate or limit the interaction between younger and older students. The school facilities on average were 60 years old and not built with security in mind.

There were too many ways that unauthorized individuals could enter and leave. Every school in the system presented its own set of challenges. You will see a one-size-fits-all approach is neither practical or recommended.

This hearing has started what we think should be a continued national conversation on school security and safety that includes experts from the field and school officials in order to learn the best ways to protect our schools.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I applaud you and the Committee for taking a leadership role on this critical issue of school safety. I know we can all agree that keeping our children safe in their schools is worth all of our time, all of our collective experience, and all of our wisdom. I am humbled that we might have an opportunity to play a role.

[The statement of Mr. Bontrager follows:]

Prepared Statement of Brett Bontrager, Senior Vice President and Group Executive, Stanley Black & Decker Security Systems Division

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Miller, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the critical issue of school safety. My name is Brett Bontrager. I am the Senior Vice President and Group Executive of Stanley Security Solutions, which is a division of Stanley Black & Decker.

Stanley Security Solutions is headquartered in Indianapolis—in Congresswoman Brooks' congressional district. While many of you know Stanley Black & Decker for its construction and do-it-yourself products, our company has also been in the security business for many decades.

It is because of this expertise, decades of school experience and the proximity of our world headquarters in Connecticut in relation to the tragedy in Newtown that led us to be able to immediately play a role in helping the students and faculty of Sandy Hook. After the decision was made by the town to move the students to a decommissioned school, Chalk Hill, two tenured employees from our team were called in to perform a comprehensive security survey and determine what was needed in the building to allow the students to move in and be safe. Our team worked through the holidays to make sure that the Chalk Hill school building was ready for the children when they returned to school to provide a safe and secure environment for the students, parents and faculty.

While there is certainly some information on websites and in other literature, and products do exist and are on the market to secure our nation's schools, we have not been able to find in our research a website or other single source of information that comprehensively integrates all of the security needs together. For school administrators, board of education members and superintendents, the daily challenges that come with educating our children and running a school district are all-consuming. Now, in the wake of the Newtown tragedy, parents want these same officials to become experts in security.

As we all know security measures and practices are designed to slow down an intruder for, every moment that you can delay or slow down an intruder to allow time for law enforcement to arrive, can save countless lives, but understanding the right solutions and the overall task is overwhelming.

A good starting point is to ask the basic question: What is school safety? Certainly, no single lock or system is the answer. Instead, a comprehensive, integrated security package and long-term roadmap should be designed and implemented, which would take into account the unique physical nature of each school. Each school stands on its own geographic footprint and has unique physical characteristics. This necessitates that prior to the installation of any security system each school district should ensure that its school buildings and grounds undergo a site evaluation, a risk assessment and a long-term, comprehensive security roadmap is developed.

Upon completion of the site evaluation and risk assessment, decisions must then be made on the level of security needed. By levels of security I am referring to security products that range from essential hardware and mechanical access equipment, such as door hardware which includes intruder locks and master key systems, to wireless situational awareness monitoring, and every solution in between.

A school can add basic hardware changes, blast and ballistic resistant doors, electronic access control or monitoring. Each district can work within their own specific needs, considering their budget as well as the local rules and regulations.

One clear trend that security providers see is the strong need to tie mass notification via an intercom system to a school's access control, intrusion monitoring system and security cameras. This allows for coordination and visibility for response teams both inside the school as well as from local law enforcement or fire personnel in the case of an emergency. Lack of integration with the local first responder team can be a critical flaw in the school security process.

Now that I've walked you through the theoretical and general aspects of school safety, I'd like to provide the Committee with some specific examples of schools across the country where we have worked with the administration to customize the best solutions for their needs as well as explain the components of those systems. You will quickly see that a one-size, fits-all approach is neither practical nor recommended.

• One of the best examples I can provide is the work that was done with one of the largest school districts in Louisiana which included 6,000 employees, 42,000 students from pre-K to 12th grade and 66 different schools. The district encompasses urban centers, suburban neighborhoods, rural towns and communities.

In reviewing efficiencies and cost saving measures, the district determined that several of their high school campus locations were underutilized. It was decided that to fully utilize their available space and to reduce overhead costs, each facility would integrate 7th and 8th graders. This idea however, did not come without security challenges. It was important that each of these locations be able to isolate or limit the interaction between younger and older students. The school facilities on average were 60 years old and not built with security in mind. There were too many ways that unauthorized individuals could enter and leave. Every school presented its own set of challenges, multi-level, construction issues, etc.

• A second example is of a school district not far from where we are sitting today in a suburban community where the school enrollment of approximately 27,000 is divided amongst five high schools, eight middle schools and seventeen elementary schools. The school division had experienced rapid growth and began to research higher levels of student safety in the classroom. The Assistant Superintendent for Facilities contacted us to help develop solutions to enhance security campus-wide and system-wide and we worked closely with the school officials to survey all properties, identify any deficiencies, enhance security overall and pull together a 5-year plan to make it all happen. It was important to the schools that they increase the ability to control all traffic into and out of their facilities as the building exteriors were still being secured with keys and access was given to a large number of individuals. Ultimately the schools ended up implementing a standardized template for key control and utilization by establishing a key hierarchy throughout the different school levels.

This hearing has started what we think should be a continued national conversation on school security and safety that includes experts from the field and school officials in order to learn the best ways to protect our schools.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I applaud you and the Committee for taking a leadership role on the critical issue of school safety. I know we can all agree that keeping our children safe in their schools is worth all of our time, all of our collective experience, and all of our wisdom. I am humbled that I might play a role in this effort.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you.

Dr. Osher, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF DR. DAVID OSHER, VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Mr. OSHER. Good afternoon, and thank you for this opportunity to discuss a subject vitally important to all of us. I am David Osher, and I am a vice president at the American Institutes for Research. AIR is a nonpartisan behavioral and social science research organization based here in Washington. We don't advocate for any policy position, so this is a chance for me to talk about evidence-based practices in hopes of helping you with your decisions.

Unfortunately, there are no quick fixes or easy solutions to respond to the tragedy at Sandy Hook or any of the other school shootings that have abruptly altered so many lives, but there are steps we can take to change the school environment so that students and teachers feel safe.

And research shows that students and teachers perform better when their schools improve discipline by focusing on student self-discipline, not external punishment; by promoting healthy behaviors, not suppressing unhealthy ones, by preventing problem behaviors rather than punishment, by building connections to students, not removing them from the school community, and by coordinating services systematically, not adding services piecemeal.

Safe and successful schools create positive school climates where students, all students, have good social and emotional skills, feel physically and emotionally safe, are connected to and supported by their teachers, and feel challenged and are engaged in learning.

These schools do this by employing a three-tiered approach to social emotional learning, positive behavioral support, the support of student and family engagement, and addressing students' academic and mental health needs.

For two decades I have conducted research and led national centers, studies, and expert panels that focused on safety, violence prevention, the conditions for learning, and student support. Today, I would like to focus on some of my experiences in Cleveland.

I led an audit of city schools following a 2007 shooting in which a 14-year-old student who had been suspended for fighting, returned to his school, which had a security guard, shot two teachers and two students, and then took his own life.

The findings in our report were stark. While discipline was harsh and reactive, students and faculty felt unsafe. Services were fragmented and driven by adult desire, not by student need, and the conditions for learning were poor.

City, school, and teacher union leaders embraced our recommendations and implemented a strategic three-tiered approach to improving conditions for learning and reducing discipline problems and violence.

Here are a few of the recommendations we made in 2008. Free up guidance counselors and school psychologists so they have more time to counsel students. Train school administrators, teachers, and security staff to use positive approaches to discipline rather than reactive and punitive actions, and to develop students in social and emotional competence, and to better understand and communicate with the students. Develop an early warning and intervention system to identify potential mental health issues, and employ student support teams that address the identified needs.

Last month, we released a paper, "Avoid Simple Solutions and Quick Fixes" examining where Cleveland schools stand today. The picture is far from perfect, but progress is clearly being made and is attributable to the district-wide use of student surveys to monitor progress, employing social emotional learning in all elementary schools, transforming punitive in-school suspension to planning centers to which students can self-refer and where students learn self-discipline, and by coordinating services through student support teams.

If we compare 2008/2009 to 2010/2011, which was the data we had, the attendance rate district-wide increased 1.5 percent. Out-of-school suspensions decreased 58.8 percent district-wide. There were statistically significant decreases in the number of reported behavioral incidents per school. Disobedient/disruptive behavior went from 131.8 per school to 73.9 and the average number of cases involving fighting and violence went from 54 to 36 percent.

Promotion and prevention are more effective, improve conditions for learning, and have less counterproductive or harmful side-effects than do suppression and punishment, particularly for vulnerable students and students of color.

Children and youth require safe, supportive schools if they are to succeed school and thrive. These needs are particularly great for children who struggle with the adversities of poverty, such as students in Cleveland where all students are eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Cleveland provides an example of what is possible, even in hard times, and even under less than perfect conditions for implementing student-centered policies.

Cleveland's successes are consistent with the recommendations of the Interdisciplinary Group on Preventing School and Community Violence, a group of prominent researchers on school safety, which called for a balanced approach that focused on student support and connectedness and stated that, quote—"Reliance on metal detec-

tors, security cameras, guards, and entry check points is unlikely to provide protection against all school-related shootings, including the shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School."

These recommendations are not new. They came out before in reports in response to Paducah and other studies, and I want to thank you for your time.

[The statement of Mr. Osher follows:]

Prepared Statement of Dr. David Osher, Vice President, American Institutes for Research

Good afternoon and thank you for this opportunity to discuss a subject vitally important to all of us. I am David Osher, and I am a vice president of the American Institutes for Research. AIR is a nonpartisan behavioral and social science research organization based here in Washington. We don't advocate for any policy position, so this is a chance for me to talk about evidence-based practices in hopes of helping you with your decisions.

Unfortunately, there are no quick fixes or easy solutions to respond to the tragedy at Sandy Hook—or any of the other school shootings that have abruptly altered so many lives. But there are steps we can take to change the school environment so that students and teachers feel safe. And research shows that students and teachers perform better when their schools improve discipline by focusing on student self-discipline, not external punishment; by promoting healthy behaviors not suppressing unhealthy ones, by preventing on of problem behaviors rather than punishment, building connections to students, not removing them from the school community, and coordinating services systematically, not adding services piecemeal.

Safe and successful schools create positive school climates where students have good social and emotional skills, feel physically and emotionally safe, are connected to and supported by their teachers, and feel challenged and are engaged in learning. These schools do this by employing a three-tiered approach to social emotional learning, positive behavioral support, the support of student and family engagement, and addressing students' academic and mental health needs.

For two decades I have conducted research and led national centers, studies, and expert panels that focused on safety, violence prevention, the conditions for learning, and student support. Today, I would like to focus on some of my experiences in Cleveland.

I led an AIR audit of city schools following a 2007 shooting in which a 14-year-old who had been suspended for fighting, returned to his school—which had a security guard—shot two teachers and two students, and then took his own life.

The findings in our report were stark. While discipline was harsh and reactive, students and faculty felt unsafe. Services were fragmented and driven by adult desire, not by student need, and conditions for learning were poor.

City, school, and teacher union leaders embraced our recommendations and implemented a strategic tiered approach to improving conditions for learning and reducing discipline problems and violence.

Here are a few of the recommendations we made in 2008:

- Free up guidance counselors and school psychologists so they have more time to counsel students.
- Train school administrators, teachers and security staff to use positive approaches to discipline rather than reactive and punitive actions, to develop student social and emotional competence, and to better understand and communicate with the students.
- Develop an early warning and intervention system to identify potential mental health issues, and employ student support teams to address identified needs.

Last month, we released a paper—"Avoid Simple Solutions and Quick Fixes"—examining where Cleveland schools stand today. The picture is far from perfect, but progress clearly is being made and is attributable to the district wide use of student surveys to monitor progress, employing social emotional learning in all elementary schools, transforming punitive in-school suspension to planning centers to which students can self-refer and where students learn self-discipline, and coordinating services through student support teams.

For example, comparing the 2008-2009 school year to the 2010-2011 year:

- The attendance rate district-wide increased 1.5 percentage points.
- Out-of-school suspensions decreased 58.8 percent district wide.
- There were statistically significant decreases in the average number of reported behavioral incidents per school. Disobedient/disruptive behavior went from 131.8 to

73.9 per school, and the average number of cases involving fighting/violence went from 54.5 to 36.4.

Promotion and prevention are more effective, improve conditions for learning, and have less counterproductive or harmful side-affects than do suppression and punishment—particularly for vulnerable students and students of color. Children and youth require safe and supportive schools if they are to succeed in school and thrive. These needs are particularly great for children who struggle with the adversities of poverty, such as students in Cleveland where all students are eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Cleveland provides an example of what is possible, even in hard times, and even under less than perfect conditions for implementing student centered policies, which reduce school removal, drop out, and the pipeline to prison.

Cleveland's successes are consistent with the recommendations of the Interdisciplinary Group on Preventing School and Community Violence. a group of prominent researchers on school safety, which called for balanced approach that focused on student support and connectedness and stated that "reliance on metal detectors, security cameras, guards, and entry check points is unlikely to provide protection against all school-related shootings, including the shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary."

These recommendations are not new.

Thank you.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Ellis, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK ELLIS, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF SAFETY AND SECURITY, FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. ELLIS. Chairman Kline, Ranking Member Miller, and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you about school security issues.

As the director of the Office of Safety and Security with the Fairfax County Public Schools, school safety and security have been my professional and personal focus for the last 12 and one-half years.

The Fairfax County Public Schools efforts in emergency management and security involve many components. Emergency management planning affects both the school and the division wide perspectives and utilizes the four phase paradigm that is widely accepted; mitigation/prevention, preparation, response, and recovery.

In the Fairfax County Public Schools, each school has an individual, site-specific plan that is updated each year and is reviewed by staff in the Office of Safety and Security. These plans include such things as the identification of the school crisis management team and their respective roles, standard language and response protocols for emergency actions, integration of students with disabilities and special needs into the response planning, detailed floor plans identifying the location of utility cutoffs, communication protocols, drills and training schedules, and the identification of staff with specific, relevant skills.

The school plan also addresses tactical considerations for command post locations, designated off-site evacuation locations, bus staging areas, and parent-student reunification procedures.

Training is provided by required drills such as fire, bus evacuation, lockdown, and tornado drills. These are supplemented by customized, site-specific tabletop exercises facilitated by staff from my office. Tabletop exercises analyze an emergency event in an informal environment. They provide participants with an emergency scenario to analyze, identify, and resolve issues as well as to

prompt constructive discussion and increase their awareness of the roles and responsibilities.

In addition to the individual school crisis plans, the Fairfax County Public Schools maintain a division-wide emergency operations plan. This plan is implemented when an incident overwhelms a school's ability to deal with an emergency, an incident that involves multiple sites, or when the Fairfax County government requests the school system to fulfill its pre-designated obligations within the Fairfax County Emergency Operations Plan. Examples of an activation of this plan include the response for 9/11, the sniper incidents of 2002, and large storm incidents.

Fairfax County Public Schools has implemented many security measures over the past several years, which include the use of exit door numbers, access control devices at all elementary and middle schools, an anonymous Tip Line system, interoperable radio communications with public safety, visitor screening, and School Resource Officers in all high and middle schools.

Much of the efforts of my office also involve the establishment and maintenance of relationships with agencies that we work with during an incident, such as police, the fire and rescue department, the health department.

In emergencies, relationships are currency. Having them facilitates communications and understanding of needs and roles. They have to be established prior to an incident and they require an ongoing effort.

Today schools are challenged with a variety of tasks many of which are beyond historical expectations but are now commonplace. Educators are individuals committed to teaching and making the difference in the life of the child. Their primary mission is education. They are not public safety officials, but accept the roles they are given in today's society.

Likewise, public safety officials are not always familiar with school operations and needs. School administrators and staff require training, assistance, and support for the emergency management and security responsibilities they are charged with and embrace.

I am often asked whether schools need more security measures. My answer is that, ultimately, communities play a large role in determining the nature and extent of school security measures they are willing to accept and to fund.

Expectations need to be clearly understood and they need to be reasonable. Statistically, schools remain incredibly safe places for children to be. Perspective, reasonableness, and cost are necessary criteria for communities to use in their deliberations.

I know of no school system that guarantees safety and security, but I do know that the professionals in the education community will do all that they can reasonably do to maintain a safe and secure educational environment.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you about this important topic.

[The statement of Mr. Ellis follows:]

Prepared Statement of Frederick E. Ellis, Director, Office of Safety and Security, Fairfax County Public Schools, VA

As the director of the office of safety and security with the Fairfax County Public Schools, school safety and security have been my professional and personal focus for the last twelve and one half years.

Fairfax County Public Schools, in Fairfax County, Virginia, is the eleventh largest school system in the country with more than 181,000 students, 23,000 employees, over 200 facilities comprising more than 25 million square feet and a budget of approximately $2.5 billion. It is a very large school system in a diverse and urbanizing suburb of Washington, D.C.

While school security encompasses many topics, my intent today is to provide insight into how a school division addresses the many challenges that we face by examining the emergency management processes and briefly describing some of the security measures we have in place.

A school-centered emergency management program examines potential emergencies and disasters based on the risk posed by likely hazards; develops and implements programs and actions aimed toward reducing the impact of these events on the individual school; prepares for those risks that cannot be eliminated; prescribes the actions required to deal with the consequences of the events and takes action to quickly recover from the event. Emergency planning focuses on the four phases of emergency management:

1. Mitigation/Prevention
2. Preparedness
3. Response
4. Recovery

Hazards can be classified into three categories: natural, technological, and school specific-hazards. Natural hazards include severe weather events. Technological hazards may involve hazardous materials or infrastructure failures, while school specific hazards address issues that could occur on or near a school, such as a bomb threat, a reported weapon or police activity near the school.

Mitigation is any sustained activity that schools take to reduce the loss of life and damage related to events that cannot be prevented, while prevention is any step that schools can take to decrease the likelihood that an incident will occur.

School safety audits, security and school climate surveys, neighborhood crime data review, hazard and vulnerability analysis efforts all play a role in the development of mitigation and prevention strategies. Issues identified from these initiatives are used to address physical and programmatic remediation.

The preparedness phase readies schools to respond in a rapid, coordinated and effective manner to an emergency. Because it is not possible to completely prevent every hazard that poses a risk, preparedness measures can help to reduce the impact of hazards by taking specific actions before an emergency occurs. An important aspect of preparedness is plan development.

In the Fairfax County Public Schools, each school has an individual, site specific plan that is updated each year and is reviewed by staff in the office of safety and security. These plans include such things as the identification of the school crisis management team and their respective roles, standard language and response protocols for emergency actions, integration of students with disabilities and special needs into the response planning, detailed floor plans identifying the location of utility cutoffs, communications protocols, drills and training schedules and the identification of staff with specific, relevant skills. The school plan also addresses tactical considerations for command post locations, designated off-site evacuation locations, bus staging areas and parent-student reunification procedures.

A critical component of preparation is training. Training can take many forms and in school divisions, these are typically drills and tabletop exercises. Drills test a specific operation or function of crisis and emergency plans. In Fairfax County, schools regularly conduct a variety of drills to demonstrate the steps they should take in an emergency. These drills include fire and bus evacuations, lockdown and tornado drills. Tabletop exercises analyze an emergency event in an informal environment. They provide participants with an emergency scenario to analyze and increase their awareness of their roles and responsibilities. The exercises are designed to prompt a constructive discussion about existing emergency response plans as participants identify, investigate and resolve issues. In Fairfax County, the office of safety and security provides facilitated tabletop exercises to schools on a rotating basis; high and middle schools receive them every other year, while elementary schools are provided one every three years.

When emergencies arise, schools must quickly implement the policies and procedures developed in the prevention-mitigation and preparedness phases to effectively

manage the crisis and protect the school community. Throughout the response phase, efforts focus on de-escalating the emergency and taking accelerated steps toward recovery. The response phase is often the effort to bring order to chaos and is predictably unique to each incident.

The response phase activities include activating the school's crisis management team, delegating responsibilities, establishing an incident command post, activating communication and response procedures, accounting for all students and staff, liaison with public safety agencies and documenting actions. In Fairfax County Public Schools, there are five universal responses: Lockdown, Secure the Building, Shelter-in-Place, Stay Put-Stay Tuned, and Evacuation. A lockdown is used to describe enhanced security measures taken to protect against potentially violent intruders that may be inside the building. Secure the building is used to prevent unauthorized entry if the threat is outside. Shelter-in-Place procedures are used to temporarily separate people from a hazardous outdoor atmosphere, such as in a hazmat situation. Stay Put-Stay Tuned is implemented at the request of public safety officials to limit the impact on the transportation infrastructure. An Evacuation is used when locations outside of the school building are safer than inside the school.

The recovery phase is designed to assist students, staff, and their families in the healing process and to restore educational operations in schools. Recovery is an ongoing process that includes not only the mental, emotional and physical healing process of students, faculty and staff, but a school's physical (buildings and grounds), fiscal (daily business operations) and academic (a return to classroom learning) recuperation. A timely return to normalcy is considered a significant goal, for both the school and the community.

In addition to the individual school crisis plans, the Fairfax County Public Schools maintain a divisionwide emergency operations plan. This plan is implemented when an incident overwhelms a school's ability to deal with an emergency, an incident that involves multiple sites or when the Fairfax County government requests the school system to fulfill its pre-designated obligations within the Fairfax County Emergency Operations Plan. The purpose of the divisionwide plan is to use school system resources to assist in the resolution of an incident. Like the school plan, the divisionwide plan establishes a command structure and roles, identifies lines of succession and details provisions for staffing the inter-government agency emergency operations center, as well as the Fairfax County Public School's department operations center. Examples of an activation of this plan include the response for 9-11, the sniper incidents of 2002 and large storm incidents.

Fairfax County Public Schools has implemented many security measures over the past several years. These include the use of exit door numbers, access control devices at all elementary and middle schools, an anonymous Tip Line system, interoperable radio communications with public safety, visitor screening and School Resource Officers in all high and middle schools.

Much of the efforts of my office also involve the establishment and maintenance of relationships with agencies that we work with during an incident, such as the police, the fire and rescue department, the health department, etc. In emergencies, relationships are currency. Having them facilitates communications and understanding of needs and roles. They have to be established prior to an incident and they require an ongoing effort. An excellent example of this is our School Liaison Commander position. This individual is a Fairfax County Police Lieutenant who is assigned to the office of safety and security and is funded by the Fairfax County Public Schools. The position provides a conduit for information exchange, oversees the School Resource Officer program, participates in tabletop exercises and is a piece of our on-scene incident command system staffing.

Today, schools are challenged with a variety of tasks, many of which are beyond historical expectations, but are now commonplace. Educators are individuals committed to teaching and making the difference in the life of a child. Their primary mission is education. They are not public safety officials but accept the roles they are given in today's society. Likewise, public safety officials are not always familiar with school operations and needs. School administrators and staff require training, assistance and support for the emergency management and security responsibilities they are charged with and embrace.

I'm often asked whether schools need more security measures. My answer is that, ultimately, communities play a large role in determining the nature and extent of school security measures they are willing to accept and to fund. Expectations need to be clearly understood and they need to be reasonable. Statistically, schools remain incredibly safe places for children to be. Perspective, reasonableness and cost are necessary criteria for communities to use in their deliberations. I know of no school system that guarantees safety and security, but I do know that the profes-

sionals in the education community will do all that they can reasonably do to maintain a safe and secure educational environment.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you about this important topic.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you, sir.

I want to thank all the witnesses for their testimony and for their observance of the 5-minute limit. That is probably the best of any panel that we have ever had in this committee ever so I trust that my colleagues are going to follow that fine example.

I am going to reserve my questions to a little bit later in the hearing, and I would like now to go to Dr. DesJarlais for the first question.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank the witnesses and all in attendance for this very important hearing and topic that affects us all. As a father with a daughter in kindergarten and also a freshman and a senior, I know that it impacts each and every one of us.

Mr. Canady, can we start with you and could you tell us how a school resource officer interacts with law enforcement community during a critical incident?

Mr. CANADY. Well, in most instances, the school resource officer is a member of the local law enforcement agency whether it be the sheriff's department or the police department. And they obviously are going to have trained prior to that or they should have in the incident command and know how to function in that role when an incident occurs so that it is—I won't say seamless—but almost seamless in terms of their role in that they would certainly once incident command is established, they would respond to the incident commander just like everyone else and follow the processes that they issue.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. What would you say the role of a school resource officer is during a typical school day?

Mr. CANADY. Well, during a typical school day, it can really vary. In my testimony I mentioned that they may be doing traffic control one minute and, you know, a few minutes later they are in a classroom teaching students about distracted driving or drunk driving, whatever it may be.

They are certainly visible. They certainly, if they are doing the job right, they are engaged with students. There is ongoing relationship building. They certainly should be a trusted adult that a student can come to for information, for guidance. So they really become part of the team.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. And so I am guessing from what you are saying, there is quite a difference depending on the age of the students in the school?

Mr. CANADY. Well, to some degree, yes, sir. I would say that officers in the middle school and high school area probably their job is similar to what I just described. At the elementary level, traditionally a lot of the work at the elementary level that has been done by the SRO has been in the classroom in an educational setting.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Just from discussions with educators from around my district and throughout the committee hearings over the

112th Congress, certainly I think that most people who are a little older and went to school at an earlier time recognize that there was more discipline, more firm handed discipline in classrooms and schools than there is today.

I see a lot of frustration from our teachers and principals feeling that their hands are somewhat tied in order to maybe shape behaviors that could prevent some of the harmful outcomes.

How much of an impact do you think that has or anyone else who would like to comment on that and what could we do to help bring a little bit more discipline back into the schools and maybe prevent some of the tragedies that occur not necessarily the type in the shooting, but other events.

Mr. CANADY. Well, any officer that has been trained by our association has clearly heard that they are not to have a hand in the formal school discipline. There is not a role for our officers in that. However, obviously, if they are walking through the hallway and they see a student doing something that they shouldn't, they should address that just like any other responsible adult, but the formal school discipline we believe belongs in the hands of the educators.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Bond, your testimony focuses a lot on post-incident recovery. Can you discuss in a little more detail some of the issues that come up during this timeframe that principals need to be prepared to deal with?

Mr. BOND. After an incident the first thing that schools have to do is to reestablish trust with the community. If the parents do not trust the school to keep their children safe, then education is not going to take place at a high level. So that is the main thing that you are trying to do is use the media, use other methods, and involve the parents in developing that trust relationship that the crisis has broken.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Okay, just quickly because my time is running out, how do local schools interact with the mental health community before and after a critical incident and what role do school-based health centers play in identifying and assisting and referring students with social and emotional challenges?

Mr. BOND. After school shootings and other crises, you always have your local mental health community and NOVA from the national come in and you have to work with students, but you also have to work with the teachers, but most importantly, you have got to get mental health services available to the parents. That is where you have the biggest problem. Most kids will feel very comfortable in talking to their teacher or trusted adult, but you have to address mental health as a whole community issue after a crisis.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Thank you, Mr. Bond.

I yield back.

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pompei, do you have school resource officers in your school or schools you have worked in?

Mr. POMPEI. Our district does.

Mr. MILLER. How do you interact with them?

Mr. POMPEI. Well, you know, they collaborate with the local law enforcement so it is a contract that they——

Mr. MILLER. But how do you interact if you are counseling students and you have resource officers. Do you talk to one another? Do you discuss students? Do you tip one another as to maybe problems that a student is having or not, so as you go through the day you are aware of these——

Mr. POMPEI. Sure. You will see an SRO in the office of a school counselor quite frequently and if not, the school counselor will seek out that SRO. Counselors are very uniquely qualified. We advocate on behalf of the well-being of that student and so we don't typically get involved in discipline. We are there, sometimes we mediate, but we do remain neutral to make sure that we keep that trusting relationship——

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Canady, is that usual?

Mr. CANADY. I think that is very consistent. And it is something that we——

Mr. MILLER. You have separate jobs but you have——

Mr. CANADY. Very separate jobs but at the same time we have the same interests and that is the well-being of the student and so an SRO who is not interacting effectively with their counselor either doesn't understand the job or is not well-trained.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Ellis, I think you said something that we say very often in this committee is that the schools are among the safest places in our environment for students. I just wonder how we measure that.

Mr. Pompei, you have discussed and I discussed in my opening that there are a lot of students on campus who are living with a certain level of fear or intimidation or acts of violence against them that are undetected, you are not aware of, but I just—what are we talking about when we talk about this blanket statement of safety. Is that against major incidents of violence or——

Mr. ELLIS. My reference was for homicides of youth on school property because that seems to be the perspective a lot of people take. And some of the statistics for instance, the Bureau Justice statistics funded by the Department of Education for instance from 1992 through 2010 revealed that less than 2 percent of all homicides of youth from 5 to 18 occur at a school.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Pompei, what happens to incidences of violence—I mean of bullying and intimidation? You mentioned you are concerned that when you were growing up and the question of whether it is your day and how that was handled and the intimidation and the physical actions against you. How is that handled today in assessing the environment of the school and how do resource officers play into that assessment of safety?

Mr. POMPEI. Well, quite frankly it is many times on certain topics, completely ignored. There is a lack of professional development that equips educators to respond effectively and appropriately using research proven strategies to address all acts of bullying but there are certain ones in more conservative areas that are completely ignored and so students such as those who identify as LGBT are forced to fend for themselves.

Many times they don't even have the support at home so, you know, in my district, we look at research. We look at what creates

a safe, inclusive welcoming school climate and then we ensure that the educators in my district have the professional development so they could then all act together in making sure that all students feel safe, welcoming.

Another thing that school counselors do that are—that is unique, if I could share—is that we will work to change those behaviors. So while the principal may order a suspension, the school counselor will work with that student to create pro-social skills and to curve that behavior so that they don't continue to bully and are using different ways to deal with their anger or their aggression.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Osher, that is sort of along the lines of what you discussed, the changes made in the Cleveland District in terms of internalizing these discussions between faculty, counselors, and students and then portioning out some responsibility and discipline.

Mr. OSHER. That is right. I mean, if I can connect your questions here, I think the real challenge in schools is not the high, the low incidence and very traumatic events that we want to prevent but it is also low-level aggression that takes place consistently and persistently as reflected in bullying statistics and things like that.

And that I would add to the issue that schools are safe, but if one looks at the 2009 Institute of Medicine Report on the Prevention of Mental Emotional Behavioral Disorders, one of the points they make is there are school effects and if I am a gay student in a school where I am being treated in a certain way or I am a vulnerable student and feeling disconnected, that has mental health implications that are harmful to me and can really affect the course of my life.

These can be addressed. They can be addressed by social emotional learning. You heard from Mr. Pompei before in terms of the meta-analysis. They can be addressed by doing something that actually was taking place at Sandy Hook, which was a program like responsive classrooms.

We have class meetings at the beginning of the day that really connect young people and teachers and enable people to really act with each other in a respectful, healthy, and academically productive way. Cleveland is actually moving in the same direction now. They are trying to create class meetings to connect people on top of the social and emotional learning so you can really build a fabric of community that holds people together.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you.

Dr. Heck?

Mr. HECK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to all of the panel members for being here today and providing us with your experiences and recommendations, and I understand a comprehensive approach to decreasing school violence is a lot more than just talking about gun violence whether it is from disruptive behaviors from bullying to gun violence but I want to concentrate on the gun violence issues.

You know, in the wake of Columbine, which seemed to be the national wake-up call, we saw then that police departments started to develop the response to the active shooter incidents, schools started to develop emergency plans. I think Mr. Canady and Mr.

Ellis talked about, I mean, you are pretty much describing national incident management system approach to emergency management and what the schools have done.

So a sharing of information of maybe how a school CCTV can be accessed by law enforcement, blueprints, things along those lines. But all of those things are reactive. It requires an incident to take place to implement the plan or to you know, kind of have the police department show up.

So what proactive measures can we put in place so that we are preventing and not responding to the incidences? That in my mind is the goal. We want to prevent the incident. We want to be prepared to respond but hopefully, never have to respond. And what role should Congress play in that process?

And I would say, Mr. Bond, in hindsight, having had one of the first incidences, what things, in hindsight would you have thought could have been in place to actually help prevent the incident as opposed to being better able to respond to the incident in Paducah?

Mr. BOND. Having everyone responsible for school safety. And by that, I mean teachers, and especially students. Students have information about what is dangerous in school, what is going on. They know more about what is going on in school than the principal does. In my particular school, eight kids saw the gun at school 4 days before the shooting took place.

Not one single one of those kids told me, told a teacher, nor did they tell their parents or Sunday school teacher or preacher. Information. Information is the most valuable thing that we can have in school and that comes from having trusting relationships with teachers, trusting relationships with students, and students taking responsibility for their own school safety.

Mr. HECK. So, I will go to Mr. Pompei then. So with that perspective, being a school counselor, how do we do that? How do we get the students to share that information or be more proactive in their own defense?

Mr. POMPEI. Sure. Well, the school counselor is actually that confidential space that kids will go to and share those really scary circumstances whether it is something they see like a gun in the school or something that they are dealing with internally or something they are experiencing at home or in the community.

I think the issue is, is that when I mentioned in my testimony, the ratios of school counselors to students is so amazingly high that students know that, and so the likelihood that they are going to seek out the support, that safe place inside the school counselor's office are somewhat minimized when they realize that if they put in a note to see the counselor, it might be 2 days before they get seen or 3 days or the counselor might just want to just talk about it casually in the hall because they know that they might not be able to call that student in because their caseload is so high.

But when you have caseloads low, these school counselors really can create those trusting wonderful relationships with students where they, and I would like to say they would more than likely come to that school counselor to say, "Hey. I need to tell you something confidentially. This is what we are experiencing. This is what we see." So that school counselor can then intervene.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Canady, I know you are primarily on building a rapport between the resource officer and the students; that certainly is a proactive approach, but anything else that you would look at that would try to help prevent these incidents rather than trying to respond to them?

Mr. CANADY. The relationship issue is so huge. You know, I think it is the most important one. You can get more information from a student when you have a positive relationship with them than you can in trying to interrogate someone. There is no question about that. So the relationship is huge, but also, I would add to that, relationship with parents. When the parents trust the SRO or the school counselor or school administrator, they are more willing to share information, which can be very helpful.

Mr. HECK. Great. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield back.

Mr. BOND. May I address that——

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentleman. We will get back to that, I am sure.

Mr. Andrews, you are recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I thank the witnesses for very, very good testimony. I want to ask your position on something. What is your opinion of authorizing personnel other than police officers to bear arms in schools? Mr. Bond, what do you think?

Mr. BOND. I think overall, it would be detrimental.

Mr. ANDREWS. Okay. I just want to be brief.—Mr. Canady, what do you think?

Mr. CANADY. Our association took a strong stance on that from the beginning and that was we would not favor the wholesale arming of teachers. We realize there are unique situations.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Pompei?

Mr. POMPEI. Absolutely disagree with that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Bontrager?

Mr. BONTRAGER. I am a security expert, I am not an expert on gun control and what we focus on is how to, if the schools decide that that is where they want to go, how do we make it as safe as possible.

Mr. ANDREWS. I understand.

Mr. Osher?

Mr. OSHER. One of my expertise is in implicit bias from social psychology. It is a very dangerous, risky, proposition.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Ellis?

Mr. ELLIS. I would agree with that. I think it is a very risky proposition, and I would not be in favor of it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Pompei, the National Association of School Counselors has a recommended ratio of 250 students to one counselor. What is your opinion about that ratio? Do you think it is accurate? Good?

Mr. POMPEI. I mean, to be honest, I would love it to be even lower than that because of the kind of work I know I could do, but I can tell you, speaking from experience in California where our ratio is above 1,000:1 and I can tell you the type of work that we know as school counselors we need to be doing, is not being done and it is not because there is not a desire to have it done. So to do the preventative work that needs to be done——

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you.

Mr. Osher, your data show apparently that two of the really effective strategies for reducing school violence are freeing up guidance counselors and psychologists. They have more time to counsel students and develop an early warning intervention system which I think strongly implies a lot of counseling interaction with students.

The national ratio of students to counselors is 470:1, which means even to come down to the present ratio, we would really have to double the number of school counselors. Would you favor a federal program to help finance such a result?

Mr. OSHER. I think that such a program is consistent with evidence that I have seen. Let me just add one thing that is also important that in many jurisdictions that I have been in, school counselors spend their time doing schedules and readmitting students who have been suspended. What you want to do is free them up, just like you would want to free school psychologists up to use the skills they have so that they can build the relationships and participate——

Mr. ANDREWS. Apropos that point, the Bill and Linda Gates Foundation commissioned a study a while back. They asked students about their perceptions of their counselors. And 60 percent of the students gave their counselors either a fair or poor grade, 35 percent of the students gave them a poor grade, the lowest one, 48 percent of the students said that they felt that they were quote—"A face in the crowd," as opposed to really understanding their counselor had some sense of who they were.

Now I attribute that frankly to the overwhelming workload the counselors have both in terms of the number of students they have and then the additional workload besides counseling. Do you think that there should be some guidelines or suggestions or rules that govern what duties school districts can assign to counselors?

I mean, I am very sensitive to not micromanaging what our schools do, and I am sure Mr. Bond would be well aware of why that is, but it does strike me that counselors are utility infielders. They are doing administrative scheduling work. Some of them are even involved in transportation work in some districts. Do you think that we should impose some requirements that they stick to the core mission? What do you think, Mr. Osher?

Mr. OSHER. I think when everyone is making policy, one has to try to structure it so that it is utilized well, and whether it is through guidelines, whether it is through technical assistance and support, I think it is important for people to know that this is an important investment and it needs to be used well.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Pompei, do you want to comment on that? Then my time is up.

Mr. POMPEI. Yes, the American School Counselor Association naturally has a national model that highlights the type of items that school counselors should be focusing on their day even to the point of percentage of time they should be focusing. It also will list those for example for administrators and school district directors to highlight what school counselors should not be focusing on.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think it is really inspiring the way you have overcome your very difficult experience to help other young people. We appreciate that very much.

Mr. POMPEI. Thank you.

Chairman KLINE. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. Walberg?

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you to the panel for being here on this important issue and challenging situation.

Mr. Canady, you acted for, as I understand it, over a decade as a supervisor for your local school services division and now you serve in a national capacity. I guess the first question I have is how have you witnessed the role of law enforcement change in dealing with school safety over the years?

Mr. CANADY. Well, one of the most important ways that I have witnessed the change is the SRO actually becoming a part of the safety team and a part of the plan. SROs who again are well-trained and understand the job get very engaged in the plan. They get very engaged in helping the school to practice the plan, different elements of it. So those are some of the changes that I think are significant.

Mr. WALBERG. I represent school districts like small rural Hillsdale County and others, larger like Lansing, Jackson, Monroe County. Is there a different role that must be taken at the local level between communities?

Mr. CANADY. As far as between the law enforcement agencies in the community?

Mr. WALBERG. Law enforcement agencies, the whole issue of security, based upon the size situation of the community.

Mr. CANADY. Yes, I think one of the things that definitely needs to happen is more focus on training. Of course, we train police officers to work in schools, but our training is also available to school administrators. So in those community environments, the teams need to be training together. School administration, law enforcement, fire department, they need to be working together in a safety team.

Mr. WALBERG. The principles are the same, but there are unique situations, right? One size doesn't fit all?

Mr. CANADY. I would say that one size does not fit all. There are very unique situations out there and yes.

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you.

Mr. Bond, in your testimony, you state, and I quote—"That the most effective way to prevent acts of violence targeted at schools is by building trusting relationships with students and others in the community so that threats come to light and can be investigated as appropriate. The solution is a matter of school culture. It is a matter of community engagement. It is a matter of public health"—end quote. Why doesn't that statement include any mention of federal involvement?

Mr. BOND. Because what I was addressing here is how we prevent school violence at the community. Of course, the federal government has oversight over all of those, but the federal government has oversight, they have the funding capacity over all of that I did mention.

Mr. WALBERG. Okay.

Mr. Bontrager, in your testimony, you talked about your work to secure local schools over the years and can you give us a sense of some of the typical—if there is any such thing as typical—but the typical security items that schools need to protect students?

Mr. BONTRAGER. You are absolutely right. There is no typical solution and it starts with a core solution that is normally around what we would call mechanical hardware. There is lots of openings, so there is lots of locks and access points and one of the most important parts is the control of the keys; who has the ability to gain access.

So having control of a keying system so that you know who can get into what portion of what room, what portion of the building, et cetera, and then it goes out from there. If there is a desire to add access control, electronic access control and video, but it starts at the core with mechanical. It goes to video and alarms and staff protection and notification from there.

Mr. WALBERG. Okay, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KLINE. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. Scott, you are recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To follow up on Dr. Heck's observations, a forensic psychologist at the University of Virginia, Dewey Cornell says in his presentations that if your school shooting prevention program begins when the shooter is at the door, it is too late. With that in mind, Mr. Osher, your testimony mentions that promotion and prevention are more effective. What do you mean by promotion and prevention?

Mr. OSHER. Sure. When I think about promotion—when I talk about promotion, I mean building assets. Assets can be through social emotional learning that develops my ability to stop and think before I do something; a competency. It can be my relationships with the counselor like Mr. Pompei.

Prevention is when we do things to try to prevent bad things from happening. When I think about positive behavioral interventions and supports that stop teachers from reacting to students or stop security officers from being negative, that is a preventive behavior.

We need to do both of them, but we want both people to know not to jump over a bridge and we also at the same time want to have railings that would prevent people from jumping over a bridge.

Mr. SCOTT. I think you mentioned that the prevention and promotion initiatives have to be comprehensive.

Mr. OSHER. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. What does that mean?

Mr. OSHER. Often times schools and districts try to do one thing and they get poor results. Comprehensive is, I think, has at least two components. One component is thinking about tiered interventions, what you do for everybody, what you do for some people who are at a more elevated level of need whether it is academically or behaviorally, and what you do for people who have greater needs.

But comprehensive is also connecting the dots and often what happens in schools and districts and in public policy is that the dots are not connected. So it is thinking about the connections between what we do in security and what we do to make—help students be engaged. Those things are not disconnected events.

When I have a metal detector outside of the school and people are waiting on line to get in and they end up getting to class late, and then a teacher may not let them in or push them in the hall because of that or the classroom dynamic is disrupted, those things are connected and we have to have plans that address all of them.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you. You also make a point that prevention and promotion are less counterproductive and have fewer harmful side effects than suppression and punishment. What kind of counterproductive or harmful side effects were you talking about?

Mr. OSHER. One big harmful side effect is the disproportionate exclusion from education for poor kids and children of colors and children with emotional and behavioral disabilities. It is the issues that the Council and state governments report that came out of Texas last year raised that this is a major issue.

The data are consistent across the country regarding profound disparities and what we also know, say from a place like New York where I am working right now, is consistently—what is happening is students doing stupid things and end up being criminalized, and the first step may be a summons, but the second step that that same person does who may be more likely to be profiled or because they have an emotional problem to be picked up is that they have a summons and the next thing you know you have a bench warrant and judges and district attorneys in New York City have been talking about their concern with that part of the pipeline to prison.

Mr. SCOTT. Are you talking about zero tolerance policies?

Mr. OSHER. The data on the way in which zero-tolerance policies are implemented are highly problematic. And again, these are functioned to deny opportunities to learn to the students who are removed, but we also know from research that they had impacts on the other students including their willingness to trust adults.

Mr. SCOTT. What does your research show about police in schools, the SRO——

Mr. OSHER. I can't hear you——

Mr. SCOTT. What does your research show about SROs? The police in the schools?

Mr. OSHER. There is little good research, but I can tell you from TA centers that I have worked that on the one hand we have seen good SROs and their work is consistent with the Denver plan that you have heard, that people may have heard about.

On the other hand, I think the issue is that with scarce resources, there are opportunity costs and when I was listening before to Mr. Pompei I think about a school in Chicago that replaced all security personnel with a counselor for each grade and as well as a counselor for the first year of college, which along with focusing on people's commitment to each other, reduced fully the amount of violence in the school and that has persisted for now 5 years.

Thinking I might get a question like this, I checked with Chicago security yesterday to get the answer and so there is an opportunity cost even if something is good.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you. The gentleman's time has expired. Dr. Roe?

Mr. ROE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

And I want to thank the panel. I have certainly learned a lot here today and I know when I was in school and perhaps any of you can take this question. I don't ever recall a school shooting. I grew up on a farm and I grew up hunting. I grew up around guns.

As soon as I was big enough, my family showed me how to hunt and shoot and I look back and looked at the data. There have been 137 school shootings since 1980—and I didn't go back further than that—with 297 deaths, fatalities that may not have included Sandy Hook. 2,000 kids each year die in automobile accidents, children do. It is a far bigger problem, but what I have—car wrecks are.

Someone, I have forgotten who it is on the panel said that schools are safe places and for the most part, they really are and to Mr. Scott's comment, I want to brag on the SRO program. In my county next to me, Sullivan County Tennessee, Kingsport is the major city in that county and its resource officer prevented—a man came into school with a gun and she stood there and faced this man down. One of the bravest women I have ever met in my life, and I don't know how many lives she saved, but I think the school resource officer program is great.

I also agree that the counseling, as Mr. Andrews said, is woefully underdone. I remember when I got out of high school I went to the counselor, the school counselor one time in 4 years. That was to tell me what I was supposed to do with the rest of my life, and just like you said, I sort of blew that off and went on.

So it is basically worthless. I hate to say that about Ms. Marable but it was basically worthless, and I just wonder on the—on the SROs, what we are doing our community, in my district is we are raising the resources now locally, put an SRO in each school in our system.

I think that is a good thing to do, but I think the other thing I learned today is we need to go a step further and make sure that we have got the prevention and as you all point out the planning and the training and the reevaluation of things on a regular basis. It is not like you do your will once when you are 25, put it on the shelf, and never get it out again until you are in the graveyard.

I think that is a great point you made that these things change each day, and Mr. Canady, I would like for you to tell me about in your association, what number of schools across the country are covered by SROs? Do you know how many? The number or anything?

Mr. CANADY. I am sorry, I couldn't hear the last part of your question.

Mr. ROE. In other words, how many schools have an SRO, a resource officer there?

Mr. CANADY. The best estimates we been able to come up with are around 10 percent. We think it is somewhere around 10 percent. We don't see a lot beyond that.

Mr. ROE. So it is a very low number then.

Mr. CANADY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROE. It is, and I agree with you. What I have seen when I—and I have got so tired of adults here in the last election that a week before the election, I went to seven schools and visited them and all of them had a resource officer and they—at least the students I saw around—he was part of the school system or she.

They were very much a part of—I mean, a lot of the kids, maybe they had gotten to know these folks and everything, but they seemed to interact. I was amazed at how well and how much trust they had and I think that is—goes for both Mr. Pompei, you and Mr. Canady, the trust that the students gain to when they get to know if you take the time to get out and do that and I think they will share a lot of things with the resource officer, with the school counselor if they are available and it sounds like they are not available if only 10 percent of schools have them and if in your case in California where one in 1000, that is, that is almost as well not have one if you have that few. Any comment?

Mr. CANADY. Well, it certainly, you know, we are not calling for more police in schools. What we are asking for are the ones that go in the schools that they are properly trained. However, I certainly know the benefits of an SRO. I have seen it firsthand for several years, and I can certainly speak to that and I believe any school could benefit from one again if they are properly selected properly trained.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Bond?

Mr. BOND. Is Campbell County Tennessee in your district, Mr. Roe?

Mr. ROE. No sir, just out of it.

Mr. BOND. Just out of your district. In 2005 in Campbell County, an assistant principal was killed. And that school did not have an SRO and they heard a kid had a gun on campus and two assistant principals and the principal tried to disarm him. He shot all three of them in 3 seconds. One died, one has a bullet an inch behind his heart, and the principal had his bladder exploded. Had they had an SRO, they would have been able to search that young man without that happening.

Mr. ROE. I think the decision has been made in our community and I am ready to yield back is that we are going to have SROs, and I certainly will take the other things back from this panel.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KLINE. Gentleman's time is expired.

Mrs. McCarthy?

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I truly thank you for having this hearing.

I am hopeful that we are going to have more hearings on school safety because the testimony that we have heard today, which I think is excellent and I think each person here has put out some good points. But the truth of the matter is, we don't know, whether most schools can even have an SRO; we don't know if they can afford it.

Counselors, we know that we don't have enough counselors. My former life was a nurse. I know darn well we don't have enough nurses in schools, and we know, especially in the grade schools and the middle schools that is where most kids that are troubled are

first referred to services. The nurse brings them to the counselor or to someone that would need help.

But, you know, there is a lot of people here—certainly here in this committee—know that I am not a stranger to the debate on gun violence and how can we prevent it. I certainly offered the last major piece of legislation on this issue that had to do with Virginia Tech, but I have to say that I agree with Mr. Ellis that what happened in Connecticut was a terrible, terrible tragedy, but I don't want my schools to start to panic because the majority of my schools they are the safest places some of these young people go to especially in certain neighborhoods and depending on the community that they are living from.

We certainly know that a lot of young people are killed going to school and coming out of school or hanging out at the school. So I think that, you know, while this committee can do some work to make schools safer from gun violence, you know, my personal belief is that we need to do something in tandem with trying to reduce gun violence outside the school—and that has to do with gun violence prevention—this is something that everybody should be thinking about.

Mr. Palmer, you know, couple years ago, I was the chairwoman here on Healthy Families and Communities Subcommittee and I had a hearing on cyber bullying, and even to this day, we do not have enough information in our schools to talk about cyber bullying.

We have worked with many, many organizations, Girl Scouts of America, who found out their young ladies some of them the worst of those that were actually, we used to call it "picking on a kid". It is not that way anymore and something that goes on Facebook is there forever, and we need to do more on that and I think that is important and that is something that can be done within the school.

So I understand what you went through and I really appreciate that you took that and made it your career to help others and I think that is extremely important and unfortunately some of these sad things that happen in our lives makes us activists in one way or the other.

But Mr. Canady, I was interested in what you were saying. You mentioned that the school resource officers should always operate with a memorandum of understanding between law enforcement and the school district. Is this always the case?

Mr. CANADY. I am sorry, I couldn't hear the last part.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. In your testimony, when you were speaking, you had said that the school and the SROs should actually have a memorandum of understanding on how to work together.

Mr. CANADY. Yes——

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Is this always the case?

Mr. CANADY. I understand the question now. It is not always the case, unfortunately. It should be. That is the foundation for a program to be successful. Without that, it is very difficult for it to succeed.

So the MOU is one of the things we have been teaching for 23 years now, and I see that as to some degree, not that I know the details, but it appears to me that is what is happening in Denver

is that the city and school district are coming together and putting an MOU in place and agreeing to work together.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. And when we talk about possibly if it is only 10 percent of having school resources, SROs in the schools, obviously what we are going through here, whether the money comes from Washington, goes down to the state from the state to our schools, we are not going to have, never have the resources that are needed unfortunately.

But I also believe very, very strongly as we, many of us have been working on reducing gun violence, a strong component of that is really to be able to have mental health providers in schools, whether they are psychologist, psychiatrists. I don't know too many schools that have a psychiatrist, inside the school, talk to the teachers.

The teachers can pick out these young people that have problems right away, but then how do we get the parents to react to that. So these are a lot of things that I happen to think this committee should really be looking into because if we are going to keep our schools as safe as possible, I think that we really, really have to have a comprehensive program.

Thank you.

Chairman KLINE. The gentlelady's time has expired. We are looking at votes probably in the next 20 to 25 minutes. So after discussion with the ranking member, I am going to reduce members' time to 3 minutes instead of 5 minutes so pay attention.

Mr. Rokita, you are recognized.

Mr. ROKITA. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I also want to thank all of you for your testimonies. It has been very educational for me. I happen to be the subcommittee chair for K-12 here on this committee and I share Ranking Member McCarthy's comments as well on everything she said on these issues.

So let me quickly—I also happen to be a member of the budget committee here in the House and so my mind especially this time of year turns to that type of work.

For Mr. Bond, maybe Mr. Ellis as well and anyone else who wants to respond, how much does it cost local school districts to develop and implement a school safety plan? Especially noting that it is a living document.

Mr. BOND. School safety plan is just part of what goes into being the administrator and professional development. A day of professional development, 1 day of professional development costs one, two-hundredths of the school's budget.

Mr. ROKITA. Okay.

Mr. BOND. So——

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Ellis, anything to add to that?

I don't mean to cut you off, but——

Mr. ELLIS. I think the simple answer is it depends. It depends on the expertise——

Mr. ROKITA. Are you a lawyer? [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLIS. No, I am not. I think—if I could finish—it depends on the expertise available in the school system. It depends on the expertise available in the local community, for instance through the Office of Emergency Management and locality, what kind of re-

sources can come to bare to assist the school to develop those kinds of plans.

Mr. ROKITA. Do any of you know if there is any specific federal program or funding that goes to helping plan these or create these plans?

Mr. ELLIS. There used to——

Mr. BOND. Title——

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Bond?

Mr. BOND. Title IV that used to exist, Title IV all went to school safety in the——

Mr. ROKITA. No, but for the planning? Do you have a flexibility to use that money to create your plan and implement it?

Mr. BOND. Title IV allowed you to develop the plan, have professional development on it, bring in expertise, yes, Title IV does that.

Mr. ELLIS. And there used to be grants——

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Ellis?

Mr. Ellis [continuing]. Through the Department of Education's Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools, the REMS Grants, the Readiness and Emergency Management in Schools. It is my understanding those do not exist anymore since 2011.

Mr. ROKITA. Okay.

Mr. Bontrager, real quick, while I have you here, thank you for your presence in Indiana, too. I played hockey just down the street from where you guys have 1500 or so employees.

Your testimony talks about how educators have a lot on their plates trying to educate students and are now expected to be—people trying to educate students are now expected to be an expert on school security. Can you talk a little bit more about how private companies can help to defray some of these costs and so forth?

And when you put the hardware in, do you kind of just turn it over or do you help the training as well?

Mr. BONTRAGER. So two things. I think a lot of the solutions, a lot of the products exist in the market and the schools need to be made aware of them as opposed to trying to figure out what can we do, we need to find a way to pair them with people that know what the opportunities, what the solutions are that can be implemented at those schools.

And no, the answer to your second question is we provide training specifically for people as simple as locking systems to wireless locks. We bring them to our facilities to train the employees in the school as to how they work so that they can train others and keep the program alive and keep the integrity of the program as the years go on.

Mr. ROKITA. Thank you, all. My time is expired.

Chairman KLINE. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Courtney? And there will be a little bit of latitude here, understanding your connection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And again I just wanted to make a note that as someone who represents a district that is about a 50-minute drive from Newtown, I really want to thank the chairman for holding this hearing.

This is the first hearing in the House side since the Sandy Hook incident took place and I just want you to know that it has not gone unnoticed and hopefully, some of our colleagues in other areas

of jurisdiction in the house are going to take the incredible outpouring of reaction in response to Newtown as seriously as you did. And again, with that, I just, again, want to reiterate my thanks.

Thank you to the panel. I am sort of an all-of-the-above guy in terms of a lot of the ideas that are being presented here today. You know, in particular, the teamwork between school resource officers, school health base centers, school counselors is something I have witnessed repeatedly over the last month and a half or so talking to school districts in Connecticut and they are a team when they are working the right way.

And also what I heard is that one of the reasons why it is not like the good old days is that kids are coming to school with severe diagnosed conditions of mental health illness at shockingly young ages and the one item that I heard again, repeatedly, from school counselors and educators is the fact that again, even when you have got a fairly robust system of counselors and school-based health centers, the fact is, is that sometimes you need to refer out into the community for pediatric psychiatrists and adolescent psychiatrists.

And in a state with Yale Medical School and UConn Health Center turning out physicians, this is not an area of profession where frankly we don't have near enough bodies out there to deal. I mean, the waiting time for even emergency situations is just, it is really just unacceptable.

And I just want to see, Mr. Pompei if you can sort of confirm that experience as well; the need to refer out, which is required sometimes, is really very difficult.

Mr. POMPEI. Absolutely. School counselors, school nurses, we very much are aware of who is in the community. So part of our job is that middle person, that collaborator with the communities. So we are the person the administrator will come to if they find out that there is a need because they know the school counselor will have access in their file drawer right, you know, readily available to make sure that they can make those recommendations.

We work very, very closely with the community-based mental health professionals for long-term care and then we collaborate with them so once they are getting that long-term care, we can provide the changes that are needed to make a positive transition for that student to come back to school, making sure we are working with the teachers to say hey, these are triggers for the student and making sure that they are getting the training and then meeting with the student as follow up for the rest of the school day.

Mr. COURTNEY. So again, as we try to consider what to do in response to the situation, you know, I think it is important for us to know that there is a loan forgiveness program for pediatric and adolescent psychiatry, which through the National Health Service Corps, which is going to expire this year, and to me, this is an issue which our committee should look at.

It deals with the needs of young people and it deals with obviously a workforce gap that is out there and we can fix that by reextending that.

And I would just lastly add, Mr. Bontrager, your point about trying to find a place for people to sort of get best practices, the REMS technical assistance program at the U.S. Department of Education

actually still does exist. They do do webinars. They do have online information, but frankly, we should also try and follow that up with some more resources, and I don't know if you want to comment on that, and I will be done.

Mr. BONTRAGER. Yes, I know it is the TA does exist, but the grants are no longer being offered for localities.

Mr. COURTNEY. Right.

Mr. OSHER. Could I just then say that the Department of Education has brought the REMS TA Center along with the National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments that I lead together to make sure that we coordinate our activities in response to these issues and to try to make those connections.

Chairman KLINE. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. Guthrie?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Bond, for coming up from home. I appreciate you being here and I know what happened in your school, the tragedy was there, as the way you reacted, your school, the Paducah community is something that—I know it still reverberates there and we appreciate you coming here to share your experiences because hopefully there are very few people that have the experiences you have and you can share those to other schools.

But my question I guess since in 1998, the legislature passed in Kentucky the school safety at Eastern Kentucky University bullying and all the things that went forward. And since 1997, you have now in school safety, what now that you knew then, what have you learned or what do you think is available to professional development, what you would have learned, what your teachers learn—I know this is very speculative—but if you knew then, what you know now, do you think Mr. Carneal would have been prevented from doing what—other than—hopefully a kid now will say, "I saw a gun at school." Hopefully that—that would hopefully be evident, but what other things? Because I understand he was a mentally ill and troubled student in a lot of ways.

Mr. BOND. I think what I have learned, Mr. Guthrie, is that communication cannot be replaced with anything; money, any commitment, communication with the people involved in the school, the trusting each other, understanding that we are all responsible for each other cannot be replaced by locks, police officers, cameras. That is the ultimate thing that we have to develop. We all play a part of that; SROs, counselors, principals, school nurses. We are all in this together.

Mr. GUTHRIE. When you see somebody with his behavior now today, there are—I mean, he was a loner, understanding a lot of the——

Mr. BOND. No, sir. Mr. Carneal was an A/B student. He was in the band.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I knew he did well, but I——

Mr. BOND. His father was an attorney. His sister was a valedictorian.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes, I have met her.

Mr. BOND. He wasn't a loner. He had never had a disciplinary write up in his life.

Mr. GUTHRIE. It just——

Mr. BOND. He had never been in the principal's office for being in trouble until he brought all those guns and killed those people.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Because that would be difficult to spot somebody like that. That is what the concern is, I guess. We appreciate you Mr. Pompei went to the counseling—how you——

Mr. POMPEI. Well, I hear from my colleagues in like sometimes when school counselors will go into a lesson in a classroom and I have been in a classroom where I have noticed a behavior that in our—you know, training that school counselors get when we get credentials, that sometimes we notice things that teachers or an administrator that never had that training can spot.

And then that is when we will start to work with that student so that we can deal with and try to, you know, probe and find out if something is going on there. I am not saying that a school counselor would have been able to identify that, but it is very common for a school counselor to spot things because of the training we receive that other educators at the school system might not. So——

Mr. GUTHRIE. Thank you.

I yield back.

Chairman KLINE. Gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. Wilson?

Ms. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think that in every tragic incident we have within school violence we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have done something to prevent this and I think that there is not a one-size-fits-all for all schools.

I represent a school district, two school districts; one that has a full police force, the other has just a few SROs, but that is the difference in the school districts. But I think one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors, enough social workers, and mentors for the children. That is all of them. Whether they have SROs or whatever else they have, and I don't think it is so much for the counselor to detect who needs help.

The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few, so children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, they don't have anyone that they really trust in the school to speak with because there are so few counselors and they are always busy. They are planning for college and testing, et cetera.

So the one thing I think we need to do is expand the pool of school counselors, and social workers who can make home visits after the school counselor gives them recommendations and also mentors from the community because a lot of times it is just a matter of miscommunication. "I don't know who I could have gone to for help."

And I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are in prison, in jail, with just one person being available to help them through a bad day, to help them through anger, to help them through bullying, to help them through mommy and daddy getting a divorce, or mommy getting beat-up the night before, or mommy is a crack addict, whatever.

But to me, I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the numbers of counselors? I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a

difference it would make for children in schools. And I would like to get your reaction. I am a former school principal and——

Chairman KLINE. The gentlelady's time has expired.

I think it is an excellent question. We would like to get that for the record if we could from the witnesses. We can get the response.

Ms. WILSON. Thank you.

Chairman KLINE. Ms. Bonamici?

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you very much, Chairman Kline and Ranking Member Miller, for having this important hearing.

And thank you to the panel for your excellent testimony. I have two questions, and in the interest of time, I will ask them both together and then ask for your response.

First, thank you so much for your discussion about prevention. It is so important. And I would like you to perhaps, Mr. Bond and Mr. Pompei, talk briefly about that barriers, other than resources, which we understand, and the ratio that is too high, what are the barriers? Are there student privacy barriers or other barriers to prevention?

My second question has to do with a different kind of school safety and Mr. Ellis, you mentioned natural disasters as a school safety issue. Oregon, my state, is due for a major earthquake along the Cascadia fault and there are schools that are along that coast there that are in the fault zone and will likely result—there will be a tsunami there. And so we have dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure and because we are so close to the fault, we don't have very much response time.

So we take this very seriously, and I wonder if anyone has experience in planning for this type of natural disaster.

So first the barriers to mental health and then the emergency preparedness aspect. Thank you.

Mr. BOND. I keep coming back to the same thing, communication, but schools haven't adapted to modern communication that kids use. In the old days, we could put a box out and say drop a note in. Kids don't drop notes. We could have hotlines. Kids don't use telephones.

We have to have mechanisms in place where kids can send text messages with their concern, e-mail messages with their concern, but setting the system up is easy part, but then we have to have someone like a counselor that has time to monitor those and follow up because if you ask kids to give you information and you don't follow up on that information, you will never get any information from that child again.

You have to follow up with the child's concern, and we don't have those resources in place to follow up with those children's concerns.

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you.

Mr. Pompei?

Mr. POMPEI. And the number one barrier, I know that you mentioned—other than school—the student to school counselor ratio—that would be the number one barrier—but as far as school climate as a whole and the well-being of the child as a whole, I would say the number one—me speaking as a school counselor—would be the lack of professional development that is connected to what does research say, what are the research-proven ways that create a safe, nurturing, inclusive, welcoming school climate for all kids.

Very much the professional development is connected to helping the students learn algebra, helping the students learn English, helping teaching vocabulary, and it has completely avoided the professional development on that topic even though the research has the connection; when they feel safe and connected, they are more likely to learn.

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you.

And I see that my time has expired, so perhaps I can get some response after the hearing on the record about the preparing for natural disasters and that safety aspect.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KLINE. Thank the gentlelady, her time is expired, and we would appreciate response if you have—you are poised to answer that question about natural response, we would like to get that for the record.

I have held off my questions until the end here trying to make sure that we got questions in before we went to vote, and I am not going to ask a question now because it is I am sure a lengthy answer, but I just want to make this observation. Listening to the discussion here today, how many times your responses, almost everybody, has talked about the need to have a trusted adult and to have communications between the students and those trusted adults and communications between students and students.

And it seems to me that is an area where schools will be well-advised to make sure that their staff beyond just the counselors—and I very much appreciate that work—and beyond just the officers in the school, but for there to be an education training awareness program so that teachers and administrators are seen as trusted adults and the students can talk to them.

I was just struck by again and again as we went back and forth how that theme continued to play out.

Let me yield to Mr. Miller for any closing remarks he might have.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, again, thank you very much for the hearing. I think you heard from our members how important they thought this was.

And thank you again to the panel. I assume we will have additional hearings on this. Thank you.

Chairman KLINE. Thank the gentleman.

And again, I want to thank the witnesses. Truly an excellent panel. Marvelous resource. Of course we picked you, so I guess we get some credit here, but truly marvelous and thank you very much for your testimony and your responsiveness.

And with that the committee stands adjourned.

[Additional submissions for the record from Mr. Miller follow:]

Prepared Statement of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD)

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD), a division of CEC, are pleased to offer testimony for the House Education and the Workforce hearing, Protecting Students and Teachers: A Discussion on School Safety.

The tragic events that took place in Newtown, Connecticut in December, 2012 whereby 26 young students and educators were killed by gunfire, must serve as motivation for significant changes at the federal, state and local levels to address violence in our nation's schools and communities. While this heartbreaking event con-

tinues to capture the national spotlight, we know that, unfortunately, far too many of our students experience violence on a regular basis in their schools and neighborhoods. The country is looking to the Congress and the Administration for leadership to address the issue of safety in our schools and communities.

Members of CEC and CCBD serve on the frontline, working in schools with children and youth with disabilities and other at-risk students as special education teachers, behavioral specialists, school administrators, or higher education faculty who are preparing the next generation of educators. As a result, CEC/CCBD members are professionally trained to understand the complexities of children and youth with disabilities, including the 371,600 students[1] with diagnosed emotional and behavioral disorders. Through this work, it has become clear that Congress should pursue the following policy recommendations:

1. School safety policy proposals should use an interdisciplinary approach that reinforces a partnership between education, juvenile justice, mental health, social welfare, and community engagement systems;
2. School safety policy proposals should require implementation of evidence based practices that address prevention and response while ameliorating the stigma associated with mental illness;
3. School safety policy proposals should focus on the impact of mental health challenges on students' social, educational, and employment outcomes; and
4. School safety policy proposals should confront and remedy the national shortage of special educators and specialized instructional support personnel who are trained to address the complex needs of students with mental health difficulties.

Below, we provide a rationale for the above recommendations.

First, it is vital that policy proposals—whether at the federal, state, or local level—use an approach that reinforces interdisciplinary partnerships between education, juvenile justice, mental health, social welfare, an, including community engagement systems. This approach is necessary because "school violence is not a single problem amenable to a simple solution but, rather, involves a variety of problems and challenges."[2] While it is tempting to address single issues—such as installing metal detectors at entry points in school buildings—research has demonstrated that it is necessary to address school safety using a comprehensive, coordinated approach.

Second, in the wake of national tragedies, it has been common to see implementation of policies which represent a knee-jerk response rather than those rooted in evidence and research. It is critical that we learn from past practices and look to research and evidence to determine successful practices and policies. Similar to the adage, the best offense is a good defense, we have learned through research and practice about the importance of focusing on prevention. In response to the events at Sandy Hook Elementary School, over100 national organizations representing over 4 million professionals in education and allied fields and over 100 prominent researchers and practitioners supported a statement issued by the Interdisciplinary Group on Preventing School and Community Violence, which stated, "Preventing violence and protecting students includes a variety of efforts addressing physical safety, educational practices, and programs that support the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of students."[3]

A review of past initiatives must help inform us of how to move forward today. Policies such as zero tolerance, which the American Psychological Association found to be ineffective; profiling, for which the U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education revealed no accurate or useful demographic or social profile of school attackers;[4] and other simplistic solutions, have not had their intended effect.

Instead, school safety policies should encourage strategies that support prevention and are rooted in research, such as:

- Fostering Communication: "Comprehensive analyses by the U.S. Secret Service, the FBI, and numerous researchers have concluded that the most effective way to

---

[1] "Number of Students ages 6 through 21 served under IDEA, Part B, by disability and state." U.S. Department of Education, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Data. Data Accountability Center, n.d. Web. 26 Feb 2013. *http://www.ideadata.org/arc—toc13.asp*

[2] Cornell, Dewey G., and Matthew J. Mayer. "Why Do School Order and Safety Matter?" Educational Researcher. 39.1 (2010): 7-15. Print.

[3] Interdisciplinary Group on Preventing School and Community Violence. Call for More Effective Prevention of Violence. Dec. 19, 2012. Web. *http://curry.virginia.edu/articles/sandyhookshooting.*

[4] Borum, Randy, Dewey G. Cornell, William Modzeleski, and Shane Jimerson. "What Can Be Done About School Shootings? A Review of the Evidence." Educational Researcher. 39.1 (2010): 27-37. Print.

prevent many acts of violence targeted at schools is by maintaining close communication and trust with students and others in the community."[5]

Practically, this means policies must (1) support professional development and training for school staff—including teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, and administrators—regarding effective communication strategies and initiatives; (2) employ a cadre of staff who are professionally trained to address the mental health needs of students; and (3) support changes to teacher preparation programs which reinforce the importance of communication.

• Supporting a Positive School Climate and Connectedness: School climate, which impacts school safety, teaching and learning, interpersonal relationships, and institutional environment, according to researchers cited by the U.S. Department of Education, plays an integral role into the academic and social development of students. Research has demonstrated that a positive school climate helps create a culture of respect, understanding, and caring among educators and students where members of the school community feel physically and emotionally safe and secure, and facilitates an environment conducive to learning.

Practically, this means: (1) embracing whole school reforms that reinforce the important role of having a positive school climate, such as Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports; (2) supporting this shift in mindset with the tools and resources needed to foster its implementation, such as professional development and training, and (3) data collection and analysis tools to help schools study and respond to local school climate information.

• Addressing Needs of Marginalized Students: "Research indicates that those students most at risk for delinquency and violence are often those who are most alienated from the school community. Schools need to reach out to build positive connections to marginalized students, showing concern and fostering avenues for meaningful involvement."

Practically, this means: We need to confront and address the persistent national shortage of special educators who are trained to address the complex needs of students with behavioral disorders and the shortage of specialized instructional support personnel such as school counselors, school social workers, and school psychologists who are underutilized and underemployed in schools. In 2011, the U.S. Department of Education reported a shortage of special educators in every state, continuing a decades-long trend.[6]

• Increasing school based mental health services: School based mental health services for purposes of screening, providing direct services, engaging and supporting families, and serving as a connection to community based supports, are critical to providing the prevention, response, and treatment that are so vital to students' well-being. We must confront the stigma associated with mental health problems through multiple avenues, including making it an integral part of our educational system.

Practically, this means: Addressing the national shortage of special educators and specialized instructional support personnel by reducing the ratios of students to school counselors to 250:1, school social workers to 250:1, school psychologists 1,000:1, school nurses (750:1) and often increasing the number of other professionals who are specifically trained to address the mental health needs of students. In many schools, these professionals carry a caseload that far exceeds the recommended ratios above and far too often, no school-based mental health and student service providers are available to assist students in times of crisis, or at any other time.

In closing, CEC/CCBD stands ready to work with members of Congress to promote policies and meaningful actions not only to address violence in our nation's schools and communities but to create solutions that are rooted in safety, prevention, and an interdisciplinary approach.

Prepared Statement of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.

I. Introduction

The horrific killing of 26 children and adults last December at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut shook our nation to its core. We continue to grieve with the families of those lost in the senseless act of violence, as well as

[5] Interdisciplinary Group on Preventing School and Community Violence. Call for More Effective Prevention of Violence. Dec. 19, 2012. Web. *http://curry.virginia.edu/articles/sandyhookshooting*.

[6] United States. Department of Education Office of Post Secondary Education. Teacher Shortage Areas Nationwide Listing: 1990-1991 through 2012-2013. 2012. Web.

those in Newtown who face continual reminders of the loss of their friends and neighbors. We thank Chairman Kline, Ranking Member Miller, and Members of the Committee for convening a hearing to discuss this very important issue.

It is intuitive that safe schools are essential to student learning. If students are not safe or feel threatened, they cannot learn. Experience and research show us that the right policies and practices implemented to achieve school safety can have powerful effects that transcend preventing danger in schools. Indeed, such measures can also lead to increased academic performance, higher graduation rates, and lower rates of disciplinary infractions. Conversely, some well-intended but ill-conceived practices implemented in the name of safety can lead to lower academic performance, dropping out of school, and higher rates of involvement with the juvenile and criminal justice systems, especially for students of color. Both the impressive potential of well-founded school safety practices and the damaging effects of misguided approaches make this issue central to any discussion regarding educational opportunity.

The tragic shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School have reminded us that even public schools, some of our nation's safest places, can experience unspeakable violence. Since Sandy Hook, several proposals aimed at improving the safety of schools by increasing the number of security personnel have come forth. The National Rifle Association (NRA) suggested that every school in America should have an armed police officer.[1] Maricopa County, Arizona, Sheriff Joe Arpaio has placed 500 armed, uniformed volunteers outside the schools in his county.[2] And close to Washington D.C., Prince George's County, Maryland, has proposed creating a new police force for schools.[3] Likewise, Montgomery County, Maryland aims to double the number of School Resource Officers for schools within the county.[4]

Although we all seek to ensure the safety of all schoolchildren, proposals such as those described above ignore the lessons from previous tragedies about what works to prevent school violence. We urge the Committee to help our nation learn from such tragedies in crafting legislative solutions to this one.

II. "Zero-Tolerance" Policies and School Police Have Not Meaningfully Improved School Safety

Following tragic shootings like that at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, many states and school districts have adopted and implemented "get tough" approaches to monitoring school environments, such as zero-tolerance policies.[5] Many also dramatically expanded the use of security equipment, such as metal detectors and surveillance cameras, as well as deploying additional police in schools.[6] While well-intended, history and experience have shown that these approaches to school safety fail to address the actual issues that negatively impact students and school safety.[7]

Designed to address only the most serious school-based incidents, both zero-tolerance disciplinary policies and police presence in schools are far too often applied to routine instances of student misbehavior. While there is no indication that student behavior has worsened, school discipline rates are at their all-time highs, double what they were in the 1970s.[8] The Department of Education's most recent Civil Rights Data Collection shows that, in the 2009-2010 school year, over 3,000,000 students were suspended.[9] Meanwhile, students who attend schools with embedded law enforcement personnel are frequently confronted with citations, summonses, and even arrested for non-criminal behavior.[10] At a statewide level, the effect is alarming: for example, in Florida, almost 17,000 students per year in the 2010-2011 school year, that is, 45 per day, were referred to juvenile courts by school-based law enforcement.[11] The overwhelming majority of these referrals were for misdemeanors, such as disruption of a school function or disorderly conduct.[12]

Students of color, African Americans in particular, suffer disproportionately from these approaches. The Department of Education's Civil Rights Data Collection indicates that "across all districts, African-American students are over 3½ times more likely to be suspended or expelled than their white peers."[13] State-level data suggests similarly stark racial disparities in students' contact with police. For example, African-American students were three and half times more likely to be arrested in school than White students in Delaware in 2010-2011.[14] That same year, African Americans comprised only 21% of Florida school enrollment, but accounted for 46% of all school-related referrals to law enforcement.[15]

A wealth of research indicates that reliance on police and exclusionary discipline are ineffective at making schools safer. The American Psychological Association has found that there is no evidence to support the suggestion that using suspension, expulsion, or zero-tolerance policies results in increases in school safety or improvements in student behavior.[16] In fact, exclusionary discipline practices have negative effects on student academic performance: students who are suspended and/or ex-

pelled, especially those who are repeatedly disciplined, are far more likely to be held back a grade, drop out of school, or become involved in the juvenile or criminal justice system than are students who do not face exclusionary discipline.[17] Moreover, students who are arrested are two times as likely to drop out as their peers.[18]

The individuals experiencing arrest or exclusionary discipline are not the only ones who are harmed by these practices. Indeed, research shows that schools with high suspension rates score lower on state accountability tests, even when adjusting for demographic differences.[19] And when schools involve police in disciplinary measures, schools can alienate students and create distrust, thus undermining order and safety.[20]

Involving courts and police in addressing school matters exacts a high financial toll on the nation. The Texas Public Policy Foundation has called for reforms to school-to-court referral practices because of their high costs and low levels of effectiveness.[21]

Last December, during a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee hearing, Acting Administrator for the Department of Justices' Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Melodee Hanes testified to the high cost and debilitating administrative burden placed on juvenile courts and juvenile detention facilities created by the high number of school-to-court referrals for school-based misconduct that is more appropriately dealt with in the context of school discipline.[22]

III. School Violence Is Best Prevented by Building Trust between Students and Educators

In the aftermath of the shootings at Columbine High School, the U.S. Department of Education and the Secret Service explained that the best way to prevent violence targeted at schools is to improve connectedness and communication between students and educators.[23] If students feel they can trust an educator, they are far more likely to share any tips on, or fears about, school safety as well as any personal concerns about bullying, harassment, and discrimination.[24] There are several proven approaches to improving a school's learning environment that help build trust between students and teachers.

Notably, recent research suggests that involving police in school discipline can breed student alienation and distrust, severing the connectedness for which both ED and the Secret Service have called.[25]

School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) is an evidence-based approach to school discipline shown to reduce disciplinary referrals, support improvements in student attendance and academic achievement, and improve teacher perceptions of school safety.[26] Schools implementing SWPBS define and teach school-wide expectations for student conduct and acknowledge students' positive behavior.[27] SWPBS schools monitor trends in disciplinary data to guide school-wide interventions. For example, a significant number of disciplinary referrals originating in a hallway could spur a school to station more teachers there during passing periods. Similarly, schools provide targeted and individualized supports to students who receive more disciplinary referrals than others. Such supports can be as simple as regular check-ins with one educator and as intensive as wraparound services for those students whose needs warrant them.

Over 16,000 U.S. public schools have received training in SWPBS.[28] When two Illinois middle schools merged to form Alton Middle School in 2006, the school's disciplinary rates spiked significantly. After implementing SWPBS and training teachers in addressing racial bias, Alton became a far more orderly school and reduced its suspension rate by 25% with the most significant drop of African-American students.[29]

Restorative Justice is a promising approach to resolving conflicts within a school community in ways that strengthen bonds among students and between students and educators.[30] To promote reconciliation and mutual responsibility, schools implementing restorative justice engage all members of the school community affected by a conflict in addressing and resolving it. Denver Public Schools revised its discipline code around the principles of restorative justice and has cut its suspension rate in half, its expulsion rate by a third, and its rate of referrals to law enforcement by ten percent since then.[31]

School Offense Protocols are being implemented in jurisdictions in Georgia, Connecticut, and Kansas, among other states.[32] Piloted in Clayton County, Georgia, school offense protocols delineate between matters of safety, to be handled by law enforcement, and matters of discipline, to be handled by educators.[33] After a 1248 percent increase in court referrals from schools, 90% of which were for misdemeanors, the Clayton County Juvenile Court convened representatives from the school district, law enforcement, and mental health and wellness providers.[34] The resulting protocol has led to a near 70 percent drop in court referrals from schools

and a 24 percent increase in graduation rates.[35] Notably, the school district's referral rates for weapons possession (mandatory referrals under state law) dropped by over 60 percent since the protocol's implementation.[36]

IV. Recommendations

1. Support best practices in school climate to improve trust and help prevent school violence.

The Positive Behavior for Safe and Effective Schools Act (H.R. 3165, 112th Cong.) and the Restorative Justice in Schools Act (H.R. 415, 112th Cong.) would facilitate training in, and implementation of, the best practices described above and would be essential additions to a reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

2. Monitor school climate to provide assistance—not punishment—to schools from local and state educational agencies.

School discipline and climate should serve as indicators of a school's success or needs and should be monitored with attendance, achievement, and graduation rates. Representative George Miller's Amendment to the Student Success Act (H.R. 3989, 112th Cong.), which would track school discipline rates as an indicator of school improvement in persistently low-achieving schools, is a promising example.

3. Support the development of comprehensive local or regional strategies to improve student safety while reducing the number of youth entering the justice system.

Congress should promote expanded educational opportunities for youth by supporting community-based solutions such as those implemented in Clayton County (described above). Funds should go toward the development and implementation of multi-year, comprehensive local or regional plans to reduce the use of exclusionary discipline and the number of youth entering the juvenile and criminal justice systems. The Youth PROMISE Act (H.R. 2721, 112th Cong.) would help support this purpose.

ENDNOTES

[1] Wayne LaPierre, Remarks at NRA Press Conference (Dec. 21, 2012) (transcript available at *http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2012/12/21/us/nra-news-conference-transcript.html).*

[2] Nirvi Shah, Nations, Districts Step Up Safety, Education Week, Jan. 23, 2013, at 1.

[3] Donna St. George & Ovetta Wiggins, Schools Taking Serious Look at Putting Armed Police in Schools after Massacre, Wash. Post, Feb. 7, 2013, at A1.

[4] Id.

[5] Russell Skiba et al., Are Zero Tolerance Policies Effective in the Schools? A Report by the American Psychological Association Task Force 23-25 (2006), available at *http://www.apa.org/pubs/info/reports/zero-tolerance-report.pdf.*

[6] Id.

[7] See, Amanda Petteruti, Justice Policy Institute, Education Under Arrest: the Case against Police in Schools (2011).

[8] Johanna Wald and Daniel Losen, Defining and Redirecting a School-to-Prison Pipeline. In Wald & Losen (Eds.), New Directions for Youth Development (no. 99; Deconstructing the School-to-Prison Pipeline) 9-15 (2003).

[9] Daniel Losen and Jonathan Gillespie, Opportunities Suspended: the Disparate Impact of Disciplinary Exclusion from School 6 (2012).

[10] See, Amanda Petteruti, supra note 7.

[11] Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Delinquency in Florida's Schools: A Seven Year Study 3 (2011), available at *http://www.djj.state.fl.us/docs/research2/2010-11-delinquency-in-schools-analysis.pdf?sfvrsn=0.*

[12] Id. at 8-9; ACLU of Florida, Advancement Project, & Florida State Conference of the NAACP, Still Haven't Shut Down the School-to-Prison Pipeline 6-8 (2011).

[13] OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, CIVIL RIGHTS DATA COLLECTION SUMMARY 2 (2012). *http://ocrdata.ed.gov/Downloads/CMOCRTheTransformedCRDCFINAL3-15-12Accessible-1.pdf.* Despite being only 18% of students in the Civil Rights Data Collection sample, African-American students were 35% of students suspended once, 46% of those suspended more than once, and 39% of students expelled. Furthermore, the CRDC indicates that "Over 70% of students involved in school-related arrests or referred to law enforcement are Hispanic or African-American."

[14] Chief Judge Chandlee Johnson Kuhn, Family Court of the State of Delaware & Kerrin C. Wolf, Fightin' and Fussin': An Examination of School Arrests, Adjudications, and Dispositions in Delaware (presentation on file with the authors).

[15] Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, supra note 11 at 3.

[16] Skiba et al, supra note 5 at 71-79.

[17] Tony Fabelo et al., Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Relates to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement x, 40-46, (2011).

[18] Gary Sweeten, Who Will Graduate? Disruption of High School Education by Arrest and Court Involvement 23 JUST. Q. 462 (2006).

[19] Skiba et al, supra note 5 at 44-48.

[20] Matthew J. Meyer & Peter E. Leone, A Structural Analysis of School Violence and Disruption: Implications for Creating Safer Schools, 22 Education and Treatment of Children 333, 352

(1999) (finding highly-restrictive efforts to control students by involving police in school disciplinary matters cause higher levels of school disorder by diminishing students' belief in the legitimacy of school staff authority); Randall R. Beger, The Worst of Both Worlds, 28 Crim. Just. Rev. 336, 340 (2003) (finding that aggressive security measures produce alienation and mistrust among students which, in turn, can disrupt the learning environment and create an adversarial relationship between school officials and students).

[21] Right on Crime, Priority Issues: Juvenile Justice (2010), at *http://www.rightoncrime.com/priority-issues/juvenile-justice/*.

[22] Ending the School to Prison Pipeline: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights of the S. Comm. on the Judiciary, 112th Cong. 2-3 (statement of Melodee Hanes, Acting Administrator for the Department of Justices' Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention).

[23] U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education, The Final Report and Findings of the Safe Schools Initiative: Implications for the Prevention of School Attacks in the United States (May 2002), available at *http://www.secretservice.gov/ntac/ssi—final—report.pdf.*

[24] Id.; Dewey G. Cornell et al. A Call for More Effective Prevention of Violence (Dec. 19 2012), available at *http://curry.virginia.edu/articles/sandyhookshooting.*

[25] Mayer & Leone, supra note 28.

[26] Robert H. Horner et al, A Randomized Wait-List Controlled Effectiveness Trial Assessing School-Wide Positive Behavior Support in Elementary Schools, 11 J. POSITIVE BEHAVIOR INTERVENTIONS 133 (2009).

[27] See generally, George Sugai & Brandi Simonsen, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: History, Defining Features, and Misconceptions (2012), available at *http://www.pbis.org/school/pbis—revisited.aspx.*

[28] Id.

[29] Matt Cregor, Emphasize the Positive and Personal, Education Week, Jan. 10, 2013, at 40.

[30] See generally, Sharon Lewis, International Institute for Restorative Practices, Improving School Climate: Findings from Schools Implementing Restorative Practices (2009).

[31] Advancement Project. Test, Punish, and Push Out: How "Zero Tolerance" and High-stakes Testing Funnel Youth into the School-to-Prison Pipeline 35 (2010); Cregor, supra note 36.

[32] Ending the School to Prison Pipeline: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights of the S. Comm. on the Judiciary, 112th Cong. 5-6 (statement of the Honorable Steven C. Teske, Chief Judge, Juvenile Court of Clayton County, GA).

[33] Id. at 3.

[34] Judge Steven C. Teske & Judge J. Brian Huff, The Court's Role in Dismantling the School-to-Prison Pipeline, Juv. & Fam. Justice Today, Winter 2011, at 16, available at *http://www.ncjfcj.org/sites/default/files/Today%20Winter%202011Feature%20%282%29.pdf.*

[35] Statement of the Honorable Steven C. Teske, supra note 39 at 3 & 4.

[36] Steven C. Teske, A Study of Zero Tolerance Policies in Schools: A Multi-Integrated Systems Approach to Improve Outcomes for Adolescents, 24 J. of Child & Adolescent Psychiatric Learning 88, 93 (2011), available at *http://www.ncjfcj.org/sites/default/files/Zero%20Tolerance%20Policies%20in%20Schools%20%282%29.pdf.*

Prepared Statement of the National Disability Rights Network (NDRN)

The National Disability Rights Network (NDRN) would like to thank Chairman Kline, Ranking Member Miller, and the members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for focusing their attention on the importance of ensuring that students are safe when they go to school. The tragic events that took place in Newtown, Connecticut magnify the importance of addressing this issue. Ensuring that schools are safe for students to learn and for teachers to teach must be at the forefront of any discussion. The expectation cannot be that children will develop academic and social skills necessary for them to be successful adults, if they do not feel safe at school. As recognized in the testimony of Mr. Pompei and Mr. Osher, the emotional and social needs of students must be addressed, if we expect students to learn academic subjects. Negative school climates, bullying, restraint and seclusion, and other practices, lead to students not feeling safe in school, and, as a result, dropping out, being suspended or expelled. Students deserve safe and supportive schools that implement evidence-based practices that create positive school climates, and schools where students feel safe.

NDRN is the national membership association for the Protection and Advocacy (P&A) System, the nationwide network of congressionally-mandated agencies that advocate on behalf of persons with disabilities in every state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, U.S. territories (American Samoa, Guam, U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands), and there is a P&A affiliated with the Native American Consortium which includes the Hopi, Navaho and Piute Nations in the Four Corners region of the Southwest. NDRN and the P&As promote a society where people with disabilities enjoy equality of opportunity and are able to participate fully in community life by exercising informed choice and self-determination. For over thirty years, the P&A System has worked to protect the human and civil rights of individuals with disabilities of any age and in any setting. Collectively, the P&A agencies are the largest provider of legally-based advocacy services for persons with disabilities in the United States. P&A agencies use multiple strategies to ensure the

rights of persons with disabilities are protected including information and referral, monitoring, investigations, and individual and systemic advocacy. In addition, P&A agencies engage in training for stakeholders (e.g., parents, teachers, administrators, state and local government officials, and advocates) on a wide range of disability issues.

Although today's hearing focuses on the context of how to create schools that are safe, as Mr. Bond recognizes in his testimony, it is critical that safety in schools is addressed in the greater context of safety in the community. In recent years, the media have reported on both natural and man-made emergencies including but not limited to shootings on college campuses, malls and movie theaters, in addition to numerous natural disasters and other forms of violence within and outside of schools. The work of the P&As and NDRN in the dual arenas of emergency preparedness, response and recovery, and representation of students with disabilities, makes the P&As and NDRN uniquely qualified to provide a perspective on the topic of today's hearing.

Emergency Preparedness, Response and Recovery

Emergency preparedness, response and recovery have been a priority for P&A agencies and NDRN for many years. This has included work by the P&As and NDRN on the Katrina Aid for Today Project as well as memoranda of understanding or agreement with the American Red Cross and Federal Emergency Management Agency, developed to enhance collaboration during disasters.

Making School Safe for All Students

With regard to the education of students with disabilities, the P&As in many states use 20 percent or more of their budgets to work on a range of issues impacting students with disabilities.

For example:

The Minnesota Disability Law Center (MDLC) advocated for a six-year-old boy with Asperger Syndrome and a sensory processing disorder. The student had experienced numerous issues in school and was being frequently physically restrained or suspended. In one instance, he was physically restrained when he refused to come out from his hiding place under a table. The boy told his parents that a school staff person had dropped him and hurt his arm. His parents were concerned for his safety—that their son was not in the proper program or getting the services he needed. MDLC staff reviewed his school records and discovered that the boy was being restrained on a weekly basis and had been suspended for more than 13 days for behavior due to his disability. The school had not conducted a manifestation determination review and had not provided the parents with proper notices about the use of restraints. A manifestation determination review (MDR) is a legal process intended to ensure that a student is not punished for behavior related to his or her disability. With MDLC's assistance, a proper functional behavior assessment (FBA) was conducted. An FBA evaluates data to determine the reason behind a student's misbehavior. The FBA results confirmed that the boy's placement was not an appropriate placement. The boy was then placed in an autism-based sensory program which was a better fit for him. MDLC assisted the parents in filing a complaint with the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE). As a result of this complaint, the school district was found to be in violation for failing to conduct an FBA and for using restraints without proper training and reporting. MDE found that the boy had been denied a free and appropriate public education (a violation of the special education law) and ordered compensatory educational services for him. Following proper evaluations and an appropriate placement, the boy now enjoys going to school and is making great gains. He has not been suspended or restrained since, even in an emergency.

Disability Rights New Jersey (DRNJ) intervened on behalf a 17 year-old young man who has Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and learning disabilities. The student's mother contacted DRNJ because her son had been suspended from school for nine days for fighting with another student. When he tried to return to the school following the suspension, the school principal refused to allow him to return to school and he was sent home.

The student went without any educational services for a couple of weeks until the school district began providing him with homebound instruction. A month after the suspension began; the district finally conducted a MDR and found that the behavior in question was a manifestation of his disability. As such, he could not be punished for it with a suspension of longer than ten days. The Individualized Education Program (IEP) team, the team that determines his school program, agreed to send him to a different in-district school, but failed to provide transportation so he was unable to attend.

DRNJ intervened with the district and had the district arrange transportation so that he could return to school. DRNJ also filed a complaint with the New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) seeking compensatory services for the time that he missed from school and for corrective action regarding the district's discipline procedure. OSE investigated the matter and found that the district had violated the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act's (IDEA's) discipline procedures by failing to conduct a manifestation determination review before the 10th day of suspension and for failing to begin home instruction by the 5th day of his suspension. OSE ordered that the district conduct an in-service training for all administrators as well as child study team members on discipline procedures for individuals with disabilities. In addition, OSE ordered compensatory services for the student.

School Resource Officers

The National Center on Education Statistics, defines a school resource officer as a "career law enforcement officer, with sworn authority, deployed in community-oriented policing, and assigned by the employing police department or agency to work in collaboration with school and community-based organizations." School Resource Officers (SROs) are often a partner in our current emergency preparedness community. In order to ensure they are available to keep students safe, it is critical that they are allowed to provide the service for which they are trained.

Law enforcement should be used only to protect school safety—never to implement garden variety school discipline. Discipline that does not directly impact school safety is best left to educators who are trained to address it. Students are more likely to confide safety concerns to SROs if they are not also acting as assistant principals, and it would be tragic if an SRO were unavailable to stop an armed assailant from entering the school building because she was at the office with a student caught doing something non-violent, like text messaging in class.

As sworn police officers, SROs are typically accountable first to the police department, and second to the school district. Schools and police departments need clear, written agreements that specify what the SRO's roles and duties will be. SROs need additional training beyond the typical law enforcement training about student behavior. In the same vein, we support the President's call for training teachers on the behavioral needs of students in the context of the classroom, and recognize its importance in improving school climate. School children are not small adults. Recent advances in medical imaging have supported what parents know—that young people actually think and reason differently than adults do.

It is unfair to ask any school staff or SRO to manage student behavior without providing the tools necessary to keep everyone safe. There are school wide practices that have been proven to reduce school conflict and are widely accepted in the education community. These include "Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports" (PBIS) and restorative justice practices. In addition to these, SROs should be trained in, child and adolescent development, techniques for working with youth with disabilities, including youth with mental health needs, and de-escalating violent situations. Without this training, SROs cannot effectively increase safety in our nation's schools.

Education and youth advocates oppose increasing the number of SROs. Evidenced based practices like those above, protect students without the negative impact on particular groups of children, as occurs currently with SROs.

We have over fifteen years of experience to inform us on the negative impact of increasing law enforcement in school, especially on children of color and children with disabilities. A recent study by the Justice Policy Institute[2] (JPI) found that increase in law enforcement presence, especially in the form of SROs, coincided with increases in referrals to the justice system for minor offenses like disorderly conduct. According to the JPI, these referrals have a lasting effect on youth, as arrests and referrals to the juvenile justice system disrupt the educational process and can lead to suspension, expulsion, or other alienation from school. It is well documented that students with disabilities are more likely to drop-out of school or be suspended or expelled when compared to their peers without disabilities.[1]

NDRN firmly believes that additional SROs should not be placed in schools that: 1) have no school based mental health professionals, or 2) have school-based mental health professionals in ratios far below those recommended by their professional organizations, as documented by Mr. Pompei in his testimony. Prevention, by meeting

[1] "Education Under Arrest: The Case Against Police In Schools" J.P.I., November 2011, *http://www.ceep.indiana.edu/projects/PDF/PB—V4N10—Fall—2006—Diversity.pdf; http://www.dignityinschools.org/sites/default/files/DSC%20National%20Pushout%20Fact%20Sheet%2012.10.pdf; http://www.ncset.org/publications/viewdesc.asp?id=425*

the needs of all students before a crisis erupts, is the most critical part of any plan to ensure school safety.

We can choose not to set youth on a track to drop out of school that puts them at greater risk of becoming involved in the justice system later on, all at tremendous costs for taxpayers, the youth and their communities. One significant step is to ensure that SROs provide a school safety rather than a school discipline function, their roles are limited, clear and well defined, and they are specifically trained to work with children and youth.

The examples above show only a sample of the range of work that P&As engage in everyday to ensure students with disabilities are safe at school. Again, thank you for holding this important hearing, NDRN and the P&A System are eager to work with the Education and Workforce Committee to ensure all students are feel safe when they enter school each day.

[Additional submissions from Mr. Osher follow:]

How Can We Improve School Discipline?

David Osher, George G. Bear, Jeffrey R. Sprague, and Walter Doyle

School discipline addresses schoolwide, classroom, and individual student needs through broad prevention, targeted intervention, and development of self-discipline. Schools often respond to disruptive students with exclusionary and punitive approaches that have limited value. This article surveys three approaches to improving school discipline practices and student behavior: ecological approaches to classroom management; schoolwide positive behavioral supports; and social and emotional learning. The article examines their epistemological and empirical roots and supporting research, suggesting ways to combine approaches.

Keywords: at-risk students; school psychology; student behavior/attitude; violence

Schools face a number of challenges related to disruptive and antisocial students. The behavior of these students interferes with learning, diverts administrative time, and contributes to teacher burnout (Byrne, 1999; Kendziora & Osher, 2009). This article deals with the range of discipline issues that include horseplay, rule violation, disruptiveness, class cutting, cursing, bullying, sexual harassment, refusal, defiance, fighting, and vandalism. Failure to deal effectively with this low-level aggressive behavior contributes to poor individual, school, and community outcomes (Conoley & Goldstein, 2004).

Schools typically respond to disruptive students with external discipline, which consists of sanctions and punishment such as office referrals, corporal punishment, suspensions, and expulsions. For example, at least 48% of public schools took a serious disciplinary action against a student during 2005–2006. Among these actions, 74% were suspensions lasting 5 days or more, 5% were expulsions, and 20% were transfers to specialized schools (Dinkes, Kemp, & Baum, 2009). Such responses present a short-term fix to what often is a chronic and long-term problem. Little evidence supports punitive and exclusionary approaches, which may be iatrogenic for individuals and schools (Mayer, 1995; Skiba, Peterson, & Williams, 1997). For example, segregation with antisocial peers can increase antisocial behavior (Dishion, Dodge, & Lansford, 2006), and punitive approaches to discipline have been linked to antisocial behavior (Gottfredson, Gottfredson, Payne, & Gottfredson, 2005; Mayer & Butterworth, 1995) and increased vandalism (Mayer & Butterworth, 1995; Dishion & Dodge, 2005), particularly when they are perceived as unfair. Similarly, suspension and expulsion disproportionately affect students with emotional and behavioral disorders and students of color, contributing to school disengagement, lost opportunities to learn, and dropout (American Academy of Pediatrics, 1998; Morrison et al., 2001; Osher, Morrison, & Bailey, 2003; Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, this issue of *Educational Researcher*, pp. 59–68).

School discipline entails more than punishment. It is complex and includes developing student *self-discipline* (Bear, 2005). Discipline and its opposite, indiscipline, are transactional phenomena nested in classroom, school, and community ecologies. The interactions that produce disciplined behavior (or indiscipline) are mediated and/or moderated by the developmental needs of students; teacher, student, and school culture; student socioeconomic status; school and classroom composition and structure; pedagogical demands; student and teacher role expectations and capacity to meet the institutionally established expectations for their roles; and school climate. These transactions can involve issues of student–school fit; bonding to school; academic demands; school support for at-risk youth; differential beliefs and responses of adults to challenging behaviors; and race, gender, and cultural factors (Eccles, Lord, & Buchanan, 1996; Hemphill, Toumbourou, Herrenkohl, McMorris, & Catalano, 2006; Kellam, Mayer, Rebok, & Hawkins, 1998; McNeely & Falci 2004; Osher, Cartledge, Oswald, Artiles, & Coutinho, 2004; Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2000).

This article surveys three approaches that promise to improve school discipline practices and student behavior: ecological approaches to classroom management; schoolwide positive behavioral supports (SWPBS); and positive youth development (PYD). In addition to giving an overview of these approaches, we examine epistemological and empirical roots and supporting research; suggest ways that the three can be combined; and identify the importance of using family-driven, culturally competent approaches and of effectively addressing mental health needs and the adversities of poverty. An underlying premise of this article is that schoolwide interventions, regardless of their roots, create cognitive and behavioral ecologies that promote both situational order and student learning and development.

Ecological Approaches to Classroom Management

Improving school discipline through an ecological approach to classroom management focuses on improving the efficacy and holding power of the classroom activities in which students participate (see Doyle, 2006). Unlike SWPBS and PYD, it is an

Educational Researcher, Vol. 39, No. , pp. 48–58
DOI: 0.3 02/00 3 89X093576 8
© 20 0 AERA. http://er.aera.net

indirect approach to improving school discipline in that it is aimed at the quality of the settings that students occupy rather than at the students themselves. This section delineates the key features of this ecological approach to classroom management and applies the approach to school discipline.

From an ecological perspective, classrooms are viewed as a behavioral stream that can be analytically divided into roughly 10- to 20-minute activity segments, each representing a particular arrangement of participants, resources and props, participation roles, location, focal content, and the like (Gump, 1969). Each segment has a characteristic vector or program that defines the pattern of involvement for that segment. Subject lessons have vectors or programs that define appropriate action or work involvement for a given event. These programs of action provide slots and sequences for participants' behavior; create direction, momentum, and energy for lessons; and pull participants along.

From the perspective of classroom management, these segments both define what constitutes classroom order at a given moment and hold those orders in place as they become routinized. Segments provide situated instructions or signal systems (Kounin & Gump, 1974) for how to participate in classroom events. Although norms, rules, and interpersonal relationships play a part in the overall picture of classroom management, ecologists emphasize that it is the strength and the stability of the programs of action embedded in particular activities that create and maintain classroom order (Doyle, 2006).

The teacher's core management task, then, is to gain and maintain students' cooperation in the programs of action that organize and shape classroom life. Teachers accomplish this by defining activity segments, introducing them into the environment, inviting and socializing students to participate, and monitoring and adjusting enactment over time. This task is collaborative: The teacher and students jointly construct classroom order. The difficulty of this task is related to the complexity of the activities a teacher is trying to enact, the number of students in a class, time constraints, the demands of the work assigned to students, the ability and willingness of students to engage in these activities, the social and emotional capacities of students, the quality of the relationship between and among teachers and students, and seasonal variations and distractions.

Classroom management is an enterprise of creating conditions for student involvement in curricular events, and attention is focused on the classroom group and on the direction, energy, and flow of activity systems that organize and guide collective action in classroom environments. The emphasis is on cooperation, engagement, and motivation, and on students learning to be part of a dynamic system, rather than on compliance, control, and coercion. The holding power of programs of action is, of course, always vulnerable to some degree, and misbehavior (i.e., alternative vectors) is an ever-present possibility. In a classroom with strong lesson vectors (Doyle, 2006) and an alert teacher, alternative vectors are usually seen early and stopped quickly by a short desist ("Shh"), a gesture, or physical proximity (Evertson & Emmer, 1982; Evertson, Emmer, Sanford, & Clements, 1983). In fact, most of what passes as classroom discipline practice consists of these brief, often unobtrusive reminders to get back on track. If lesson vectors are weak because of teacher skill or an unwillingness or inability of students to cooperate, such efficiencies are unlikely to work well. In these circumstances, discipline in a more formal sense—explicit techniques directed to remediating individual students' conduct—emerges as the central issue.

An ecological approach deals with school discipline by increasing the strength and the quality of classroom activities. Implicit in this approach is the premise that participating in well-managed classroom activities encourages self-discipline by educating students about what is possible through cooperation and coordinated action with others. In addition, it provides the essential conditions for caring, support, clear expectations, and guidance that foster healthy student development and motivation. The management of the setting has concurrent limitations in the face of strong student resistance to participation in classroom activities. In such circumstances, other schoolwide approaches, such as SWPBS and PYD, can help establish the necessary conditions for classroom work.

Foundational Research

The ecological approach to classroom management derives from two major sources. The first is Gump's (1990) finding, based on his work with the Midwest Psychological Field Station in the 1950s, that a child's behavior conformed to the shape of the setting that the child occupied. In other words, children in the same place behaved more alike than did a single child in different places. In Gump's words, "Places were clearly coercive of behavior. They represented phenomena more stable, more extraindividual, and more ecological than the specific psychological situations of individual behavior streams" (p. 438). The second was Kounin's (1970) efforts to ascertain what teachers did that led to high levels of student work involvement in classrooms. In an analysis of some 285 videotaped lessons, Kounin concluded that teachers with high levels of work involvement used proactive strategies of "withitness," "overlapping," group focus, and momentum to manage classroom group structures rather than desists or reprimands to correct individual student behaviors.

Research on the Ecological Approach

In contrast to SWPBS and PYD, the ecological approach has typically been framed as content for preservice teacher education rather than as a schoolwide intervention. The research traditions on the ecological approach area are typically descriptive and qualitative rather than quantitative and experimental. As a result, no body of scientific studies supports the efficacy of the approach. However, it is known, in general, that well-managed classrooms support academic achievement and that variables derived from the ecological framework have been associated with management success (Evertson & Emmer, 1982; Evertson et al., 1983). It is also logical that participation in well-orchestrated classroom activities promotes personal and social development. Studies have not been done, however, to examine whether an ecological approach to classroom management promotes schoolwide discipline or promotes self-discipline. Nonetheless, the approach offers considerable promise for advancing the field as a supplement to existing approaches by promoting classroom engagement. If classroom activities lack holding power, it is unlikely that schoolwide discipline will make up for this deficiency. At the same time, for the ecological approach to be effective, students

must come to class ready to attend and to be engaged. This is rarely possible in chaotic, unsafe, or alienating schools, or when students struggle with barriers to learning (Adelman & Taylor, 1997; Osher et al., 2008). The remaining sections consider these challenges.

Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Supports and Social Emotional Learning

Two universal approaches to schoolwide discipline have predominated during the past decade:

- Schoolwide positive behavioral supports (SWPBS), which are schoolwide systems to communicate and teach rules (and reward students for following them) and function-based behavioral interventions (Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2004; Horner, Sugai, Todd, & Lewis-Palmer, 2005)
- Social emotional learning (SEL), which incorporates approaches that emphasize self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2003; Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, in press) and builds on the connectedness of students and staff (Osher et al., 2008; Watson, 2003).

These two approaches differ in their primary aims—developing systems to manage student behavior versus developing student assets that foster self-discipline—and often in the methods used to achieve each aim. These differences are consistent with the distinction commonly made between *teacher-centered* and *student-centered* approaches to learning and classroom management (e.g., Freiberg, 1999). With respect to discipline, in teacher-centered approaches, the primary focus is on external school rules and the adult use of behavioral techniques, especially positive reinforcement and punishment, to manage student behavior. In student-centered approaches, the primary focus is on developing students' capacities to regulate their own behavior and in building caring, engaging, and trusting relationships. Whereas SWPBS programs tend to be teacher centered, SEL programs are student centered. Still, the two approaches have much in common: Like the ecological approach, which focuses on instructional engagement, both have ecological components. In addition, both emphasize the prevention of problem behaviors and the promotion of behavioral and social competencies; emphasize "positive" techniques over punitive techniques; and recognize the critical role of academic instruction and the participation of teachers, administrators, students, families, and communities.

The SWPBS Approach to Discipline

SWPBS is a comprehensive and preventive approach to discipline (Sprague & Golly, 2004). The primary aim of SWPBS is to decrease problem behavior in schools and classrooms and to develop integrated systems of support for students and adults at the schoolwide, classroom, and individual student (including family) levels. SWPBS is based on the hypothesis that when faculty and staff members actively teach, using modeling and role playing, and reward positive behaviors related to compliance with adult requests, academic effort, and safe behavior, the proportion of students with mild and serious behavior problems will be reduced and the school's overall climate will improve (Sugai, Horner, & Gresham, 2002).

SWPBS is not a wholly original approach. Multiple branded programs, some of which involve social and emotional learning strategies, describe similar approaches to reducing problem behavior and increasing positive behavior. SWPBS can be subsumed under the term *positive behavioral supports* (PBS), which has its roots in behavioral theory (Skinner, 1974) and its applications in applied behavior analysis (Baer, Wolf, & Risley, 1968). PBS was initially developed to intervene with, and support, students and adults with significant intellectual disabilities and severe behavior problems (Carr et al., 2002). SWPBS procedures are organized around three main themes: prevention, multitiered support, and data-based decision making. Prevention involves defining and teaching a common set of positive behavioral expectations, acknowledging and rewarding expected behavior, and establishing and using consistent consequences for problem behavior (including teaching or reteaching alternative behaviors). The goal is to establish a positive school and classroom climate in which expectations for students are predictable, directly taught, consistently acknowledged, and actively monitored.

Research-based support programs for students at risk of antisocial behavior follow a three-tier approach, operating at the *universal* (schoolwide), *selective* (for students who are at risk), and *indicated* (for students who are the most chronically and intensely at risk) levels. The greater the student's need, the more intense and detailed that support should be. Selective and indicated supports should be based on the principles and procedures of applied behavior analysis to define behavioral challenges, complete functional behavioral assessments, and design effective and efficient procedures for correcting patterns of problem behavior in conjunction with student- and family-centered planning approaches (Turnbull, 1999).

SWPBS schools also provide regularly scheduled instruction in desired social behaviors to enable students to acquire the necessary skills for the desired behavior change, and they offer effective motivational systems to encourage students to behave appropriately. SWPBS classrooms in SWPBS schools have the same set of common school expectations posted, and teachers develop classroom-level rules and reinforcement systems consistent with the schoolwide plan. In addition, classroom-handled versus administrator-handled behavioral problems are clearly defined, and data on patterns of problem behavior are regularly summarized and presented at faculty meetings to support decision making and practice consistency.

Foundational research. Research suggests that schools can establish clear expectations for learning and positive behavior while providing firm but fair discipline. SWPBS builds on a solid research base to design alternatives to ineffective administrative, teaching, and management practices in a school (Mayer, 1995). These include (a) setting a small number of positively stated rules and expectations (Colvin, Kame'enui, & Sugai, 1993), (b) teaching appropriate social behavior (Sugai & Fabre, 1987), (c) monitoring compliance with rules and expectations, (d) consistently enforcing rule violations with mild negative consequences (Acker & O'Leary, 1987), and (e) providing a rich schedule of positive

reinforcement for appropriate social behavior (Walker & Buckley, 1974). The behavior support strategies needed to establish a schoolwide social culture should be supplemented with classroom interventions and individualized supports for students with chronic and intense problem behavior.

Research on SWPBS. Evidence suggests that SWPBS can prevent many of the problems that arise in school settings. Studies employing the above-described components have documented reductions in antisocial behavior (Metzler, Biglan, Rusby, & Sprague, 2001; Sprague et al., 2002), vandalism (Mayer, 1995), and aggression (Grossman et al., 1997). Some studies have shown up to 50% reductions in discipline referrals over a 3-year period (Horner et al., 2009). In an experimental trial randomized at the school level, Bradshaw, Mitchell, and Leaf (2009) found that students in SWPBS schools were 35% less likely to be sent to the principal's office than those in comparison schools. In addition, school staff reported improved staff affiliation and organizational health (Bradshaw, Koth, Bevans, Ialongo, & Leaf, 2008). Staff in another study had improved perceptions of school safety (Horner et al., 2009).

The SEL Approach to Developing Self-Discipline

SEL focuses on developing individual qualities, strengths, and assets related to social, emotional, cognitive, and moral development and positive mental health (Berkowitz, Sherblom, Bier, & Battistich, 2006; Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, & Hawkins, 2004). The proximal goals of SEL programs are self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making, which, in terms of discipline, provide a foundation for more positive social behaviors and fewer conduct problems and improved academic performance (Durlak et al., in press; Zins, Weissberg, Wang, & Walberg, 2004). SEL helps develop the social and emotional capacities that enable students to realize the discipline-related goals of character education, which include responsible decision making grounded in moral reasoning and the capacity to exhibit such qualities as respect, resilience, bonding with others, resolving conflicts appropriately, caring, and self-understanding (Berkowitz & Schwartz, 2006).

In comparison with SWPBS, SEL's roots are quite diverse. SEL evolved from research on prevention and resilience (Greenberg, Domitrovich, & Bumbarger, 2001; Weissberg, Caplan, & Harwood, 1991; Zins & Elias, 2006). Durlak et al. (in press) suggest that SEL's conceptualizers drew from Waters and Sroufe's (1983) description of competent individuals having abilities "to generate and coordinate flexible, adaptive responses to demands and to generate and capitalize on opportunities in the environment" (p. 80). SEL has also built upon research in youth development (Catalano et al., 2004; Hawkins, Smith, & Catalano, 2004) and positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Although there have been systematic reviews of empirical findings that relate to SEL (e.g., Denham & Weissberg, 2004; Durlak et al., in press), no definitive document delineates the relationships between and among the many research areas that contribute to SEL.

SEL integrates building capacities and conditions for learning. Capacities focus on integrating cognition, affect, and behavior—and build on social-cognitive theory, including information processing and problem solving (Bandura, 1986; Crick & Dodge, 1996; Spivack, Platt, & Shure, 1976), self-control (Meichenbaum, 1977), resilience (Werner, 1982), connectedness (Schaps, Battistich, & Solomon, 1997), character education (Berkowitz et al., 2006), and neurocognitive development (Greenberg, Kusche, & Riggs, 2004). Conditions emphasize creating opportunities for skill application and learning and recognition for successful skill application (Catalano et al., 2004; Hawkins et al., 2004). The aspects of SEL that relate to self-discipline also draw on work in developmental psychology and community psychology. From developmental psychology, SEL draws on research on moral and prosocial development (Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2006; Kohlberg, 1984), emotions (Goleman, 1995; Saarni, 1999), attachment (Ainsworth, 1989), peer relations and friendship (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 2006), self-concept (Harter, 2006), motivation (R. M. Ryan & Deci, 2000), and the ecology of human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). SEL programs differ in the degree to which they draw from these areas. As we show later, theory and research in these areas have guided many SEL programs, often in an iterative research-development-practice-research process in which practitioners and researchers refine programs, research, and theory.

When implemented in schools, nearly all SEL programs share several common features, such as curriculum lessons, either taught in a packaged program or integrated throughout the existing curriculum, designed to teach social skills and foster social, emotional, and moral development. Often, SEL programming includes a home–school component to foster generalization of skills taught. Planned opportunities also are provided for students to apply, practice, and further develop social, emotional, and moral competencies. These may include service learning, class meetings, and cooperative learning activities. Another common feature is an authoritative approach to classroom management and schoolwide discipline characterized by much greater emphasis on supportive teacher–student relations and student responsibility than on the use of rewards and punishment in preventing and correcting behavior problems (Bear, 2005; Brophy, 1996).

Foundational research. Research demonstrates that both problematic and prosocial behaviors are mediated by social-cognitive processes and emotional processes. For example, Dodge, Coie, and Lynam (2006) identified social information-processing skills that differentiate aggressive and nonaggressive children, including impulse control, interpretation of hostile intentions in others, number and quality of solutions generated when faced with interpersonal problems, personal and social goals, and self-efficacy. Research in emotions shows that aggressive children have difficulty regulating their emotions and are less likely than other children, especially those who are more prosocial, to experience empathy and guilt—the two emotions most closely related to antisocial and prosocial behavior (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Hoffman, 2000). Likewise, moral reasoning research demonstrates that, unlike prosocial children, antisocial children tend to focus more on themselves, focusing on the rewards and consequences for their behavior, with limited empathy-based guilt (Manning & Bear, 2002; Stams et al., 2006).

Research also supports the importance of school bonding and supportive relations between teachers and students (e.g., Hamre

& Pianta, 2006; Hawkins, Farrington, & Catalano, 1998; Osterman, 2000), as well as developing positive peer relationships (Buhs & Ladd, 2001; Rubin et al., 2006). Under such conditions, students are more likely to internalize school values (Wentzel, 2004), exhibit on-task behavior (Battistich, Solomon, Watson, & Schaps, 1997), exhibit less oppositional and antisocial behavior (Meehan, Hughes, & Cavell, 2003), and have fewer conflicts with teachers and peers (Hamre, Pianta, Downer, & Mashburn, 2008). Social supports and relationships are particularly important for children at greatest risk for school disengagement and problem behaviors (Hamre et al., 2008). Finally, SEL recognizes the importance of supportive home–school relationships in the prevention and correction of misbehavior (e.g., Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997).

Research on SEL. Comprehensive literature reviews document the effectiveness of universal SEL programs. They include reviews of school-based programs for promoting mental health and preventing school violence, aggression, and conduct problems (e.g., Hahn et al., 2007; Lösel & Beelmann, 2003; D. B. Wilson, Gottfredson, & Najaka, 2001; Wilson & Lipsey, 2007; S. J. Wilson, Lipsey, & Derzon, 2003) and more focused reviews of programs identified as SEL (Durlak et al., 2007), character education (Berkowitz & Bier, 2004), and PYD (Catalano et al., 2004). Rigorous experimental studies of several programs demonstrate improvements in student school behavior. They include studies of PATHS (Providing Alternative Thinking Strategies), Second Step, Steps to Respect, and Caring School Communities (formerly the Child Development Project). Significant findings include reductions in aggression and disruptive behavior (Greenberg et al., 2004), decreases in antisocial behavior and increases in socially competent behavior (Battistich, 2003; Frey, Nolen, Van Schoiack-Edstrom, & Hirschstein, 2005), and less bullying and argumentative behavior (Frey, Hirschstein, et al., 2005).

Comparing SEL and SWPBS

No studies have directly compared the relative efficacy of SWPBS and SEL programs. However, several meta-analyses have compared social-cognitive and behavioral programs for preventing behavior problems among children and youth. Findings have been mixed. In a meta-analysis limited to studies that employed a randomized control group design, Lösel and Beelmann (2003) reported that behavioral, cognitive, and cognitive-behavioral programs yielded similar effect sizes (.37, .39, and .39, respectively) at the end of intervention. However, in studies that included a follow-up phase, a larger effect size was found for cognitive (.36) and cognitive-behavioral (.37) programs than for behavioral programs (.17). In contrast, S. J. Wilson et al. (2003) reported larger overall effect sizes for behavioral classroom management programs than for social-cognitive programs but only when their analyses included experimental, quasi-experimental, and nonexperimental pre-post intervention designs with no control group. When their analyses were limited to research-focused studies or demonstration projects (excluding the few "routine practice" programs in their meta-analysis) that employed a randomized control group design, the effect size difference between intervention and control groups in social-cognitive programs was .36, whereas the difference was .18 for behavioral programs. Those effect sizes were further reduced to .24 and .08, respectively, when statistically corrected for behavioral programs having a greater number of participants with serious behavior problems. Perhaps the best comparison of social-cognitive and behavioral programs comes from a meta-analysis by S. J. Wilson and Lipsey (2007) that included a more focused comparison of universal school-based programs for preventing aggressive and disruptive behavior. When quasi-experimental and randomized control experimental studies were included, the average effect size was .21 with no significant differences between programs that emphasized cognitive/emotional techniques, behavioral techniques, or social skills training.

Methodological issues. Randomized control designs have tended to yield much smaller effect sizes than quasi-experimental and nonexperimental designs (S. J. Wilson & Lipsey, 2007). Although this problem applies to both approaches to schoolwide discipline, until recently it has been a problem for evaluating SWPBS, which has relied primarily on case studies without control groups (e.g., Horner & Sugai, 2007). Another common shortcoming of universal prevention studies is that they rarely demonstrate that program effects last or generalize across settings. This gap may be particularly important in SEL studies, because they are expected to create portable capacities for self-management. However, longitudinal studies of PATHS (Greenberg & Kusche, 2006), Caring School Communities (Watson & Battistich, 2006), and the Seattle Social Development Program (Hawkins et al., 2007) demonstrate sustained behavioral impacts.

Most SWPBS and SEL studies lack multilevel research designs and analyses that examine or control for effects at the individual, classroom, and schoolwide levels. Studies that examined multilevel effects on disruptive behavior (e.g., Thomas, Bierman, Thompson, & Powers, 2008) and school climate (e.g., Koth, Bradshaw, & Leaf, 2008) report that schoolwide-level variance is substantially less than individual- and classroom-level variance. This raises an important question with respect to schoolwide discipline: Are schools likely to have a greater impact on reducing disruptive behavior and improving school climate by focusing not on universal schoolwide interventions but on interventions at the classroom and individual levels? For example, longitudinal research on the classroom-based Good Behavior Game found robust effects on aggressive males (Ialongo, Poduska, Werthamer, & Kellam, 2001). Future research is needed to examine whether schools experience greater overall effectiveness in reducing schoolwide disruptive behavior (and in more efficiently using scarce resources) by targeting the most disruptive classrooms and individuals rather than the entire student body.

Effect sizes are affected by a study's outcome variables. Two measures used in evaluating SEL and SWPBS programs may inflate evidence of program effectiveness: teacher ratings of student behavior and office disciplinary referrals. Although teachers are natural raters (Kellam & Van Horn, 1997), teachers in intervention schools may believe that negative reports could result in loss of resources. For example, treatment group teachers in an experimental study of positive behavioral interventions and supports reported enhancements in their "principal's ability to lobby for resources for the school and positively influence the allocation

of district resources" (Bradshaw et al., 2008, p. 466). Teacher perceptions of key issues such as bullying may also differ from those of students (e.g., Bradshaw, Sawyer, & O'Brennan, 2007). These and other differences may contribute to S. J. Wilson and Lipsey's (2007) finding that teacher reports typically yield larger effect sizes than student reports. Similarly, although disciplinary referrals are an important outcome and a valid measure (Irvin, Tobin, Sprague, Sugai, & Vincent, 2004), their use alone to infer changes in student behavior is problematic because changes in referrals may reflect changes in referral practices and not decreases in problem behavior (Bear, in press; Morrison, Redding, Fisher, & Peterson, 2006). For example, a school can drastically decrease office referrals for tardiness by simply instructing teachers to no longer refer students to the office for that behavior; however, no actual decrease in tardiness may actually occur.

Combining SWPBS and SEL

Effective schools establish shared values regarding mission and purpose; promote prosocial behavior and connection to school traditions; and provide a caring, nurturing climate involving collegial relationships among adults and students (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Gottfredson et al., 2000).

Research suggests the following:

- There are least four social and emotional conditions for learning—emotional and physical safety, connectedness, authentic challenges, and a responsible peer climate (Durlak et al., in press; Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; Goodenow, 1993; Osher & Kendziora, in press; Osterman, 2000; Wentzel, 1998).
- These conditions can be facilitated by four types of student support: positive behavioral support, supportive relationships, engaging and supportive teaching, and SEL (Osher, Dwyer, & Jimerson, 2005; A. M. Ryan & Patrick, 2001; Thuen & Bru, 2009).
- These conditions and supports are interrelated, and interventions that address them should align (Kendziora & Osher, 2009; Osher et al., 2008).

SWPBS and SEL have different objectives. SWPBS targets office referrals and data-based decisions related to behavior problems; SEL targets self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making (Durlak et al., in press). Although SEL programs may help students develop social and emotional competencies related to self-discipline, they provide few interventions to help educators manage disruptive behavior. Conversely, SWPBS programs that focus exclusively on concrete reinforcers to manage student behavior are less likely to help students develop social and emotional competencies related to self-discipline (Bear, 2005, 2009, in press).

SWPBS and most SEL programs have modest intervention effects (Bradshaw et al., 2009; D. B. Wilson et al., 2001), which may be due to the multitude of factors that contribute to problem behavior. Alone, SWPBS and SEL may not be sufficient to address the variation of school contexts (Benbenishty & Astor, 2005; Kellam & Rebok, 1992). Behavioral interventions do not always generalize to settings that lack behavioral support systems (Biglan, Wang, & Walberg, 2003; Kauffman, 1999) and may be insufficient in districts with a high rate of mobility between schools. Alternatively, some schools are so chaotic that they are not initially ready for SEL (Kendziora & Osher, 2009).

The need to meet these challenges, to coordinate what are often a hodgepodge of unaligned prevention interventions (Gottfredson et al., 2000), and to provide multiple types of support drives efforts to align and/or combine SWPBS and SEL. Combining SWPBS intervention components with the development of social-emotional competencies and supportive teacher–student relations should produce meaningful behavioral changes at the whole-school level, compared with singular, poorly integrated intervention approaches (Metzler et al., 2001; Sprague et al., 2002). Although not designed to determine the impacts of individual components, studies of prevention/intervention approaches that combine programs or components suggest that the combination of some SWPBS and SEL programs should enhance the power of each (Metzler et al., 2001). One example is Best Behavior (Sprague et al., 2002), which combines SWPBS and Second Step. Another is PeaceBuilders, which uses daily rituals, prompts, cues, and positive reinforcement to teach elementary school students to praise people, avoid put-downs, seek wise people as advisors and friends, notice and correct hurts they cause, and right wrongs. These rules are learned through daily rituals that instill these concepts (Flannery et al., 2003).

If programs are implemented in the same school, it is important that they be aligned to address the explicit and implicit assumptions of the interventions to ensure that they are compatible (Osher et al., 2004; Osher & Kane, 1993). For example, a combined SWPBS and SEL intervention may require more training and/or result in low overall treatment adherence because of increased complexity, time, and resource requirements (Bradshaw et al., 2009). Similarly, some SEL interventions are constructivist and may not align with schools that employ direct instruction approaches (Osher et al., 2004). Finally, if the combined programs are not aligned, staff may experience program activities as contradictory rather than complementary (Fixen, Naoom, Blasé, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005).

Conclusion

This article identified the transactional nature of discipline, the multiple factors that affect discipline, and the importance of the schoolwide context. It examined three approaches to creating a disciplined school environment and suggested how they could be integrated or aligned. However, other challenges remain, and three are particularly important: collaboration with families, cultural and linguistic competence and responsiveness, and ways to respond to the needs of students with substantive mental health needs. Families play a key role in improving behavior and engagement, but families often are estranged from schools, particularly parents of children with behavioral problems (Comer & Haynes, 1991; Eccles & Harold, 1993; Friesen & Osher, 1996). Racial and cultural disparities in services and discipline (Osher, Woodruff, & Sims, 2002; Townsend, 2000) indicate the need for cultural and linguistic competence and responsiveness (Gay, 2000; Osher et al., 2004). The mental health needs of some students may require intensive supports, and the aggregate mental

health needs of students in some schools may be so great that, as a group, these students incapacitate their schools by negatively socializing other students and/or by demoralizing staff or driving adult behavior in unproductive directions. These schools may need effective mental health services and internal systems to facilitate appropriate conditions for discipline and learning (Kendziora & Osher, 2009; Sebring, Allensworth, Bryk, Easton, & Luppescu, 2006; Warren, Schoppelrey, Moberg, & McDonald, 2005).

These challenges are often related. Addressing them will likely improve the impact of each approach. Overall, these challenges may become greater because of the worldwide economic downturn, which may exacerbate risk factors that are the sequelae of stress and poverty and eviscerate safety nets that buffer these risk factors' impact. The problems may be compounded if accountability systems fail to overcome the barriers that teachers and students face in creating productive, disciplined learning environments. Fortunately, districts (e.g., Cleveland) are expanding the measures they collect and the metrics they report to include the conditions for learning and are using ecological approaches to classroom management and evidence-based SWPBS and SEL to improve those conditions (Osher & Kendziora, in press). These data can be aligned with school demographics to identify evidenced strategies and practices that can be used to improve safety, support, academic challenge, and social-emotional learning (e.g., http://cpstoolkit.com); to monitor the effectiveness of interventions; and in so doing, to improve discipline.

REFERENCES

Acker, M., & O'Leary, S. (1987). Effects of reprimands and praise on appropriate behavior in the classroom. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 15*, 549–557.

Adelman, H. S., & Taylor, A. Z. (1997). Addressing barriers to learning: Beyond school-linked services and full-service schools. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 67*, 408–421.

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist, 44*, 709–716.

American Academy of Pediatrics. (1998). Guidance for effective discipline. *Pediatrics, 101*, 723–728.

Baer, D. M., Wolf, M. M., & Risley, T. R. (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1*, 91–97.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Battistich, V. (2003). Effects of a school-based program to enhance prosocial development on children's peer relations and social adjustment. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 1*(1), 1–16.

Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1997). Caring school communities. *Educational Psychologist, 32*, 137–151.

Bear, G. G. (with A. Cavalier & M. Manning). (2005). *Developing self-discipline and preventing and correcting misbehavior*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bear, G. G. (2009). The positive in positive models of discipline. In R. Gilman, E. S. Huebner, & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology in schools* (pp. 305–321). New York: Routledge.

Bear, G. G. (in press). *From school discipline to self-discipline*. New York: Guilford.

Benbenishty, R., & Astor, R. (2005). *School violence in context: Culture, neighborhood, family, school and gender*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2004). Research-based character education. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591*, 72–85.

Berkowitz, M. W., & Schwartz, M. (2006). Character education. In G. G. Bear & K. M. Minke (Eds.), *Childrens needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention* (pp. 15–27). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Berkowitz, M. W., Sherblom, S., Bier, M., & Battistich, V. (2006). Educating for positive youth development. In M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 683–702). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Biglan, T., Wang, M., & Walberg, H. (2003). *Preventing youth problems*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Bradshaw, C. P., Koth, C. W., Bevans, K. B., Ialongo, N., & Leaf, P. J. (2008). The impact of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) on the organizational health of elementary schools. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*, 462–473.

Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2009). Examining the effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools [Online]. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*. Available at http://pbi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/1098300709334798v1

Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2007). Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. *School Psychology Review, 36*, 361–382.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brophy, J. E. (1996). *Teaching problem students*. New York: Guilford.

Bryk, A., & Driscoll, M. (1988). *The high school as community: Contextual influences and consequences for students and teachers*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Buhs, E. S., & Ladd, G. W. (2001). Peer rejection as an antecedent of young children's school adjustment: An examination of mediating process. *Developmental Psychology, 37*, 550–560.

Byrne, B. M. (1999). The nomological network of teacher burnout: A literature review and empirically validated model. In R. Vandenberghe & A. M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international research and practice* (pp. 15–37). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge College Press.

Carr, E. G., Dunlap, G., Horner, R. H., Koegel, R. L., Turnbull, A. P., & Sailor, W., et al. (2002). Positive behavior support: Evolution of an applied science. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 4*, 4–16, 20.

Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M. L., Ryan, J. A. M., Lonczak, H. S., & Hawkins, J. D. (2004). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591*, 98–124.

Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. (2004). *School-wide positive behavior support: Implementers blueprint and self-assessment*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2003). *Safe and sound: An educational leader's guide to evidence-based social and emotional learning programs*. Chicago: Author.

Colvin, G., Kame'enui, E. J., & Sugai, G. (1993). School-wide and classroom management: Reconceptualizing the integration and management of students with behavior problems in general education. *Education and Treatment of Children, 16*, 361–381.

Comer, J., & Haynes, M. (1991). Parent involvement in schools: An ecological approach. *Elementary School Journal, 91*, 271–278.

Conoley, J. C., & Goldstein, A. P. (2004). *School violence intervention: A practical handbook* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.

Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1996). Social information-processing mechanisms on reactive and proactive aggression. *Child Development*, *67*, 993–1002.

Denham, S. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2004). Social-emotional learning in early childhood: What we know and where to go from here. In E. Chesebrough, P. King, T. P. Gullotta, & M. Bloom (Eds.), *A blueprint for the promotion of prosocial behavior in early childhood* (pp. 13–50). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Dinkes, R., Kemp, J., & Baum, K. (2009). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2008* (NCES 2009-022/NCJ 226343). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, and U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Dishion, T. J., & Dodge, K. A. (2005). Peer contagion in interventions for children and adolescents: Moving towards an understanding of the ecology and dynamics of change. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *33*, 395–400.

Dishion, T. J., Dodge, K. A., & Lansford, J. E. (2006). Findings and recommendations: A blueprint to minimize deviant peer influence in youth interventions and programs. In K. A. Dodge, T. J. Dishion, & J. E. Lansford (Eds.), *Deviant peer influences in programs for youth: Problems and solutions* (pp. 366–394). New York: Guilford.

Dodge, K. A., Coie, J. D., & Lynam, D. (2006). Aggression and antisocial behavior in youth. In W. Damon & R. M. Learner (Series Eds.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 719–788). New York: John Wiley.

Doyle, W. (2006). Ecological approaches to classroom management. In C. Evertson & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 97–125). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Durlak, J. A., Taylor, R. D., Kawashima, K., Pachan, M. K., DuPre, E. P., & Celio, C. I., et al. (2007). Effects of positive youth development programs on school, family, and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *39*, 269–286.

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (in press). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*.

Eccles, J. S., & Harold, R. D. (1993). Parent school involvement during the early adolescent years. *Teachers College Record*, *94*, 568–587.

Eccles, J. S., Lord, S., & Buchanan, C. M. (1996). School transitions in early adolescence: What are we doing to our young people? In J. A. Graber, & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Transitions through adolescence* (pp. 251–284). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial behavior. In W. Damon & R. M. Learner (Series Eds.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 646–718). New York: John Wiley.

Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the year in junior high classes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *74*, 485–498.

Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., Sanford, J. P., & Clements, B. S. (1983). Improving classroom management: An experiment in elementary classrooms. *Elementary School Journal*, *84*, 173–188.

Fixen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blasé, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature* (FMHI Pub. No. 231). Tampa: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, National Implementation Research Network.

Flannery, D. J., Vazsonyi, A. T., Liau, A., Guo, S., Powell, K. E., & Atha, H.. (2003). Initial behavior outcomes for PeaceBuilders universal violence prevention program. *Developmental Psychology*, *39*, 292–308.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*, 59–109.

Freiberg, H. J. (1999). *Beyond behaviorism: Changing the classroom management paradigm*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Frey, K., Hirtschstein, M. K., Snell, J. L., Van Schoiack-Edstrom, L. V., MacKenzie, E. P., & Broderick, C. J. (2005). Reducing playground bullying and supporting beliefs: An experimental trial of the Steps to Respect program. *Developmental Psychology*, *41*, 479–491.

Frey, K., Nolen, S. B., Van Schoiack-Edstrom, L. V., & Hirtschstein, M. K. (2005). Effects of a school-based social–emotional competence program: Linking children's goals, attributions, and behavior. *Applied Developmental Psychology*, *26*, 171–200.

Friesen, B., & Osher, T. (1996). Involving families in change: Challenges and opportunities. *Special Services in the Schools*, *11*(1/2), 187–207.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.

Goodenow, C. (1993). The psychological sense of school membership among adolescents: Scale development and educational correlates. *Psychology in the Schools*, *30*, 79–90.

Gottfredson, G. D., Gottfredson, D. C., Czeh, E. R., Cantor, D., Crosse, S. B., & Hantman, I. (2000, July). *National study of delinquency prevention in schools*. Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates.

Gottfredson, G., Gottfredson, D., Payne, A., & Gottfredson, N. (2005). School climate predictors of school disorder: Results from a national study of delinquency prevention in schools. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *42*, 412–444.

Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C., & Bumbarger, B. (2001). The prevention of mental disorders in school-aged children: Current state of the field. *Prevention & Treatment*, *4*, Article 1.

Greenberg, M. T., & Kusche, C. A. (2006). Building social and emotional competence: The PATHS curriculum. In S. R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety* (pp. 395–412). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Greenberg, M. T., Kusche, C. A., & Riggs, N. (2004). The PATHS curriculum: Theory and research on neurocognitive development and school success. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 170–188). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, *39*, 59–68.

Grossman, D. C., Neckerman, H. J., Koepsell, T. D., Liu, P.-Y., Asher, K. N., & Beland, K., et al. (1997). Effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *277*, 1605–1611.

Gump, P. V. (1969). Intra-setting analysis: The third grade classroom as a special but instructive case. In E. Willems & H. Raush (Eds.), *Naturalistic viewpoints in psychological research* (pp. 200–222). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Gump, P. V. (1990). A short history of the Midwest Psychological Field Station. *Environment and Behavior*, *22*, 436–457.

Hahn, R., Fuqua-Whitley, D., Wethington, H., Lowy, J., Crosby, A., & Fullilove, M., et al. (2007). Effectiveness of universal school-based programs to prevent violent and aggressive behavior: A systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *33*(Suppl. 2S), 114–129.

Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). Student–teacher relationships. In G. G. Bear & K. M. Minke (Eds.), *Childrens needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention* (pp. 59–71). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Downer, J. T., & Mashburn, A. J. (2008). Teachers' perceptions of conflict with young students: Looking beyond problem behaviors. *Social Development*, *17*(1), 115–136.

Harter, S. (2006). The self. In W. Damon & R. M. Learner (Series Eds.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 505–570). New York: John Wiley.

Hawkins, J. D., Farrington, D. P., & Catalano, R. F. (1998). Reducing violence through the schools. In D. S. Elliott, B. A. Hamburg, & K. R. Williams (Eds.), *Violence in American schools* (pp. 188–216). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hawkins, J. D., Smith, B. H., & Catalano, R. F. (2004). Social development and social and emotional learning. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg, (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning. What does the research say?* (pp. 135–150). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hawkins, J. D., Smith, B. H., Hill, K. G., Kosterman, R., Catalano, R. F., & Abbott, R. D. (2007). Promoting social development and preventing health and behavior problems during the elementary grades: Results from the Seattle Social Development Project. *Victims and Offenders*, *2*, 161–181.

Haynes, N. M., Emmons, C., & Ben-Avie, M. (1997). School climate as a factor in student adjustment and achievement. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *8*, 321–329.

Hemphill, S. A., Toumbourou, J. W., Herrenkohl, T. I., McMorris, B. J., & Catalano, R. F. (2006). The effect of school suspensions and arrests on subsequent adolescent antisocial behavior in Australia and the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *39*, 736–744.

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Horner, R., & Sugai, G. (2007). *Is school-wide positive behavior support an evidence-based practice?* Retrieved January 10, 2009, from http://www.pbismaryland.org/documents/Evidence%20base%20for%20SWPBS%2009-22-07%20GS.pdf

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Eber, L., Nakasato, J., & Todd, A. W., et al. (2009). A randomized, wait-list controlled effectiveness trial assessing school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavioral Interventions*, *11*, 133–144.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Todd, A. W., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2005). School-wide positive behavior support: An alternative approach to discipline in schools. In L. Bambara & L. Kern (Eds.), *Positive behavior support* (pp. 359–390). New York: Guilford.

Ialongo, N., Poduska, J., Werthamer, L., & Kellam, S. G. (2001). The distal impact of two first-grade preventive interventions on conduct problems and disorder in early adolescence. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *9*, 146–160.

Irvin, L. K., Tobin, T. J., Sprague, J. R., Sugai, G., & Vincent, C. G. (2004). Validity of office discipline referral measures as indices of school-wide behavioral status and preventive effects of school-wide behavioral interventions. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *6*, 131–147.

Kauffman, J. M. (1999). How we prevent the prevention of emotional and behavioral disorders. *Exceptional Children*, *65*, 448–469.

Kellam, S. G., Mayer, L. S., Rebok, G. W., & Hawkins, W. E. (1998). The effects of improving achievement on aggressive behavior and of improving aggressive behavior on achievement through two prevention interventions: An investigation of causal paths. In B. Dohrenwend (Ed.), *Adversity, stress, and psychopathology* (pp. 486–505). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kellam, S. G., & Rebok, G. W. (1992). Building developmental and etiological theory through epidemiologically based preventive intervention trials. In J. McCord & R. E. Tremblay (Eds.), *Preventing antisocial behavior: Interventions from birth through adolescence* (pp. 162–195). New York: Guilford.

Kellam, S. G., & Van Horn, Y. V. (1997). Life course development, community epidemiology, and preventive trials: A scientific structure for prevention research. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *25*, 177–188.

Kendziora, K., & Osher, D. (2009). *Starting to turn schools around: The academic outcomes of the Safe Schools, Successful Students initiative*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development: Vol. 2. The psychology of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row.

Koth, C. W., Bradshaw, C. P., & Leaf, P. J. (2008). A multilevel study of predictors of student perceptions of school climate: The effect of classroom-level factors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *100*, 96–104.

Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Kounin, J. S., & Gump, P. V. (1974). Signal systems of lesson settings and the task related behavior of preschool children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *66*, 554–562.

Lösel, F., & Beelmann, A. (2003). Effects of child skills training in preventing antisocial behavior: A systematic review of randomized evaluations. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *587*, 84–109.

Manning, M. A., & Bear, G. G. (2002). Are children's concerns about punishment related to their aggression? *Journal of School Psychology*, *40*, 523–539.

Mayer, G. R. (1995). Preventing antisocial behavior in the schools. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *28*, 467–478.

Mayer, G. R., & Butterworth, T. (1995). A preventive approach to school violence and vandalism: An experimental study. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, *57*(9), 436–441.

McNeely, C. A., & Falci, C. (2004). School connectedness and the transition into and out of health risk behavior among adolescents: A comparison of social belonging and teacher support. *Journal of School Health*, *74*, 284–292.

Meehan, B. T., Hughes, J. N., & Cavell, T. A. (2003). Teacher–student relationships as compensatory resources for aggressive children. *Child Development*, *74*, 1145–1157.

Meichenbaum, D. (1977). *Cognitive-behavior modification*. New York: Plenum.

Metzler, C. W., Biglan, A., Rusby, J. C., & Sprague, J. R. (2001). Evaluation of a comprehensive behavior management program to improve school-wide positive behavior support. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *24*, 448–479.

Morrison, G. M., Anthony, S., Storino, M. H., Cheng, J., Furlong, M. J., & Morrison, R. L. (2001). School expulsion as a process and an event: Before and after effects on children at-risk for school discipline. In R. Skiba & G. Noam (Eds.), *New directions for youth development* (pp. 45–71). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morrison, G. M., Redding, M., Fisher, E., & Peterson, R. (2006). Assessing school discipline. In S. R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety* (pp. 211–220). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Osher, D., Cartledge, G., Oswald, D., Artiles, A. J., & Coutinho, M. (2004). Issues of cultural and linguistic competency and disproportionate representation. In R. Rutherford, M. Quinn, & S. Mather (Eds.), *Handbook of research in behavioral disorders* (pp. 54–77). New York: Guilford.

Osher, D., Dwyer, K., & Jimerson, S. (2005). Foundations of school violence and safety. In S. R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety* (pp. 51–71). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Osher, D., & Kane, M. (1993). *Describing and studying innovations in the education of children with attention deficit disorder*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Osher, D., & Kendziora, K. (in press). Building conditions for learning and healthy adolescent development: Strategic approaches. In B. Doll, W. Pfohl, & J. Yoon (Eds.), *Handbook of youth prevention science*. New York: Routledge.

Osher, D., Morrison, G., & Bailey, W. (2003). Exploring the relationship between student mobility and dropout among students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Negro Education, 72*, 79–96.

Osher, D., Sprague, J., Weissberg, R. P., Axelrod, J., Keenan, S., & Kendziora, K., et al. (2008). A comprehensive approach to promoting social, emotional, and academic growth in contemporary schools. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (pp. 1263–1278). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Osher, D., Woodruff, D., & Sims, A. (2002). Schools make a difference: The relationship between education services for African American children and youth and their overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system. In D. Losen (Ed.), *Minority issues in special education* (pp. 93–116). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research, 70*, 323–367.

Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W. M., & Parker, J. G. (2006). Peer interactions, relationships, and groups. In W. Damon & R. M. Learner (Series Eds.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 571–645). New York: John Wiley.

Ryan, A. M., & Patrick, H. (2001). The classroom social environment and changes in adolescents' motivation and engagement during middle school. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*, 437–460.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68–78.

Saarni, C. (1999). *The development of emotional competence*. New York: Guilford.

Schaps, E., Battistich, V., & Solomon, D. (1997). School as a caring community: A key to character education. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of childrens character* (Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Bryk, A. S., Easton, J. Q., & Luppescu, S. (2006). *The essential supports for school improvement*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (Eds.). (2000). Positive psychology [Special issue]. *American Psychologist, 55*(1).

Skiba, R. J., Michael, R., Nardo, A., & Peterson, R. (2000). *The color of discipline: Gender and racial disparities in school punishment*. Bloomington: Indiana Education Policy Center.

Skiba, R. J., Peterson, R. L., & Williams, T. (1997). Office referrals and suspension: Disciplinary intervention in middle schools. *Education and Treatment of Children, 20*, 1–21.

Skinner, B. F. (1974). *About behaviorism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Spivack, G., Platt, J. J., & Shure, M. B. (1976). *The problem-solving approach to adjustment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sprague, J., & Golly, A. (2004). *Best behavior: Building positive behavior support in schools*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Sprague, J. R., Walker, H., Golly, A., White, K., Myers, D. R., & Shannon, T. (2002). Translating research into effective practice: The effects of a universal staff and student intervention on key indicators of school safety and discipline. *Education and Treatment of Children, 24*, 495–511.

Stams, G. J., Brugman, D., Dekovic, M., van Rosmalen, L., van der Laan, P., & Gibbs, J. C. (2006). The moral judgment of juvenile delinquents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 34*, 697–713.

Sugai, G., & Fabre, T. R. (1987). The behavior teaching plan: A model for developing and implementing behavior change programs. *Education and Treatment of Children, 10*, 279–290.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., & Gresham, F. (2002). Behaviorally effective environments. In M. R. Shinn, H. M. Walker, & G. Stoner (Eds.), *Interventions for academic and behavior problems II: Preventive and remedial approaches* (pp. 315–350). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Thomas, D. E., Bierman, K. L., Thompson, C., & Powers, C. J. (2008). Double jeopardy: Child and school characteristics that predict aggressive-disruptive behavior in first grade. *School Psychology, 37*, 516–532.

Thuen, E., & Bru, E. (2009). Are changes in students' perceptions of the learning environment related to changes in emotional and behavioural problems? *School Psychology International, 30*, 115–136.

Townsend, B. L. (2000). The disproportionate discipline of African-American learners: Reducing school suspensions and expulsions. *Exceptional Children, 66*, 381–391.

Turnbull, R. H. I. (1999). Two case studies of functional assessment and functional support: Idea compliance and capacity-building issues. In A. C. Repp & R. H. Horner (Eds.), *Functional analysis of problem behavior* (pp. 321–337). Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth.

Walker, H. M., & Buckley, N. K. (1974). *Token reinforcement techniques: Classroom applications for the hard to teach child*. Eugene, OR: E-B Press.

Warren, K., Schoppelrey, S., Moberg, D. P., & McDonald, M. (2005). A model of contagion through competition in the aggressive behaviors of elementary school students. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 33*, 283–292.

Waters, E., & Sroufe, L. A. (1983). Social competence as a developmental construct. *Developmental Review, 3*, 79–97.

Watson, M. (with Ecken, L.). (2003). *Learning to trust: Transforming difficult elementary classrooms through developmental discipline*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Watson, M., & Battistich, V. (2006). Building and sustaining caring communities. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management* (pp. 253–280). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Weissberg, R. P., Caplan, M., & Harwood, R. L. (1991). Promoting competent young people in competence-enhancing environments: A systems-based perspective on primary prevention. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 830–841.

Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social relationships and motivation in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 202–209.

Wentzel, K. R. (2004). Understanding classroom competence: The role of social-motivational and self-processes. In R. V. Kail (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior* (*Vol. 32*, pp. 213–241). San Diego: Elsevier.

Werner, E. E. (1982). *Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wilson, D. B., Gottfredson, D. C., & Najaka, S. S. (2001). School based prevention of problem behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 17*, 247–272.

Wilson, S. J., & Lipsey, M. W. (2007). School-based interventions for aggressive and disruptive behavior: Update of a meta-analysis. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 33*(Suppl. 2S), 130–143.

Wilson, S. J., Lipsey, M. W., & Derzon, J. H. (2003). The effects of school-based intervention programs on aggressive behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*, 136–149.

Zins, J. E., & Elias, M. J. (2006). Social and emotional learning. In G. Bears & K. Minke (Eds.), *Childrens needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention* (pp. 1–14). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York: Teachers College Press.

AUTHORS

DAVID OSHER is vice president in the Education, Human Development and the Workforce Division at the American Institutes for Research, 1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW, Washington, DC 20007; *dosher@air.org*. His work focuses on collaboration, children's services, prevention, youth development, and culturally competent interventions for youth with mental health needs and their families.

GEORGE G. BEAR is a professor in the school psychology program at the University of Delaware, 221A Willard Hall Education Building, Newark, DE 19716; *gbear@udel.edu*. His research interests are in the areas of school discipline, social and emotional learning, and school climate.

JEFFREY R. SPRAGUE is a professor of special education and director of the University of Oregon Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior, 1265 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403; *jeffs@uoregon.edu*. He directs federal, state, and local research and demonstration projects related to positive behavior supports, response to intervention, youth violence prevention, alternative education, juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment, and school safety.

WALTER DOYLE is a professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Sociocultural Studies in the College of Education at the University of Arizona, 1430 East Second Street, P.O. Box 210069, Tucson, AZ 85721; *wdoyle@email.arizona.edu*. His research focuses on classroom management, curriculum theory, and the enactment of activities and task in classroom systems.

Manuscript received June 23, 2009
Revision received October 2 , 2009
Accepted November 2, 2009

December 2012 Connecticut School Shooting Position Statement
Interdisciplinary Group on Preventing School and Community Violence

December 19, 2012

The undersigned school violence prevention researchers and practitioners and associated organizations wish to comment on the tragic acts of violence at Sandy Hook Elementary School, which have shaken the nation, and express our deepest condolences to families and loved ones of the victims and the entire Newtown community. We all share a common priority: Keeping our children safe. We need to come together in our communities to share our grief and talk about how we can move forward in light of this tragic event. This document updates the School Shootings Position Statement that was disseminated nationally following the tragic school-related shootings of 2006.

It is important to emphasize that our concern is not limited to schools. The Connecticut tragedy is referred to as a school shooting, but it is better described as a shooting that took place in a school. It is also relevant to consider the hundreds of multiple casualty shootings that occur in communities throughout the United States every year. Few of them occur in schools, but of course are especially tragic when they occur. Yet children are safer in schools than in almost any other place, including for some, their own homes.

While schools are of paramount concern, the location of a shooting is not its most important feature, although it is the most visible. From the standpoint of prevention, what matters more is the motivation behind a shooting. It is too soon to draw conclusions about this case, but in every mass shooting we must consider two keys to prevention: (1) the presence of severe mental illness and/or (2) an intense interpersonal conflict that the person could not resolve or tolerate.

Inclinations to intensify security in schools should be reconsidered. We cannot and should not turn our schools into fortresses. Effective prevention cannot wait until there is a gunman in a school parking lot. We need resources such as mental health supports and threat assessment teams in every school and community so that people can seek assistance when they recognize that someone is troubled and requires help. For communities, this speaks to a need for increased access to well integrated service structures across mental health, law enforcement, and related agencies. We must encourage people to seek help when they see that someone is embroiled in an intense, persistent conflict or is deeply troubled. If we can recognize and ameliorate these kinds of situations, then we will be more able to prevent violence.

These issues require attention at the school and community levels. We believe that research supports a thoughtful approach to safer schools, guided by four key elements: Balance, Communication, Connectedness, and Support, along with strengthened attention to mental health needs in the community, structured threat assessment approaches, revised policies on youth exposure to violent media, and increased efforts to limit inappropriate access to guns and especially, assault type weapons.

Balance – Communication – Connectedness – Support

A **balanced approach** implies well-integrated programs that make sense and are effective. Although it may be logical to control public entrances to a school, reliance on metal detectors, security cameras, guards, and entry check points is unlikely to provide protection against all school-related shootings, including the shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary. Indeed, shootings have occurred in schools with strict security measures already in place. A balanced approach to preventing violence and protecting students includes a variety of efforts addressing physical safety, educational practices, and programs that support the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of students.

Communication is critical. Comprehensive analyses by the U. S. Secret Service, the FBI, and numerous researchers have concluded that the most effective way to prevent many acts of violence targeted at schools is by maintaining close communication and trust with students and others in the community, so that threats will be reported and can be investigated by responsible authorities. Attempts to detect imminently violent individuals based on profiles or checklists of characteristics are ineffective and are most likely to result in false identification of innocent students or other individuals as being dangerous when they actually pose little or no threat. Instead, school authorities should concentrate their efforts on improving communication and training a team of staff members to use principles of threat assessment to take reasonable steps to resolve the problems and conflicts revealed through a threat investigation.

Concerned students, parents, educators, and stakeholders in the community should attend to troubling behaviors that signal something is amiss. For example, if a person utters threats to engage in a violent act or displays a pronounced

change of mood and related social behavior, or is engaged in a severe conflict with family members or coworkers, it makes sense to communicate concerns to others who might provide assistance. Early identification is important not only to prevent violence, but to provide troubled individuals the support, treatment, and help they need.

Schools and communities must find effective means to overcome any reluctance to break unwritten rules against "tattling" or "snitching" by communicating to all community members that their lives or the lives of their friends might depend on seeking help for troubled individuals before problems escalate. Channels of efficient, user-friendly communication need to be established and maintained, and can be facilitated when community members, students and staff members feel comfortable bringing concerns regarding safety to the attention of school administrators.

Connectedness refers to what binds us together as families, friends, and communities. All students need to feel that they belong at their school and that others care for them. Similarly, local neighborhoods and communities are better and safer places when neighbors look out for one another, are involved in community activities, and care about the welfare of each other. Research indicates that those students most at risk for delinquency and violence are often those who are most alienated from the school community. Schools need to reach out to build positive connections to marginalized students, showing concern, and fostering avenues of meaningful involvement.

Support is critical for effective prevention. Many students and family members experience life stresses and difficulties. Depression, anxiety, bullying, incivility, and various forms of conflict need to be taken seriously. Every school should create environments where students and adults feel emotionally safe and have the capacity to support one another. Schools must also have the resources to maintain evidence-based programs designed to address bullying and other forms of student conflict. Research-based violence prevention and related comprehensive support programs should be offered, following a three-tier approach, operating at universal (school-wide), targeted (for students who are at risk), and intensive (for students who are at the highest levels of risk and need) levels.

Mental Health, Integrated Threat Assessment, Media Effects, and Access to Guns

Nationally, the mental health needs of youth and adults are often shortchanged or neglected. That needs to change. Using much-needed federal and state funding, community-based mental health organizations should work in cooperation with local law enforcement, schools, and other key community stakeholders to create a system of community-based mental health response and threat assessment. These efforts should promote wellness as well as address mental health needs of all community members while simultaneously responding to potential threats to community safety. This initiative should include a large scale public education and awareness campaign, along with newly created channels of communication to help get services to those in need.

Research has established that continued exposure to media violence (e.g., TV, movies, video games) can increase the likelihood of physically and verbally aggressive behavior, aggressive thoughts, and aggressive emotions. Exposure to violence in the media can lead to (1) displacement of healthy activities, (2) modeling inappropriate behaviors, (3) disinhibition of socially proscribed behaviors, (4) desensitization to the harmful effects of violence, (5) aggressive arousal, and (6) association with a constellation of risk-taking behaviors. Taken together, this research speaks to a strong need to revise policies on youth exposure to violence in the media.

Finally, it is also important to acknowledge that access to guns plays an important role in many acts of serious violence in the United States. Multiple lines of research have demonstrated a clear connection between local availability of guns and gun-related violent behaviors, with estimates of close to 2 million children and adolescents having access at home to loaded, unlocked guns. Although guns are never the simple cause of a violent act, the availability of lethal weapons including assault type weapons to youth and adults with emotional disturbance and antisocial behavior poses a serious public health problem. Our political leaders need to find a reasonable and constitutional way to limit the widespread availability of guns to persons who are unwilling or unable to use them in a responsible, lawful manner.

In summary, we ask for a renewed nationwide effort to address the problem of mass shootings that have occurred repeatedly in our schools and communities. Now is the time for our political leaders to take meaningful action to address the need for improved mental health services and protection from gun violence. At the same time, concerned citizens in every community should engage in comprehensive planning and coordination to prevent violence in our schools and communities. These plans should include access to mental health services for youth and adults who are showing signs of psychological distress, including depression, anxiety, withdrawal, anger, and aggression as well as assistance for the families that support them. The bottom line is that we must all work together toward the common goal of keeping our schools and communities safe.

The position statement and a complete list of organizations endorsing it is posted at:
http://curry.virginia.edu/articles/sandyhookshooting

Co-authors of this document (in alphabetical order)

Ron Avi Astor, Ph.D., University of Southern California
rastor@usc.edu
Dewey G. Cornell, Ph.D., University of Virginia
dcornell@virginia.edu
Dorothy L. Espelage, Ph.D., University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
espelage@illinois.edu
Michael J. Furlong, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
mfurlong@education.ucsb.edu
Shane R. Jimerson, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
jimerson@education.ucsb.edu
Matthew J. Mayer, Ph.D., Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey
mayerma@rci.rutgers.edu
Amanda B. Nickerson, Ph.D., University at Buffalo, State University of New York
nickersa@buffalo.edu
David Osher, Ph.D., American Institutes for Research
dosher@air.org
George Sugai, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
george.sugai@uconn.edu

Organizations Endorsing This Statement

Afterschool Alliance
Alberti Center for the Prevention of Bullying Abuse and School Violence, University at Buffalo
Alliance for Children and Families
American Academy of School Psychology
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of Pastoral Counselors
American Association of University Women (AAUW)
American Board of School Psychology
American College Counseling Association
American College Personnel Association's Commission for Counseling & Psychological Services (CCAPS)
American Council for School Social Work
American Dance Therapy Association
American Educational Research Association
American Federation of Teachers
American Group Psychotherapy Association
American Music Therapy Association
American Orthopsychiatric Association
American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children
American School Counselor Association
Association for Ambulatory Behavioral Healthcare
Association for Trauma Outreach & Prevention (ATOP)
Association for University and College Counseling Center Directors (AUCCCD)
Association of Counseling Center Training Agencies
Association of School Business Officials International
Beach Center on Disability, University of Kansas
Born This Way Foundation
Bullying Research Network
California Association of School Social Workers (CASSW)
California Organization of Counseling Center Directors in Higher Education
California Pupil Services Coalition

California Society for Clinical Social Work
California Technical Assistance Center on PBIS
CAMH Centre for Prevention Science, Toronto, Canada
Carolina Network for School Mental Health
CAST
Center for Behavior Education and Research. Neag School of Education, University of Connecticut
Center for Child and Family Well-being at the University of Nebraska Lincoln
Center for Health and Health Care in Schools at George Washington University
Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention, Winder Research Institute, Windber, PA
Center for School Mental Health at the University of Maryland School of Medicine
Center for Violence Prevention, University of Northern Iowa
Character Education Partnership (CEP)
Child Abuse Prevention Services (CAPS), Roslyn, New York
Child Welfare League of America
College of Education and Human Development, University of Maine
College of Education, University of Illinois
Communities Healing Adolescent Depression & Suicide (CHADS) Coalition for Mental Health
Connecticut Association of School Psychologists (CASP)
Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD)
Council for Exceptional Children
Council for Exceptional Children Division for Research (CEC-DR)
Council of Administrators of Special Education
Council of Directors of School Psychology Programs (CDSPP)
Council of New York Special Education Administrators
Council on Social Work Education
Division of Learning Disabilites, Council for Exceptional Children
Early Care and Education Consortium
Education Development Center
Everyone Reading
Families International Incorporated
Family Violence and Sexual Assault Institute, San Diego, CA
FedED--thefeded.org
FEI Behavioral Health, Inc.
Gateway to College National Network
Gateway Youth Suicide Prevention Resources Partnership, St. Louis
Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California Santa Barbara
Graduate School of Education, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey
Hazelden Foundation
Higher Education Consortium for Special Education
HighScope Educational Research Foundation
Illinois Council for Exceptional Children
Illinois School Psychologists Association (ISPA)
Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior, University of Oregon
Institute on Violence, Abuse and Trauma, San Diego, CA
Interdivisional Task Force on Child and Adolescent Mental Health of the American Psychological Association
International Bullying Prevention Association Board
International Association of Applied Psychology (ECOSOC and DPI)
International Reading Association
International School Psychology Association
International Society for the Study of Trauma & Dissociation (ISSTD)
Johns Hopkins Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence
Just Community, Inc., Quakertown, PA
Kids Under Twenty One (KUTO)
Leadership Council on Child Abuse & Interpersonal Violence
Learning Disabilities Association of America
Maine PBIS Leadership & Policy Council
Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology
Massachusetts School Psychologists Association
Meaningfulworld

Mediation Center of Dutchess County, NY
Mediation Works
Mental Health America
Midwest Symposium for Leadership in Behavior Disorders
Misericordia University Teacher Education Department
Mississippi Psychological Association
National Association for Children's Behavioral Health
National Association for Pupil Transportation
National Alliance of Black School Educators
National Alliance to Advance Adolescent Health
National Association for the Education of Young Children
National Association of Anorexia Nervosa & Associated Disorders, Inc.
National Association of County Behavioral Health and Developmental Disability Directors
National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
National Association of School Nurses
National Association of School Psychologists
National Association of School Resource Officers
National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
National Association of Social Workers
National Association of Social Workers-California Chapter
National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)
National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)
National Career Development Association
National Center for Learning Disabilities
National Education Association
National Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health
National Head Start Association
National Organization of Forensic Social Work
National Partnership to End Interpersonal Violence Across the Lifespan (NPEIV)
National School Climate Center
Neag School of Education, University of Connecticut
Nebraska Center for Research on Children, Youth, Families, and Schools at the University of Nebraska
New Jersey Association of School Psychologists
New Jersey Coalition for Bullying Awareness and Prevention
New York Association of School Psychologists
New York State Center for School Safety
Parents Forum
Pasadena Pride Center
Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Teacher Educators (PAC-TE)
Prevent Child Abuse America
Puerto Rico Psychology Association
Robert F. Kennedy Center for Justice and Human Rights
School of Education, Arcadia University
School of Education and Human Development, University of Southern Maine
School Social Work Association of America (SSWAA)
Sheppard Pratt Health Systems, Baltimore Maryland
Social Work Program, University of Wisconsin-Superior
Social Work Section, American Public Health Association
Society for Social Work and Research (SSWR)
Society for the Study of School Psychology
Special Education Program, College of Education, University of Washington
Stop Abuse Campaign
Student Affiliates in School Psychology (Division 16), American Psychological Association
Suffolk County Psychological Association (SCPA)
TASH
Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children
TESOL International Association

Texas Educational Diagnosticians' Association
The Boys Initiative
The Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
The Hygiology Post
The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program
Therapists For Social Responsibility
Trainers of School Psychologists
United Neighborhood Centers of America
University of Connecticut A.J. Pappanikou Center for Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service
University of Louisville Kent School of Social Work
University of Southern California Rossier School of Education
University of Southern California School of Social Work
Upper Bucks Healthy Communities Healthy Youth Coalition
Virginia Anti-Violence Project
Voices for America's Children
Voices for America's Children
Wisconsin School Psychologists Association
Witness Justice
World Council for Psychotherapy (ECOSOC)

Individual Divisions of the American Psychological Association

Society for General Psychology (Division 1), American Psychological Association
Experimental Psychology (Division 3), American Psychological Association
Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics (Division 5), American Psychological Association
Division of Behavioral Neuroscience and Comparative Psychology (Division 6), American Psychological Association
Developmental Psychology (Division 7), American Psychological Association
Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (Division 9), American Psychological Association
Society of Clinical Psychology (Division 12), American Psychological Association
Society of Consulting Psychology (Division 13), American Psychological Association
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Division 14), American Psychological Association
Division of Educational Psychology EC (Division 15), American Psychological Association
School Psychology (Division 16), American Psychological Association
Society of Counseling Psychology (Division 17), American Psychological Association
Psychologists in Public Service (Division 18), American Psychological Association
Applied Experimental and Engineering Psychology (Division 21), American Psychological Association
Society for Consumer Psychology (Division 23), American Psychological Association
Society for the History of Psychology (Division 26), American Psychological Association
Society for Community Research and Action (Division 27), American Psychological Association
Psychotherapy (Division 29), American Psychological Association
Society of Psychological Hypnosis (Division 30), American Psychological Association
Division of State, Provincial and Territorial Affairs (Division 31), American Psychological Association
Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (Division 33), American Psychological Association
Society for Environmental, Population, and Conservation Psychology (Division 34), American Psychological Association
Society for the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality (Division 36), American Psychological Association
Division of Health Psychology (Division 38), American Psychological Association
Psychoanalysis (Division 39), American Psychological Association
Division of Clinical Neuropsychology (Division 40), American Psychological Association
Society for Family Psychology (Division 43), American Psychological Association
Society for the Study of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues (Division 44), American Psychological Association
Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues (Division 45), American Psychological Association
Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence (Division 48), American Psychological Association
Society of Group Psychology and Group Psychotherapy (Division 49), American Psychological Association
Division of Addiction Research (Division 50), American Psychological Association
Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity (Division 51), American Psychological Association
International Psychology (Division 52), American Psychological Association
Society of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology (Division 53), American Psychological Association
Society of Pediatric Psychology (Division 54), American Psychological Association

Trauma Psychology (Division 56), American Psychological Association

Individuals Endorsing This Statement

Bob Algozzine, Ph.D., University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Craig Anderson, Ph.D., Iowa State University
Julie Antilla, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Anthony Antosh, Ph.D., Rhode Island College
Steven Aragon, Ph.D., Texas State University-San Marcos
Ron Astor, Ph.D., University of Southern California
Carolyn Bates, Ph.D., Austin, TX
Sheri Bauman, Ph.D., University of Arizona
George Bear, Ph.D., University of Delaware
Tom Bellamy, Ph.D., University of Washington
Rami Benbenishty, Ph.D., Bar Ilan University, Israel
Richard Bonnie, Ph.D., University of Virginia
Danah Boyd, Ph.D., NYU & Harvard Berkman Center for Internet & Society
Renee Bradley, Ph.D., Parent and Special Educator, Virginia
Catherine Bradshaw, Ph.D., Deputy Director, Johns Hopkins Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence
Stephen Brock, Ph.D., California State University, Sacramento
Mary Beth Bruder, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Brad Bushman, Ph.D., Ohio State University
Catina Caban-Owen, North Windham School, Connecticut
Kelly Caci, M.A., New York Association of School Psychologists
J. Manuel Casas, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Timothy Cavell, Ph.D., University of Arkansas
Sandra Chafouleas, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Casey Cobb, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Jonathan Cohen, Ph.D., National School Climate Center
Adam Collins, M.A., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Dewey Cornell , Ph.D., University of Virginia
Jay Corzine, Ph.D., University of Central Florida
Wendy Craig, Ph.D., Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada
Jonathon Crystal, Ph.D., Indiana University
Jack Cummings, Ph.D., Indiana University
Richard De Lisi, Ph.D., Dean, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University
Thomas DeFranco, Ph.D., Dean Neag School of Education, University of Connecticut
Frank DeLaurier, Ed.D., Melissa Institute for Violence Prevention and Treatment
Michelle Demaray, Ph.D., Northern Illinois University
David DeMatteo, JD, Ph.D., Drexel University
Stanley Deno, Ph.D., University of Minnesota
Erin Dowdy, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Paul Downes, Ph.D., Dublin City University, Ireland
Joyce Downing , Ph.D., University of Central Missouri
Kame'enui Edward, Ph.D., University of Oregon
Maurice Elias, Ph.D., Rutgers' Collaborative for Community-Based Learning, Service, and Public Scholarship
Michael Epstein, Ph.D., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Dorothy Espelage, Ph.D., University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Graciela Espindola , Sutter County Schools, CA
Michael Faggella-Luby, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Albert Farrell, Ph.D., Virginia Commonwealth University
Peter Faustino, Psy.D., New York Association of School Psychologists
Patrick Faverty, Ed.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Elizabeth Fernandez, Principal, North Windham School, Connecticut
Diana Fishbein, Ph.D., RTI International
Emily Fisher, Ph.D., Loyola Marymount University
Lori Fishman, Psy.D., Harvard Medical School
Marilyn Flynn, Ph.D., Dean, University of Southern California School of Social Work

Anjali Forber-Pratt, Ph.D., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
Laurie Ford, Ph.D., University of British Columbia
Lise Fox, Ph.D., University of South Florida
Karen Frey, Ph.D., University of Washington
Lynn Fuchs, Ph.D., Vanderbilt University
Douglas Fuchs, Ph.D., Vanderbilt University
Michael Furlong, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Ken Furlong, B.A., Carson City Sheriff's Office
Debra Furr-Holden, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence
Robert Gable, Ph.D., Old Dominion University Virginia
Karen Gallagher, Ph.D., Dean, USC Rossier School of Education
James Garbarino, Ph.D., Loyola University Chicago
Michael Gerber, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Cynthia Germanotta, M.A., President, Born This Way Foundation
Donna Gilbertson, Ph.D., Utah State University
Peter Goldblum, Ph.D., Palo Alto University
Steven Goodman, Ph.D., Director, Michigan Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative
Deborah Gorman-Smith, Ph.D., University of Chicago
Denise Gottfredson, Ph.D., University of Maryland
Kathy Gould, Illinois Autism Training and Technical Assistance Project
Sandra Graham, Ph.D., University of California, Los Angeles
Mark Greenberg, Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University
Frank Gresham, Ph.D., Louisiana State University
Eleanor Guetzloe, Ph.D., Professor Emerita, University of South Florida
Lisa Hagermoser Sanetti, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Laura Hanish, Ph.D., Arizona State University
Gregory Hanley, Ph.D., Western New England University
Isadora Hare, MSW, LCSW, Health Resources and Services Administration
Patricia Hawley, Ph.D., University of Kansas
Richard Hazler, Ph.D., Penn State University
Thomas Hehir, Ph.D., Harvard University
Kirk Heilbrun, Ph.D., Drexel University
Susan Herbst, Ph.D., President, University of Connecticut
Melissa Holt, Ph.D., Boston University
Arthur Horne, Ph.D., Dean Emeritus, Univ. of Georgia
Robert Horner, Ph.D., University of Oregon
Susan Hupp, Ph.D., University of Minnesota
Shelley Hymel, Ph.D., University of British Columbia
Shelley Hymel, Ph.D., Bullying Research Network
Decoteau Irby, Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Kathy Jens, Ph.D., Cherry Creek Schools, CO
Shane Jimerson, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Asha Jitendra, Ph.D., University of Minnesota
Beverly Johns, MacMurray College
LeAnne Johnson, Ph.D., University of Minnesota
Kristine Jolivette, Ph.D., Georgia State University
Sherri Jones, Ph.D., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
James Kauffman, Ed.D., Professor Emeritus, University of Virginia
Kerry Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy Center for Justice and Human Rights
Maryam Kia-Keating, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Jennifer Kitson, Ed.S., NCSP, Education Development Center
Becky Ladd, Ph.D., Arizona State University
Kathleen Lane, Ph.D., University of Kansas
Jim Larson, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, University of Wisconsin - Whitewater
Kelly Lassman, Ph.D., Pace University
Philip Leaf, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence
Seung-yeon Lee, Ph.D., Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Korea
Peter Leone, Ph.D., University of Maryland
Felice Levine, Ph.D., Executive Director, American Educational Research Association

Timothy Lewis, Ph.D., University of Missouri
Robert Lichtenstein, Ph.D., Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology
Benjamin Lignugaris, Ph.D., Utah State University
Susan Limber, Ph.D., Clemson University
John Lochman, Ph.D., University of Alabama
Allison Lombardi, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Anna Long, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Sabina Low, Ph.D., Arizona State University
Dan Maggin, Ph.D., University of Illinois, Chicago
Christine Malecki, Ph.D., Northern Illinois University
Roxana Marachi, Ph.D., San Jose State University
Matthew Mayer, Ph.D., Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey
G. Roy Mayer, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, California State University Los Angeles
Daniel McCarthy, MSW LCSW, School Social Work Association of America
Jennifer McComas, Ph.D., University of Minnesota
Scott McConnell, Ph.D., University of Minnesota
Phyllis McDonald, Ed.D., Johns Hopkins University
Kent McIntosh, Ph.D., University of Brish columbia
Kristen McMaster, Ph.D., University of Minnesota
Janet Medina, Psy.D., McDaniel College
Danielle Mele-Taylor, Psy.D., University at Albany
Sterett Mercer, Ph.D., University of British Columbia
William Mitchell, Ed.D., Licensed Psychologist
Daniel Murrie, Ph.D., University of Virginia
Howard Muscott, Ph.D., SERESC/NH CEBIS
Rick Neel, Ph.D., University of Washington
C. Michael Nelson, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, University of Kentucky
J. Ron Nelson, Ph.D., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Jodi Newman, Ph.D., University of Washington
Amanda Nickerson, Ph.D., University at Buffalo, State University of New York
Pedro Noguera, Ph.D., New York University
Karen Nylund-Gibson, Ph.D., University of California Santa Barbara
Wendy Oakes, Ph.D., Arizona State University
Lindsey O'Brennan, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health
Breda O'Keeffee, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Robert O'Neill, Ph.D., University of Utah
Pamela Orpinas, Ph.D., University of Georgia
David Osher, Ph.D., American Institutes for Research
Trina Osher, Ph.D., Huff Osher Consulting, Inc.
Ernestina Papacosta, Ph.D., Ministry of Education and Culture E.P.S Cyprus
William Parham, Ph.D., ABPP, Loyola Marymount University, School of Education, Counseling Program
Debra Pepler, Ph.D., York University & Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto Canada.
Reece Peterson, Ph.D., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
William Pfohl, Ph.D., Past President, International School Psychology Association
Robert Pianta, Ph.D., University of Virginia
Nicole Powell, Ph.D. MPH, University of Alabama Center for the Prevention of Youth Behavior Problems
Ron Prinz, Ph.D., University of South Carolina
Robert Putnam, Ph.D., May Institute
Jodi Quas, Ph.D., University of California, Irvine
Matt Quirk, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Linda Reddy, Ph.D., Rutgers University
Tyler Renshaw, Ph.D., Louisiana State University
N. Dickson Reppucci, Ph.D., University of Virginia
Cecil Reynolds, Ph.D., Texas A&M University
Ken Rigby, Ph.D., School of Education, University of South Australia
Phil Rodkin, Ph.D., University of Illinois
Philip Rogers, Executive Director, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)
Phillip Rogers, Ph.D., National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)

Chad Rose, Ph.D., Sam Houston State University
Susan Rose, Ph.D., University of Minnesota
Matthew Ruderman, M.Ed., University of California, Santa Barbara
Frank Sacco, Ph.D., President, Community Services Institute, Springfield & Boston, MA
Wayne Sailor, Ph.D., University of Kansas
David Sciarra, JD, Ph.D., Education Law Center
Terrance Scott, Ph.D., University of Louisville
Jill Sharkey, Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara
Susan Sheridan, Ph.D., University of Nebraska
Brandi Simonsen, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Bryan Sipe, B.S., Chief of Police, College of Coastal Georgia
Russell Skiba, Ph.D., Director, Equity Project at Indiana University
Phillip Slee, Ph.D., Flinders University, South Australia
Stephen Smith, Ph.D., University of Florida
Douglas Smith, Ph.D., Southern Oregon University
Andrea Spencer, Ph.D., Dean of the School of Education, Pace University
Sharon Stephan, Ph.D., University of Maryland School of Medicine
Skye Stifel, M.A. M.Ed., University of California, Santa Barbara
Sarah Stoddard, Ph.D., University of Michigan
Philip Strain, Ph.D., University of Colorado, Denver
George Sugai, Ph.D., University of Connecticut
Michael Sulkowski, Ph.D., University of Arizona
Jean Ann Summers, Ph.D., University of Kansas
Susan Swearer, Ph.D., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Frank Symons, Ph.D., University of Minnesota
Elizabeth Talbott, Ph.D., University of Illinois at Chicago
Jim Teagarden, Ed.D., Kansas State University
Deborah Temkin, Ph.D., Robert F. Kennedy Center for Justice and Human Rights
William G. Tierney, Ph.D., President of AERA and USC Professor
H. Rutherford Turnbull, Ph.D., University of Kansas
Ann Turnbull, Ph.D., University of Kansas
Jennifer Twyford, Ph.D., California Lutheran University
Brendesha Tynes, Ph.D., USC Rossier School of Education
Marion Underwood, Ph.D., University of Texas at Dallas
Tracy Vaillancourt, Ph.D., University of Ottawa
Hill Walker, Ph.D., Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior
Cixin Wang, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
Matthew Wappett, Ph.D., University of Idaho
Daniel Webster, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence
Michael Wehmeyer, Ph.D., University of Kansas
Mark Weist, Ph.D., University of South Carolina
Richard West, Ph.D., Utah State University
Andrew Wiley, Ph.D., Kent State University
Anne Williford, Ph.D., University of Kansas
Mark Wolery, Ph.D., Vanderbilt University
Marleen Wong, Ph.D., Associate Dean, University of Southern California School of Social Work
Linda Woolf, Ph.D., Webster University
Roger Worthington, Ph.D., Difficult Dialogues National Resource Center
Michelle Ybarra, MPH Ph.D., Center for Innovative Public Health Research (CiPHR)
Jina Yoon, Ph.D., Wayne State University
Marc Zimmerman, Ph.D., University of Michigan

We are not able to add more individuals to this list.
Organizations wishing to join the list can contact Matthew Mayer at mayerma@rci.rutgers.edu

---

[Questions submitted for the record and their responses follow:]

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, March 22, 2013.

Mr. BILL BOND,
National Association of Secondary School Principals, 6165 Keaton Lane, Paducah, KY 42001.

DEAR MR. BOND: Thank you for testifying at the February 27, 2013 hearing on "Protecting Students and Teachers: A Discussion on School Safety." I appreciate your participation.

Enclosed are additional questions submitted by members of the committee after the hearing. Please provide written responses no later than April 9, 2013 for inclusion in the final hearing record. Responses should be sent to Mandy Schaumburg or Dan Shorts of the committee staff who can be contacted at (202) 225-6558.

Thank you again for your important contribution to the work of the committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE, *Chairman,*
Committee on Education and the Workforce.

REP. RUSH HOLT (D-NJ)

1. I have introduced legislation in the House, the Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act (H.R. 482), that would require all institutions of higher learning to clearly define their anti-harassment policies, and distribute these policies to students. In your opinion, what are the core characteristics of a "non-violent" school atmosphere? In your experiences with the schools you have worked with, are schools engaging in the process of defining what a safe and non-violent atmosphere means, and, if so, are they sharing their definition of a non-violent environment with the faculty, staff, students and parents of the school community? What reasons can you identify that would impede a school from engaging in this process?

REP. FREDERICA WILSON (D-FL)

1. I think that in every tragic incident we hear of in our schools, we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have done something to prevent it.

There is not a one size fits all solution. I represent two schools districts. One has a full police force; the other has just a few SROs. That's the difference in the school districts, but I think that one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors and enough social workers and mentors for the children. That's all of them, whether they have SROs or whatever else they have.

I don't think it's hard for counselors to detect who needs help. The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few. As a result, children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, don't have anyone that they really trust in the schools. The few counselors are always busy planning for college, testing and other activities. So, the one thing that I think we need to do is expand the pool of counselors, social workers and mentors. Because a lot of times, it is a matter of miscommunication.

I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are incarcerated. One person could help them through a bad day, anger, bullying, mommy and daddy getting a divorce, mommy getting beat-up the night before. I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a difference it would make for children in schools. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI (D-OR)

1. Many of my colleagues today have focused on school safety with respect to violence in schools. In Oregon, schools are also focused on creating emergency plans for natural disasters. Oregon is due for a major earthquake along the Cascadia fault, which will likely result in a massive tsunami. Along with the dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure, many schools, like those in Seaside, Oregon, would lie directly in the path of such an event. Because of Oregon's proximity to the fault, response time once an earthquake is detected will be limited. This is a situation that Oregonians take seriously, and efforts to relocate and retrofit schools are underway.

Mr. Ellis mentioned that emergency planning focuses on three categories of hazards, including natural disasters. This is a question for all of the panelists: what kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and the challenges faced?

2. Teachers play a critical role in identifying students who need to access mental health services. The current shortage of resources such as school psychologists, counselors, and nurses is alarming. Having someone in a school with expertise in these issues, especially someone who can connect the dots between education, health professionals, and home, is critical. In addition, Mr. Bond, you stated that personnel are sometimes prevented "from helping students and families access appropriate mental health and well-being services." What are some of these barriers, especially in schools lacking psychologists and counselors? Do issues of student privacy play

into this? Without professionals in schools, what resources do teachers and faculty have for identifying students in need of help?

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, March 22, 2013.

Mr. BRETT BONTRAGER,
Stanley Black & Decker, Inc., 9998 Crosspoint Blvd., Suite #200, Indianapolis, IN 46256.

DEAR MR. BONTRAGER: Thank you for testifying at the February 27, 2013 hearing on "Protecting Students and Teachers: A Discussion on School Safety." I appreciate your participation.

Enclosed are additional questions submitted by members of the committee after the hearing. Please provide written responses no later than April 9, 2013 for inclusion in the final hearing record. Responses should be sent to Mandy Schaumburg or Dan Shorts of the committee staff who can be contacted at (202) 225-6558.

Thank you again for your important contribution to the work of the committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE, *Chairman,*
Committee on Education and the Workforce.

REP. RUSH HOLT (D-NJ)

1. I have introduced legislation in the House, the Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act (H.R. 482), that would require all institutions of higher learning to clearly define their anti-harassment policies, and distribute these policies to students. In your opinion, what are the core characteristics of a "non-violent" school atmosphere? In your experiences with the schools you have worked with, are schools engaging in the process of defining what a safe and non-violent atmosphere means, and, if so, are they sharing their definition of a non-violent environment with the faculty, staff, students and parents of the school community? What reasons can you identify that would impede a school from engaging in this process?

REP. FREDERICA WILSON (D-FL)

1. I think that in every tragic incident we hear of in our schools, we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have done something to prevent it.

There is not a one size fits all solution. I represent two schools districts. One has a full police force; the other has just a few SROs. That's the difference in the school districts, but I think that one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors and enough social workers and mentors for the children. That's all of them, whether they have SROs or whatever else they have.

I don't think it's hard for counselors to detect who needs help. The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few. As a result, children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, don't have anyone that they really trust in the schools. The few counselors are always busy planning for college, testing and other activities. So, the one thing that I think we need to do is expand the pool of counselors, social workers and mentors. Because a lot of times, it is a matter of miscommunication.

I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are incarcerated. One person could help them through a bad day, anger, bullying, mommy and daddy getting a divorce, mommy getting beat-up the night before. I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a difference it would make for children in schools. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI (D-OR)

1. Many of my colleagues today have focused on school safety with respect to violence in schools. In Oregon, schools are also focused on creating emergency plans for natural disasters. Oregon is due for a major earthquake along the Cascadia fault, which will likely result in a massive tsunami. Along with the dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure, many schools, like those in Seaside, Oregon, would lie directly in the path of such an event. Because of Oregon's proximity to the fault, response time once an earthquake is detected will be limited. This is a situation that Oregonians take seriously, and efforts to relocate and retrofit schools are underway.

Mr. Ellis mentioned that emergency planning focuses on three categories of hazards, including natural disasters. This is a question for all of the panelists: what kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and the challenges faced?

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, March 22, 2013.

Mr. MO CANADY,
National Association of School Resource Officers, 2020 Valleydale Road, Suite 207A, Hoover, AL 35244.

DEAR MR. CANADY: Thank you for testifying at the February 27, 2013 hearing on "Protecting Students and Teachers: A Discussion on School Safety." I appreciate your participation.

Enclosed are additional questions submitted by members of the committee after the hearing. Please provide written responses no later than April 9, 2013 for inclusion in the final hearing record. Responses should be sent to Mandy Schaumburg or Dan Shorts of the committee staff who can be contacted at (202) 225-6558.

Thank you again for your important contribution to the work of the committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE, *Chairman,*
Committee on Education and the Workforce.

REP. RICHARD HUDSON (R-NC)

1. My district in North Carolina is largely rural. What are some of the distinct challenges a rural school could face? What are some of the costs associated with implementing a safety plan in a rural school?

2. There are distinctly different challenges when looking at security for urban and rural schools. What are some of the differences that schools located in urban, suburban, and rural areas need to address in their safety plans?

3. Do you have any figures that show the effectiveness of resource officers?

4. How much does it cost local school districts to develop and implement a school safety plan?

5. What resources are currently available for schools and school districts to help improve their security plans?

REP. RUSH HOLT (D-NJ)

1. I have introduced legislation in the House, the Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act (H.R. 482), that would require all institutions of higher learning to clearly define their anti-harassment policies, and distribute these policies to students. In your opinion, what are the core characteristics of a "non-violent" school atmosphere? In your experiences with the schools you have worked with, are schools engaging in the process of defining what a safe and non-violent atmosphere means, and, if so, are they sharing their definition of a non-violent environment with the faculty, staff, students and parents of the school community? What reasons can you identify that would impede a school from engaging in this process?

REP. FREDERICA WILSON (D-FL)

1. I think that in every tragic incident we hear of in our schools, we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have done something to prevent it.

There is not a one size fits all solution. I represent two schools districts. One has a full police force; the other has just a few SROs. That's the difference in the school districts, but I think that one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors and enough social workers and mentors for the children. That's all of them, whether they have SROs or whatever else they have.

I don't think it's hard for counselors to detect who needs help. The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few. As a result, children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, don't have anyone that they really trust in the schools. The few counselors are always busy planning for college, testing and other activities. So, the one thing that I think we need to do is expand the pool of counselors, social workers and mentors. Because a lot of times, it is a matter of miscommunication.

I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are incarcerated. One person could help them through a bad day, anger, bullying, mommy and daddy getting a divorce, mommy getting beat-up the night before. I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a difference it would make for children in schools. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI (D-OR)

1. Many of my colleagues today have focused on school safety with respect to violence in schools. In Oregon, schools are also focused on creating emergency plans for natural disasters. Oregon is due for a major earthquake along the Cascadia fault, which will likely result in a massive tsunami. Along with the dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure, many schools, like those in Seaside, Oregon, would lie directly in the path of such an event. Because of Oregon's proximity to the fault, response time once an earthquake is detected will be limited. This is a situation that Oregonians take seriously, and efforts to relocate and retrofit schools are underway.

Mr. Ellis mentioned that emergency planning focuses on three categories of hazards, including natural disasters. This is a question for all of the panelists: what kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and the challenges faced?

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, March 22, 2013.

Mr. FREDERICK ELLIS,
Fairfax County Public Schools, 8115 Gatehouse Road, Suite 3674, Falls Church, VA 22042.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: Thank you for testifying at the February 27, 2013 hearing on "Protecting Students and Teachers: A Discussion on School Safety." I appreciate your participation.

Enclosed are additional questions submitted by members of the committee after the hearing. Please provide written responses no later than April 9, 2013 for inclusion in the final hearing record. Responses should be sent to Mandy Schaumburg or Dan Shorts of the committee staff who can be contacted at (202) 225-6558.

Thank you again for your important contribution to the work of the committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE, *Chairman,*
Committee on Education and the Workforce.

REP. RUSH HOLT (D-NJ)

1. I have introduced legislation in the House, the Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act (H.R. 482), that would require all institutions of higher learning to clearly define their anti-harassment policies, and distribute these policies to students. In your opinion, what are the core characteristics of a "non-violent" school atmosphere? In your experiences with the schools you have worked with, are schools engaging in the process of defining what a safe and non-violent atmosphere means, and, if so, are they sharing their definition of a non-violent environment with the faculty, staff, students and parents of the school community? What reasons can you identify that would impede a school from engaging in this process?

REP. FREDERICA WILSON (D-FL)

1. I think that in every tragic incident we hear of in our schools, we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have done something to prevent it.

There is not a one size fits all solution. I represent two schools districts. One has a full police force; the other has just a few SROs. That's the difference in the school districts, but I think that one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors and enough social workers and mentors for the children. That's all of them, whether they have SROs or whatever else they have.

I don't think it's hard for counselors to detect who needs help. The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few. As a result, children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, don't have anyone that they really trust in the schools. The few counselors are always busy planning for college,

testing and other activities. So, the one thing that I think we need to do is expand the pool of counselors, social workers and mentors. Because a lot of times, it is a matter of miscommunication.

I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are incarcerated. One person could help them through a bad day, anger, bullying, mommy and daddy getting a divorce, mommy getting beat-up the night before. I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a difference it would make for children in schools. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI (D-OR)

1. Many of my colleagues today have focused on school safety with respect to violence in schools. In Oregon, schools are also focused on creating emergency plans for natural disasters. Oregon is due for a major earthquake along the Cascadia fault, which will likely result in a massive tsunami. Along with the dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure, many schools, like those in Seaside, Oregon, would lie directly in the path of such an event. Because of Oregon's proximity to the fault, response time once an earthquake is detected will be limited. This is a situation that Oregonians take seriously, and efforts to relocate and retrofit schools are underway.

Mr. Ellis mentioned that emergency planning focuses on three categories of hazards, including natural disasters. This is a question for all of the panelists: what kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and the challenges faced?

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, March 22, 2013.

Dr. DAVID OSHER,
American Institutes for Research, 1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, Washington, DC 20007.

DEAR DR. OSHER: Thank you for testifying at the February 27, 2013 hearing on "Protecting Students and Teachers: A Discussion on School Safety." I appreciate your participation.

Enclosed are additional questions submitted by members of the committee after the hearing. Please provide written responses no later than April 9, 2013 for inclusion in the final hearing record. Responses should be sent to Mandy Schaumburg or Dan Shorts of the committee staff who can be contacted at (202) 225-6558.

Thank you again for your important contribution to the work of the committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE, *Chairman,*
Committee on Education and the Workforce.

REP. RUSH HOLT (D-NJ)

1. I have introduced legislation in the House, the Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act (H.R. 482), that would require all institutions of higher learning to clearly define their anti-harassment policies, and distribute these policies to students. In your opinion, what are the core characteristics of a "non-violent" school atmosphere? In your experiences with the schools you have worked with, are schools engaging in the process of defining what a safe and non-violent atmosphere means, and, if so, are they sharing their definition of a non-violent environment with the faculty, staff, students and parents of the school community? What reasons can you identify that would impede a school from engaging in this process?

REP. FREDERICA WILSON (D-FL)

1. I think that in every tragic incident we hear of in our schools, we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have done something to prevent it.

There is not a one size fits all solution. I represent two schools districts. One has a full police force; the other has just a few SROs. That's the difference in the school districts, but I think that one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors and enough social workers and mentors for the children. That's all of them, whether they have SROs or whatever else they have.

I don't think it's hard for counselors to detect who needs help. The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few. As a result, children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, don't have anyone that they really trust in the schools. The few counselors are always busy planning for college, testing and other activities. So, the one thing that I think we need to do is expand the pool of counselors, social workers and mentors. Because a lot of times, it is a matter of miscommunication.

I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are incarcerated. One person could help them through a bad day, anger, bullying, mommy and daddy getting a divorce, mommy getting beat-up the night before. I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a difference it would make for children in schools. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI (D-OR)

1. Many of my colleagues today have focused on school safety with respect to violence in schools. In Oregon, schools are also focused on creating emergency plans for natural disasters. Oregon is due for a major earthquake along the Cascadia fault, which will likely result in a massive tsunami. Along with the dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure, many schools, like those in Seaside, Oregon, would lie directly in the path of such an event. Because of Oregon's proximity to the fault, response time once an earthquake is detected will be limited. This is a situation that Oregonians take seriously, and efforts to relocate and retrofit schools are underway.

Mr. Ellis mentioned that emergency planning focuses on three categories of hazards, including natural disasters. This is a question for all of the panelists: what kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and the challenges faced?

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, March 22, 2013.

Mr. VINCENT POMPEI,
Val Verde Unified School District, 1440 Hotel Circle North, #442, San Diego, CA 92108.

DEAR MR. POMPEI: Thank you for testifying at the February 27, 2013 hearing on "Protecting Students and Teachers: A Discussion on School Safety." I appreciate your participation.

Enclosed are additional questions submitted by members of the committee after the hearing. Please provide written responses no later than April 9, 2013 for inclusion in the final hearing record. Responses should be sent to Mandy Schaumburg or Dan Shorts of the committee staff who can be contacted at (202) 225-6558.

Thank you again for your important contribution to the work of the committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE, *Chairman,*
Committee on Education and the Workforce.

REP. RUSH HOLT (D-NJ)

1. I am cosponsor of legislation, the Student Support Act (H.R. 320), which would provide states with money to improve the ratio of mental health providers (school counselors, psychologists, and guidance counselors) to students in schools of each state. Mr. Pompei, in your experience as a school counselor, what is the maximum number of students a school counselor can be responsible for in order to do their job effectively? Should this caseload responsibility be adjusted to reflect the changing academic, emotional, and social development needs of students at different grade levels?

2. I have introduced legislation in the House, the Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act (H.R. 482), that would require all institutions of higher learning to clearly define their anti-harassment policies, and distribute these policies to students. In your opinion, what are the core characteristics of a "non-violent" school atmosphere? In your experiences with the schools you have worked with, are schools engaging in the process of defining what a safe and non-violent atmosphere means, and, if so, are they sharing their definition of a non-violent environment

with the faculty, staff, students and parents of the school community? What reasons can you identify that would impede a school from engaging in this process?

REP. FREDERICA WILSON (D-FL)

1. I think that in every tragic incident we hear of in our schools, we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have done something to prevent it.

There is not a one size fits all solution. I represent two schools districts. One has a full police force; the other has just a few SROs. That's the difference in the school districts, but I think that one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors and enough social workers and mentors for the children. That's all of them, whether they have SROs or whatever else they have.

I don't think it's hard for counselors to detect who needs help. The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few. As a result, children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, don't have anyone that they really trust in the schools. The few counselors are always busy planning for college, testing and other activities. So, the one thing that I think we need to do is expand the pool of counselors, social workers and mentors. Because a lot of times, it is a matter of miscommunication.

I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are incarcerated. One person could help them through a bad day, anger, bullying, mommy and daddy getting a divorce, mommy getting beat-up the night before. I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a difference it would make for children in schools. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI (D-OR)

1. Many of my colleagues today have focused on school safety with respect to violence in schools. In Oregon, schools are also focused on creating emergency plans for natural disasters. Oregon is due for a major earthquake along the Cascadia fault, which will likely result in a massive tsunami. Along with the dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure, many schools, like those in Seaside, Oregon, would lie directly in the path of such an event. Because of Oregon's proximity to the fault, response time once an earthquake is detected will be limited. This is a situation that Oregonians take seriously, and efforts to relocate and retrofit schools are underway.

Mr. Ellis mentioned that emergency planning focuses on three categories of hazards, including natural disasters. This is a question for all of the panelists: what kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and the challenges faced?

[Responses to questions submitted for the record follow:]

Mr. Bond's Response to Questions Submitted for the Record

REP. RUSH HOLT

1. In your opinion, what are the core characteristics of a "non-violent" school atmosphere? In your experiences with the schools you have worked with, are schools engaging in the process of defining what a safe and non-violent atmosphere means, and, if so, are they sharing their definition of a non-violent environment with the faculty, staff, students and parents of the school community? What reasons can you identify that would impede a school from engaging in this process?

Bond: The principal's first responsibility as a school leader is to foster a safe, orderly, warm, and inviting environment where students come to school ready and eager to learn. Schools should implement policies, practices and structures to ensure that all students have a relationship with a trusted adult in the school and to eliminate the possibility of students remaining anonymous. The culture of the school must support and be supported by attitudes, values, and behaviors that promote high expectations and a belief that each student is capable of achieving personal and academic success. Clear expectations regarding student behaviors must be conveyed to students, staff members, and parents. Fair and natural consequences, as opposed to punitive ones, must be employed at all times.

As a member of the National Safe Schools Partnership, NASSP believes that Congress should bolster federal programs to prevent bullying and harassment in our nation's schools, which will have a dramatic impact in improving school safety and, correspondingly, student achievement for all students.

Specifically, the federal government must support education, health care, civil rights, law enforcement, youth development, and other organizations to ensure that:

• Schools and districts have comprehensive and effective student conduct policies that include clear prohibitions regarding bullying and harassment;

• Schools and districts focus on effective prevention strategies and professional development designed to help school personnel meaningfully address issues associated with bullying and harassment; and

• States and districts maintain and report data regarding incidents of bullying and harassment to inform the development of effective federal, state, and local policies that address these issues.

REP. FREDERICA WILSON

1. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

Bond: Access to school-based mental health services and supports directly improves students' physical and psychological safety, academic performance, and social—emotional learning. This requires adequate staffing levels in terms of school-employed mental health professionals (school counselors, school psychologists, school social workers, and in some cases, school nurses) to ensure that services are high quality, effective, and appropriate to the school context. Having these professionals as integrated members of the school staff empowers principals to more efficiently and effectively deploy resources, ensure coordination of services, evaluate their effectiveness, and adjust supports to meet the dynamic needs of their student populations. Improving access also allows for enhanced collaboration with community providers to meet the more intense or clinical needs of students.

During the 111th Congress, NASSP supported the Increased Student Achievement through Increased Student Support Act, which would have created a pipeline program to train additional school counselors, psychologists, and social workers and place them in high-need schools. NASSP also supports the Mental Health in Schools Act (H.R. 628), which requires in-service training for all school personnel in the techniques and supports needed to identify children with, or at risk of, mental illness and the use of referral mechanisms that effectively link such children to appropriate treatment and intervention services in the school and in the community.

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI

1. This is a question for all of the panelists: what kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and the challenges faced?

Bond: An emergency plan for a natural disaster is very similar to any other crisis plan. The common denominators are the same. In any crisis, you are dealing with the safety of students, staff and communication with parents and the community. However, natural disasters have the added dimension of the physical destruction of infrastructure, such as facilities and communication.

In 2007, eight students were killed during a tornado in Enterprise, Alabama which also destroyed the school. As with a school shooting, the same process was employed to respond and work with students, parents and the community to restore normalcy. While a natural disaster is more complicated because not only have you lost lives, but the physical infrastructure of the school is affected. This physical destruction delays the recovery process but schools do return to their educational mission quickly. A critical piece of recovery after any type of violent or traumatic event at a school is immediate emergency assistance from the Department of Education to assist students and the school community's emotional well-being. Furthermore, in a natural disaster, sustained federal funding for reconstruction from FEMA and other agencies is necessary to restore the physical infrastructure affected or destroyed.

NASSP is very supportive of the Project School Emergency Response to Violence (SERV) program which allows schools to receive funding for short and long-term counseling and other education related services to help them recover from a violent or traumatic event in which the learning environment has been disrupted.

2. Mr. Bond, you stated that [school] personnel are sometimes prevented "from helping students and families access appropriate mental health and well-being serv-

ices." What are some of these barriers, especially in schools lacking psychologists and counselors? Do issues of student privacy play into this? Without professionals in schools, what resources do teachers and faculty have for identifying students in need of help?

Bond: Principals—on behalf of their schools and communities—need unfettered access to programs, supports and services when it comes to responding to threats on the health and safety of students directly, as well as prevention and intervention before a student's behavior escalates to violence and threatens the safety of others. Principals believe the federal government must do more to encourage local education and community health system cooperation, and remove barriers to effective service delivery. There is a strong national interest for the federal government to set the standards so that all professionals in schools, mental health and law enforcement can work together to provide services for students and families, especially young children, when the need is identified.

Student privacy issues keep schools from hearing important health information that could help to better serve students within the school environment. State and federal privacy laws prohibit various entities from communicating with each other about a student's problems and keeps everyone from being able to provide the services necessary to meet a student's needs.

NASSP urges federal policymakers to remove barriers between education and local health service agencies, and encourage local communities to focus on schools as the "hub" for service delivery. Local communities must be encouraged to break down the silos between community health and education systems in the interest of school safety. We believe that all partners and stakeholders in the success of our education and community health systems must work together toward the common goal of keeping our schools and communities safe. Communities, states, and the nation generally have made only marginal strides in creating and supporting an infrastructure that provides all children and families with services that are connected to the school communities. In many cases, principals are simply unable to get students and families access to services that are needed even when the appropriate programs exist in the community.

District-wide policies must support principals and school safety teams to provide services in school-based settings and strengthen the ability of schools to respond to student and family needs directly. While working to improve school counselor-to-student ratios, districts can begin to move toward more effective and sustainable services by:

- Assigning a school psychologist, school counselor, or school social worker to coordinate school-based services with those provided by community providers;
- Ensuring that the school data being collected and resulting strategies are addressing the most urgent areas of need with regard to safety and climate;
- Providing training that targets the specific needs of individual schools, their staffs, and their students; and
- Reviewing current use of mental health staff and identifying critical shifts in their responsibilities to bolster prevention efforts.

Mr. Bontrager's Response to Questions Submitted for the Record

Chairman Kline, thank you again for the opportunity to testify at the February 27th, 2013 hearing on "Protecting Students and Teachers: A Discussion on School Safety." I have included an answer below to the question put forth by Representative Suzanne Bonamici regarding preparations for natural disasters: The other questions included in the follow up document fell outside of my scope of expertise.

Question: "What kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the specific needs that must be met and the challenges faced?"

Answer: In today's environment we are typically seeing All-Hazards Emergency Response Plans. These plans provide the framework for managing all natural hazards and human threats typically following the National Incident Management System (NIMS). High consequence threats like tornados and active shooter typically have their own sections within the Emergency Response Plans. Although responses may differ for specific events, the planning and preparedness process is the same. The plans must be written; training and exercise must be conducted, the plans must be updated on a regular basis and Emergency Responders must be included in the process.

Planning for a natural disaster versus planning for a school shooting:

Similarities: In any emergency having a thought out plan with an attempt to anticipate possible scenarios and having practiced this plan beforehand will aid in mitigating damage and facilitate response time, to ultimately increase chances of a better outcome. Having an organized and rehearsed response to any disaster or event often leads to better results. Responders need access to communications, trained resources, and appropriate equipment.

Differences: Responding to a natural disaster is different than a shooter scenario in that in a disaster you are responding to an event that has no conscientiousness. In a shooter scenario you are dealing with a person or group that is actively intent on doing harm and at the very least has some form of thought out plan on how to do this. Regardless of how you respond to a natural disaster the disaster remains unaware of your actions toward it. Responding to a shooter(s) in the correct or incorrect way is more likely to alter the outcome of the event.

Depending upon where you live, natural disasters can include anything from a flood, tornado, hurricane, or a forest fire to an earthquake or volcanic eruption. When planning for a natural disaster, having a written, agreed upon and practiced plan in place is important just like it is for any other emergency scenario. When it comes to natural disasters building construction and facility layouts can play an important role in keeping the occupants safe. For example, building structures to withstand hurricane force winds and earthquakes or locating electrical equipment and other infrastructure systems where they are safe from flooding. Having systems in place for long-term sustainability can also be important in the event of loss of power or potable water in a natural disaster where the occupants may be isolated from help and without utilities for hours or even days.

Please let me know if there is any other way my team and I can assist. We thank you again for the opportunity to assist in this important initiative.

Mr. Canady's Response to Questions Submitted for the Record

REP. RICHARD HUDSON

1. One of the challenges faced by rural districts is typically a longer response time by first-responders. This can certainly increase the need to have a first-response presence (SRO) on a school campus in a rural environment. Many rural school districts are also smaller in size which also means that they have a smaller staff. This means that there are fewer members of the school safety team thereby increasing the workload of the members.

2. Costs associated with implementing a school safety plan in a rural environment would include the writing and printing of the plan along with a site safety assessment of the campus. Costs would increase with the implementation of strategies such as electronic visitor entry systems, CPTED improvements and security personnel.

3. In general, most security practices for schools whether rural, suburban or urban are similar in nature. However, there are certainly issues like traffic flow that would be vastly different from an urban to a rural environment. The issue of response has been addressed previously but would certainly have a bearing on the security plan. For instance, rural school districts may need to be prepared to remain in a lockdown for a longer period of time than a suburban or urban district.

4. Much of the work done by an SRO is difficult to quantify. Relationship building is at the foundation of their success. I would refer you to our report; "To Protect and Educate" for our best information regarding the work of SRO's. The report is available at *www.nasro.org*.

5. The cost of the safety plan is really dependent on the size of the district and the amount of resources that are put into the plan.

6. The National School Safety Center is an excellent resource for information on school security plans. Their website is *www.nssc1.org*.

REP. RUSH HOLT

1. Creating a non-violent school atmosphere can certainly be a challenge, especially when the violence is brought to the school campus from outside. Clear-cut policies regarding issues of harassment can be helpful but more must be done. A gentleman by the name of Teny Gross is an excellent resource on this subject matter. He is the Executive Director for the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence. The website for his organization is *www.nonviolenceinstitute.org*.

REP. FREDERICA WILSON

1. I would agree with an increase in school counselors across the country. As an SRO for 12 years, I worked very closely with the counselors in our school district. They are also a critical component of any effective school safety team.

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI

1. As far as my experience in planning for natural disasters, I cannot say that this specifically falls within my realm of expertise. However, I was asked to serve as one of the writers for my former school districts school safety plan. During this process I certainly learned a great deal more about planning for natural disasters.

2. Some of the similarities that I have seen in planning for natural disasters as well as man—made disasters include things like evacuation procedures, shelter-in-place procedures and re-unification procedures. The major difference in the two is that in an act of violence it becomes necessary to stop the violence from occurring before anything else can be accomplished.

I hope that these answers to your questions are helpful. Please feel free to contact our office if we can be of further assistance.

Mr. Ellis' Response to Questions Submitted for the Record

REP. RUSH HOLT (D-NJ)

1. I have introduced legislation in the House, the Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act (H.R. 482), that would require all institutions of higher learning to clearly define their anti-harassment policies, and distribute these policies to students. In your opinion, what are the core characteristics of a "non-violent" school atmosphere? In your experiences with the schools you have worked with, are schools engaging in the process of defining what a safe and non-violent atmosphere means, and, if so, are they sharing their definition of a non-violent environment with the faculty, staff, students and parents of the school community? What reasons can you identify that would impede a school from engaging in this process?

The core characteristics of a non-violent school atmosphere is a culture and environment that allows and encourages learning. All members are treated with respect and dignity. In terms of sharing the definition, I believe that the goals are shared with all stakeholders. I cannot envision a reason that would impede a school from sharing such a statement.

REP. FREDERICA WILSON (D-FL)

1. I think that in every tragic incident we hear of in our schools, we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have done something to prevent it.

There is not a one size fits all solution. I represent two schools districts. One has a full police force; the other has just a few SROs. That's the difference in the school districts, but I think that one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors and enough social workers and mentors for the children. That's all of them, whether they have SROs or whatever else they have.

I don't think it's hard for counselors to detect who needs help. The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few. As a result, children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, don't have anyone that they really trust in the schools. The few counselors are always busy planning for college, testing and other activities. So, the one thing that I think we need to do is expand the pool of counselors, social workers and mentors. Because a lot of times, it is a matter of miscommunication.

I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are incarcerated. One person could help them through a bad day, anger, bullying, mommy and daddy getting a divorce, mommy getting beat-up the night before. I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a difference it would make for children in schools. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

I believe that the availability of mental health professionals is a key component for maintaining a safe and secure learning environment. I've pasted links to two documents of interest. Below the links is the text from an article in the Washington Post (March 29, 2013) regarding the current status of these professionals in the Fairfax County Public Schools.

http://www.nasponline.org/communications/press-release/School_Safety_Statement.pdf

http://curry.virginia.edu/articles/sandyhookshooting
Washington Post (March 29, 2013)

A multimillion-dollar budget crunch in Fairfax County schools next year might force an unsustainable workload on the mental-health clinicians who help students cope with stress, anxiety and emotional crises, administrators said.

The December mass shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Conn.—and other recent high-profile attacks involving shooters with mental illnesses—renewed public focus on mental health and started a national conversation about the role of school psychologists and social workers in students' lives. This year, several bills were introduced in Congress addressing a shortage of mental-health professionals in schools.

Fairfax County could face a similar shortage, school officials said, if additional funding is not included in next year's budget to hire more mental-health professionals.

"It's a challenge to meet all the needs of our kids," said Amy Parmentier, coordinator of social-work services in Fairfax schools. "Newtown has certainly tragically punctuated it. There's more to educating children than just academics."

This year, the ratio in Fairfax schools is one psychologist and one social worker per 2,200 general-education students. Most high schools, which average between 2,400 and 2,700 students, have only one school psychologist and one social worker.

Fairfax staffing levels are far below national standards. The National Association for School Psychologists recommends one school psychologist per 500 students. The School Social Workers Association of America recommends one social worker with a master's degree per 400 students.

The ratio in Fairfax worsened during the recession, when the school system eliminated social worker and psychologist positions to save money while student enrollment continued to balloon.

"I would never say we have enough" mental-health professionals, said Dede Bailer, who coordinates psychology services for the Fairfax schools. "It would be wonderful if we had additional staffing. But we don't have the same number of positions that we had 10 years ago, and since then our population has increased."

Kim Dockery, assistant superintendent for special services, said that social workers and psychologists can be the first line of defense in schools, helping to do proactive screenings to address students' issues before they are manifested in bigger problems. But since most clinicians have such a high workload, they are often acting more like a last resort, attending to students who are in crisis. Crucial prevention work rarely happens, clinicians said.

Clinicians said they tackle a variety of issues, including depression, anxiety, bullying, substance and alcohol abuse, family deaths and parents' divorces. Often, the clinicians are the only people students feel they can talk to openly about very personal concerns.

Nikki Simmons, the mother of an 18-year-old former Fairfax student, credits the school system's clinicians with helping to save her daughter's life. "They really helped her get out of her bad times," said Simmons. "It was hell and back."

Simmons said that funding for more mental-health professionals is crucial and described Fairfax's clinicians as among the best in the region.

She said her daughter began having mood swings during her freshman year. She started using drugs, drinking alcohol and cutting herself. The girl had thoughts of suicide.

"You're talking about an honor roll student to D's and F's in a matter of months," Simmons said.

As a sophomore at Woodson High, her daughter met with Fairfax clinicians for about 30 minutes a day. Her dark moods began to lighten.

"She always had someone to go to whenever there was something wrong," Simmons said.

Fairfax school psychologists said the county's increase in students directly correlates with an increase in need for mental-health services. In a 2011 survey, almost 30 percent of Fairfax students reported feeling symptoms of depression, and 16 percent said they had considered suicide during the previous year.

Dockery requested more funding for clinicians this year to make up for the lost positions, hoping to add 25 positions to the budgeted total of about 280, an increase of less than 10 percent. She was denied.

Superintendent Jack D. Dale said the School Board had not made mental health a priority during deliberations to craft the $2.5 billion budget.

Facing a $60 million budget shortfall from the county, the school system is under pressure from the Board of Supervisors to make more cuts.

Enrollment is expected to grow again next year, and a proportional number of social workers and school psychologists may not be hired without an amendment to next year's budget.

In many cases, a clinician oversees hundreds of students at multiple schools.

There are now eight psychologists who are each assigned to cover three schools and 63 who cover two school sites each. Among social workers, there are 18 who each have three schools and 49 who have two schools.

Bailer said that assigning a clinician to multiple schools can lead to gaps in coverage.

"Sometimes kids just come by, and if you're there and they need to talk, that's when you can do your best intervention work," Bailer said. "But if you're in three schools and you're not physically there, those conversations won't happen."

Dena Neverdon is a Fairfax schools social worker assigned to three schools: Vienna, McNair and Floris elementaries.

"Three schools is challenging," said Neverdon, who has worked for Fairfax schools since 2003. "In an ideal world, I would only work with one school. If I was there every single day, I could do so much more."

Mary Ann Panarelli, the system's director of intervention and prevention services, said that more mental-health staffers are desperately needed.

"We are facing increased challenges to continue to do as well as we have," Panarelli said. "We are meeting the needs, but at some point, there is a breaking point."

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI (D-OR)

1. Many of my colleagues today have focused on school safety with respect to violence in schools. In Oregon, schools are also focused on creating emergency plans for natural disasters. Oregon is due for a major earthquake along the Cascadia fault, which will likely result in a massive tsunami. Along with the dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure, many schools, like those in Seaside, Oregon, would lie directly in the path of such an event. Because of Oregon's proximity to the fault, response time once an earthquake is detected will be limited. This is a situation that Oregonians take seriously, and efforts to relocate and retrofit schools are underway.

Mr. Ellis mentioned that emergency planning focuses on three categories of hazards, including natural disasters. This is a question for all of the panelists: what kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and the challenges faced?

Hazards are conditions or situations that have the potential for causing harm to people, property, or the environment. Hazards can be classified into three categories: natural, technological, and school specific-hazards. An examination of the potential natural, and technological hazards, and school specific-hazards formed the basis for the planning assumptions upon which the Facility Crisis Management Security Plan is developed.

Each school has special and unique characteristics that influence the development of an individualized, comprehensive, multi-hazards school crisis, emergency management, and medical response plan. The school-based Crisis Management Team (CMT) should conduct hazard vulnerability and risk assessments to determine the strengths and weaknesses of their individual building and grounds; the school's social, emotional, and cultural climate; community and staff resources; and the unique concerns of individuals with disabilities and special needs. There is no standard method for prioritizing school hazards. All risk determinations are subjective and vary depending on the community and factors unique to the school. However, one commonly used method is to compare hazards based upon the likelihood of an event occurring and the extent of damage and trauma the event could cause the school. Assessment data must be routinely gathered and analyzed by the CMT and update the Facility Crisis Management Security Plan as necessary.

A Hazard-Specific Appendix should include incident response procedures to reduce loss of life and minimize damage and trauma that cannot be prevented.

Natural Hazards

A locality, due to its geographical location, is vulnerable to a wide array of hazards. To determine the natural hazards that present the greatest threat, a locality should consult with their local Office of Emergency Management. This office should have a quantitative and qualitative methodology using historical and anecdotal

data, community input and professional judgment regarding expected hazard impacts to rank and prioritize those natural hazards which pose the most significant threat.

For Fairfax County, Virginia, we have identified the following six (6) primary natural hazards as having the greatest impact on the school community:

1. Tornadoes
2. Hurricanes and Tropical Storms
3. Severe Thunder Storms
4. Severe Winter Storms
5. Floods
6. Extreme Temperatures

While these primary hazards have their own characteristics, effects, and dangers, they often occur in conjunction with other weather and environment conditions that exacerbate the effects, i.e., lightning, high winds, hail, snow, sleet, freezing rain, and drought.

Dr. Osher's Response to Questions Submitted for the Record

REP. RUSH HOLT (D-NJ)

I have introduced legislation in the House, the Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act (H.R. 482), that would require all institutions of higher learning to clearly define their anti-harassment policies, and distribute these policies to students. In your opinion, what are the core characteristics of a "non-violent" school atmosphere? In your experiences with the schools you have worked with, are schools engaging in the process of defining what a safe and non-violent atmosphere means, and, if so, are they sharing their definition of a non-violent environment with the faculty, staff, students and parents of the school community? What reasons can you identify that would impede a school from engaging in this process?

Thank you Congressman Holt for the question and your efforts to end harassment at all levels of learning. My own focus has been on safe and supportive environments in primary and secondary schools. As a former Dean of both a liberal arts college and two professional schools, I believe that those in higher education can learn from the lessons and experiences of educators in high school and grade school.

The science is clear. All students require safe and supportive schools if they are to succeed. If schools want to maximize learning, schools should create strong conditions for learning and well-being, places where students feel physically and emotionally safe, connected to and supported by their teachers, challenged and engaged in learning, and places where their peers have good social and emotional skills. This is as true for higher ed as it is for K-12.

A positive campus culture and climate at institutions of higher education can maximize safety, engagement, and academic success and minimize disengagement, academic failure, and attrition or unhealthy and even such dangerous behaviors as binge drinking and interpersonal violence. Schools can maximize the learning and retention of all students they admit by creating cultures and conditions for learning and student/staff support that promote academic engagement, embrace diversity, and support mental and physical wellness.

When students feel physically and emotionally safe and connected to their school, they can be better students. But when they feel anxious or experience bullying, harassment, prejudice, or marginalization, they won't perform to their potential. When students feel threatened, their defensive responses impede learning and engagement, and this response may be particularly pronounced for students who have experienced trauma, whether as a child or as an adult.

Students benefit from educators who understand their social, emotional, behavioral, and academic needs and from supportive schools. Whether third graders or college freshmen, they learn more when they feel connected and attached to their teachers or others in their schools.

While research and practice support these conclusions, many schools fail to address the need for student support and strong conditions for learning. The primary impediments are a lack of will and, where will isn't wanting, of educators' capacity to address the social and emotional needs of students and to build strong conditions for learning. The U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services have recognized this need by creating the National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments and focusing it broadly on elementary, secondary, and higher education.

REP. FREDERICA WILSON (D-FL)

I think that in every tragic incident we hear of in our schools, we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have done something to prevent it.

There is not a one size fits all solution. I represent two school districts. One has a full police force; the other has just a few SROs. That's the difference in the school districts, but I that that one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors and enough social workers and mentors for the children. That's all of them, whether they have SROs or whatever else they have.

I don't think it's hard for counselors to detect who needs help. The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few. As a result, children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, don't have anyone that they really trust in the schools. The few counselors are always busy planning for college, testing and other activities. So, the one thing that I think we need to do is expand the pool of counselors, social workers and mentors. Because a lot of times, it is a matter of miscommunication.

I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are incarcerated. One person could help them through a bad day, anger, bullying, mommy and daddy getting a divorce, mommy getting beat up the night before. I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a difference it would make for children in schools. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

My short answer, Congresswoman, is yes, increasing the number of counselors—as well as social workers and mentors—could have a significantly positive impact. That said, we also need to make sure the counselors are allowed to be counselors. Too often, they are asked to take on administrative duties, or to serve as study period monitors, or perform a host of other tasks unrelated to their mission.

I understand that as administrative workloads increase and school district budgets get tight, the easy answer is to shift duties to counselors. But that's a self-defeating path. Counselors and social workers in particular can play a vital role in the development of youth, as I've seen time and time again.

The connectedness and the experience of support that are so important for students are exactly what counselors and social workers can provide. Students who feel "connected" to a school are more likely to have improved attitudes about learning and their teachers; heightened academic aspirations, motivation, and achievement; and more positive social attitudes, values, and behavior. Research also shows that students who feel alienated from their school community are most at risk for engaging in delinquency and violence. So, in my view, counselors, social workers, and mentors are in the front lines in youth development.

Yet, since counselors and social workers can't reach every student, it's also important to build and support every teacher's capacity to connect in positive ways with students. This part of the challenge is not one of will—teachers want good relationships with students—but of building teachers' technical and social and emotional skills and giving them the support needed to connect with students. Doing this, in turn, depends on refining our accountability systems to include the conditions for learning.

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI (D-OR)

Many of my colleagues today have focused on school safety with respect to violence in schools. In Oregon, schools are also focused on creating emergency plans for natural disasters. Oregon is due for a major earthquake along the Cascadia fault, which will likely result in a massive tsunami. Along with the dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure, many schools, like those in Seaside, Oregon, would lie directly in the path of such an event. Because of Oregon's proximity to the fault, response time once an earthquake is detected will be limited. This is a situation that Oregonians take seriously, and efforts to relocate are retrofit schools are underway.

Mr. Ellis mentioned that emergency planning focuses on three categories of hazards, including natural disasters. This is a question for all of the panelists: what kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a school shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and the challenges faced?

While I have written about this in Safeguarding Our Children: An Action Guide Revised and Expanded and addressed them as a matter of policy in my international work, I do not have firsthand experience in this sphere so I'll largely defer to my colleagues on the panel.

However, let me point out, Congresswoman, that the kind of potential dangers you are concerned about are some of those that must be addressed to create a safe school environment. You mentioned that an earthquake is on the minds of many Oregonians. If it is on the minds of parents, it is on the minds of their children. So by developing a way to respond to natural disasters, or any catastrophic event, we are addressing the essential need for children to feel and be safe in their schools. And doing this in a way that also builds conditions for learning and student success reaches more students, avoids fragmentation, and makes more efficient use of public and private resources. For example, a positive climate, which can reduce or eliminate some of the risk factors that feed aggression and violence, can support crisis preparation and recovery while building and supporting resiliency so students and adults can better survive and cope with trauma and disaster.

In fact, some elements of school climate and conditions for learning that are closely allied to the learning process, are particularly able to help students handle and respond to crises. These conditions include the perceptions and experience of physical and emotional safety, connectedness and support, academic challenge and support, and student social and emotional competence. Just as a lack of safety can dampen hope, optimism, self-confidence, and affect a student's threshold for vigilance and arousal, the opposite experience of connectedness and support stemming from social and emotional learning can build student and teacher relationships that support social emotional and academic learning and equip students and adults to respond to and recover from crises.

Mr. Pompei's Response to Questions Submitted for the Record

REP. SUZANNE BONAMICI (D-OR)

1. Many of my colleagues today have focused on school safety with respect to violence in schools. In Oregon, schools are also focused on creating emergency plans for natural disasters. Oregon is due for a major earthquake along the Casacadia fault, which will likely result in a massive tsunami. Along with the dangers of collapsing buildings and infrastructure, many schools, like those in Seaside, Oregon, would lie directly in the path of such an event. Because of Oregon's proximity to the fault, response time once an earthquake is detected will be limited. This is a situation that Oregonians take seriously, and efforts to relocate and retrofit schools are underway.

Mr. Ellis mentioned that emergency planning focuses on three categories of hazards, including natural disasters. This is question for all of the panelists: What kind of experience do you have creating emergency plans for natural disasters? How is planning for a natural disaster similar to and different from planning for something like a schools shooting? What are the special needs that must be met and challenges faced?

While I do not have personal experience creating emergency plans for natural disasters, I understand the unique challenges they provide. Additionally, I know well the challenges any emergency—man-made or natural—can create in schools and among students. Schools and districts must prepare for natural disasters like any other crisis.

Schools must develop emergency preparedness and crisis response plans that help schools prevent, prepare for and respond to emergencies. The plans should address a variety of emergencies that are both predictable and unpredictable.

Similarities in planning:

• Plans for all types of emergencies must include training for school staff, predetermined communication throughout an emergency, and recovery procedures.

• Schools and districts must form crisis response teams which establish a chain of command well in advance of any incident. Who is in charge? What are individuals' roles and responsibilities? Etc.

• Schools must assess the types of crises and emergencies their region is prone to. Threat assessments should be conducted not only for human threats of violence, but for natural disasters. Plans should assess whether natural disasters, such as hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, fires or tornadoes, are likely in a community.

Differences in planning:

Weather cannot be stopped but schools must always strive to prevent other types of crises. For instance, reporting suspicious behavior of a student may prevent or delay a violent incident and provide schools the needed time to protect students and minimize damage.

• Natural disasters can be anticipated (such as your example of a school district residing on a fault line), often more so than violent incidences of a human design.

Unfortunately, there is often little or no warning before earthquakes and other natural emergencies occur.

• School emergency plans must provide guidance for safe locations during natural disaster, such as underground shelters for schools prone to tornadoes or safe areas for students and faculty in earthquake-prone areas.

• Plans must take into consideration the correct responses to natural disasters. For instance, should a school go into lockdown, shelter-in-place, or evacuate?

There are a number of special needs that must be considered in planning for natural disasters—and especially for the repercussions after a disaster occurs. Natural disasters or manmade catastrophes such as building explosions, bridge collapse, floods, hurricanes, tornadoes and earthquakes can have serious psychological consequences similar to those experienced during acts of violence.

• Issues related to the destruction of homes, property, heirlooms and livelihoods will compound the feelings of loss and powerlessness in adults and children. These disasters often multiply normal stressors at home (such as finances) and create new stressors from problems caused by the disaster—homelessness, transportation issues and lack of basic services.

• When recovering from natural or manmade disasters, it's important that families remain together as much as possible or practical. Children will pick up feelings of anxiety from their parents, so it's critical to talk about what is happening and how the family will recover together. Additionally, children must return to a normal routine as soon as possible.

Schools must consider the appropriate role they have to play in the aftermath. As a school counselor, I understand how stressors at home impact students' ability to function and perform at their best in school.

RESOURCES:

The National Education Association's Health Information Network has a Crisis Guide for schools planning for all types of emergencies. *http://crisisguide.neahin.org/crisisguide/images/SchoolCrisisGuide.pdf*

The American School Counselor Association's The Professional School Counselor and Crisis/Critical Incident Response in the Schools. *http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/PS_Crisis_Critical.pdf*

The National Association for School Psychologists provides excellent information for schools planning for natural disasters. *http://www.nasponline.org/resources/crisis_safety/naturaldisaster_teams_ho.aspx*

REP. RUSH HOLD (D-NJ)

1. I am a cosponsor of legislation, the Student Support Act (H.R. 320), which would provide states with money to improve the ratio of mental health providers (school counselors, psychologists, and guidance counselors) to students in schools of each state. Mr. Pompei, in your experience as a school counselor, what is the maximum number of students a school counselor can be responsible for in order to do their job effectively? Should this caseload responsibility be adjusted to reflect the changing academic, emotional, and social development needs of students at different grade levels?

The National School Counselors Association recommends a ratio of no more than 250 students to each counselor in grades K-12. This should be the very maximum number of students any one counselor has under his or her purview.

In California, where I am from, the ratio of school counselor to student is 1:1,000. This leaves vital student prevention and intervention services unaddressed, which is a disservice for students and society as a whole. The maximum number of students for each school counselor should never go above 250 as recommenced by the American School Counselor Association. In addition, the professional school counselor's responsibilities should include those services that directly address the diverse needs of students. Unfortunately, many administrators or districts require the professional school counselor to do clerical work, data entry, student enrollment, test administration and other items that do not support the uniquely qualified skills and training school counselors possess. Our students are entering society ill prepared and many with untreated and undiagnosed mental health issues as a result. Increasing the number of professional school counselors will make schools safer, decrease student drop out, increase academic success and make society safer as students will get these vital services during their adolescence.

RESOURCES

The American School Counselor Association's Guide to Appropriate and Inappropriate Activities for the Professional School Counselor: *http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/appropriate.pdf*

The American School Counselor Association's Guide on the Role of the Professional School Counselor: *http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/RoleStatement.pdf*

REP. FREDERICA WILSON (D-FL)

1. I think that in every tragic incident we hear of in our schools, we always end up saying someone should have done something or someone could have something to prevent it.

There is not a one size fits all solution. I represent two school districts. One has a full police force; the other has just a few SROs. That's the difference in the school districts, but I think that one thing that should be available to all schools is enough counselors and enough social workers and mentors for the children. That's all of them, whether they have SROs or whatever else they have.

I don't think it's hard for counselors to detect who needs help. The way that the funding is now for counselors, there are so few. As a result, children who have problems relating to their parents, relating to their peers, don't have anyone that they really trust in the schools. The few counselors are always busy planning for college, testing and other activities. So, the one thing that I think we need to do is expand the pool of counselors, social workers and mentors. Because a lot of times, it is a matter of miscommunication.

I have had the opportunity to talk to so many children who are incarcerated. One person could help them through a bad day, anger, bullying, mommy and daddy getting a divorce, mommy getting beat-up the night before. I heard someone say that one school had a counselor for every grade level. What a difference it would make for children in schools. I would like to find out from the panel: how do you feel about increasing the number of counselors?

Professional school counselors are certified/licensed educators with the minimum of a master's degree in school counseling and are uniquely qualified? to address the developmental needs of all students through a comprehensive school counseling program addressing the academic, career and personal/social development of all students. The American School Counselor Association recommends a school counselor to student ratio of no more than 1:250. In California, where I am from, the school counselor to student ratio is over 1:1,000 leaving us unable to appropriately and effectively service the needs of students. In fact, many students who are in need go completely un-serviced with these large caseloads. Professional school counselors are the trusted adults on campus where students know they can confidentially share their struggles, concerns and challenges. This allows for early intervention and prevention services that otherwise go unaddressed. With these enormous caseloads, it is not only a disservice for our students but society as a whole. These young people go out into society ill prepared and many with untreated and undiagnosed mental health issues as a result. Increasing the number of professional school counselors will make schools safer, decrease student drop out, increase academic success and make society safer as students will get these vital services during their adolescence.

RESOURCES

Here is the American School Counselor Associations Guide to Appropriate and Inappropriate Activities for a Professional School Counselor: *http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/appropriate.pdf*

Here is the American School Counselor Association's Guide on the Role of the Professional School Counselor: *http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/RoleStatement.pdf*

[Whereupon, at 2:16 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○