College of Professional Studies Professional Projects   Dissertations, Theses, and Professional Projects

Fall 2013

Archidiocese of Milwaukee Teacher In-Service Safety Training

Paul A. Mascari
Marquette University

Follow this and additional works at: http://epublications.marquette.edu/cps_professional

ARCHDIOCESE OF MILWAUKEE TEACHER IN-SERVICE SAFETY TRAINING

DEVELOPMENT

By

Paul A. Mascari, B.A.

A Professional Project submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts in Public Service

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

December 2013

ABSTRACT
ARCHDIOCESE OF MILWAUKEE TEACHER IN-SERVICE SAFETY TRAINING
DEVELOPMENT

Paul A. Mascari, B.A.

Marquette University, 2013

Recent active shooter events in our nation highlight the need for organizations to have comprehensive violence prevention/intervention plans in place. While much has been done to address violence in the workplace and on college campuses, K-12 schools have been slow to develop a comprehensive violence prevention/intervention curriculum for faculty, staff and students. This project was completed to meet the needs of the Catholic Schools within the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. Research was conducted to determine the effectiveness of applying safety best practices from higher education and the workplace to the elementary, middle, and secondary education settings. The outcome of this project is an in-service curriculum for faculty and staff on threat assessment, threat management, physical security considerations, and imminent threat response practices.

Keywords: active shooter, school safety, school violence, threat assessment, threat management

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Paul A. Mascari, B.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Archdiocese of Milwaukee Teacher In-Service Safety Training Development

Problem Statement

On December 14, 2012, a gunman entered Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut and fatally shot 20 children and six adults before killing himself (Barron, 2012). This tragic incident sparked debate on everything from mental health care to gun control to arming teachers in the classroom (Swanson, 2013). Recent active shooter events in our nation highlight the need for organizations to have comprehensive violence prevention/intervention plans in place.

In 2009, Wisconsin Act 309 established laws mandating safety plans and training for every school in the state. According to the statute, "Each school board and the governing body of each private school shall have in effect a school safety plan for each public or private school in the school district within 3 years of May 27, 2010" (Wisconsin Act 309, 2009). Additionally, public and private schools are required to conduct safety drills two times a year based on the safety plan.

While much has been done in this area related to violence in the workplace and on college campuses, there is an increasingly urgent need for more concentration in K-12 schools. A review of literature and research related to active shooter incidents indicates that intervention and training, in conjunction with physical security and safety protocols, could greatly reduce the potential for violence, or the loss of life in a violent encounter.

Catholic Schools in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee

With an enrollment of more than 30,000 students, the Archdiocese of Milwaukee oversees 99 elementary and 14 high schools within 10 counties in Southeastern Wisconsin (Archdiocese of Milwaukee, 2013). Catholic schools in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee would

benefit immensely from a comprehensive curriculum to address potential violence and respond

to imminent violence in a K-12 setting. The schools within the Archdiocese of Milwaukee lack a

comprehensive curriculum specifically designed to address potential violence and respond to an

imminent threat of violence. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) provides

several resources to public schools related to school safety (Wisconsin Department of Public

Instruction, n.d.). Unlike public schools in Wisconsin, the Catholic schools in the Archdiocese

of Milwaukee do not have a centralized school board and are often governed by a sponsoring

parish. Oversight and guidance is given by the Archdiocese, but control and resources are

allocated by a "local leadership team" (Archdiocese of Milwaukee, 2013). These "local

leadership teams" often lack the expertise and resources needed to develop a practical and robust

safety plan.

Literature Review

Threat Assessment and Management

After the mass shootings at Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois University, media

attention to campus safety was at an all-time high (Deisinger, Randazzo, O'Neill, & Savage,

2008, p. 3). Although not a new area of study, more focus began to be placed on threat

assessment and management. The idea of identifying and managing threats had been around for

a number years. In fact, in 1997, ten years before the Virginia Tech shooting, the United States

Postal Service issued the *Threat Assessment Team Guide* as "guidance to postal management in

responding to and assessing the seriousness of potentially violent situations" (United States

Postal Service, 1997). Despite a reputation for an unusually high rate of workplace violence, the

United States Postal Service Commission On A Safe and Secure Workplace found that "going

postal" was a myth and that postal workers were no less likely to engage in violence than the

national workforce (The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, 2000, p.1).   The

Postal Service, however, led the way in developing threat assessment strategies.

In 2002, the United States Secret Service and Department of Education (2002) came

together to create a guide to help schools carry out the *Safe Schools Initiative* by "adapting the

threat assessment investigative process developed by the Secret Service to the problem of

targeted school violence" (p. 4).   While the guide is focused on identifying students who might

pose a threat, the principles of threat assessment can also be used to assess external threats if the

proper notification and management protocols are put in place. For instance, the guide explains

that incidents of "targeted violence" are rarely sudden, impulsive acts and that people often knew

about the attacker's plan prior to the attack (United States Secret Service and United States

Department of Education, 2002, p. 17). This can also be applied to a domestic violence situation

that has the potential to spill over into a school.

Deisinger, Randazzo, O'Neill and Savage (2008) suggest targeted violence can be

prevented if early signs are recognized and a threat assessment team can intervene (p. 135).

Communication between various parties is central to identifying and managing any threat.

Information must be corroborated and put in context to determine if a person poses a threat. It's

important to note that posing a threat is different than making a threat. Someone who makes a

threat could potentially be dangerous, but the act of making a threat alone does not necessarily

indicate the person will become violent (United States Secret Service and United States

Department of Education, 2002, p. 33). The Safe School Initiative found in over 80% of the

cases, the shooter did not directly make a threat before engaging in a school shooting, but did

make known their intent (United States Secret Service and United States Department of

Education, 2002). School administrators need to develop a comprehensive threat assessment

policy that promotes communication within the school and between school administrators and law enforcement personnel.

Most of the significant literature to date focuses on the workplace, college campuses, and internal threats in K-12 schools. Elementary and high schools, especially private ones that lack centralized authority and resources, need to focus on how to identify and react to threats from outside the school as well. They need to cultivate relationships with law enforcement and determine how to engage community resources like mental health care. Universities, for instance, have large threat assessment and management teams that consist of law enforcement, faculty, student affairs, legal counsel, media relations, and mental health professionals (Deisinger, Randazzo, O'Neill, & Savage, 2008, p. 37). Interdisciplinary teams like this are well equipped to assess and deal with a potential threat once it has been identified. Most Catholic schools do not have these resources, so they must make extra effort to engage with resources in their communities when a potential threat comes to their attention.

Physical Security Considerations

Renewed emphasis has also been placed on physically securing our nation's schools. Experts recommended that school districts install self-locking, automatically closing doors to classrooms and multiple cameras around the schools (Ergenbright & Hubbard, 2012, p. 15). The idea is to keep people intent on causing harm out of the building or, as a last resort, out of the individual classrooms if they do get in. Turning elementary schools into fortresses, however, is neither practical nor desirable. The cost of facility upgrades and ongoing maintenance can quickly become unmanageable for school districts that are already struggling with tight budgets and limited resources. Additionally, almost any physical security feature a school employs can still be circumvented by a determined gunman. Children will still go out for recess and parents

and visitors will still be allowed in schools during the school day. Aside from airport-like

screening at every school and an impenetrable wall surrounding the school grounds, there is no

fool-proof way to keep those wishing to cause people harm out of the building.

One aspect of physical security that could benefit schools, however, would be the concept

known as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). The Centers for Disease

Control and Prevention (CDC) is currently studying how principles of CPTED can be used to

reduce violence in schools. These CPTED principles include

- creating a warm and welcoming environment,

- fostering a sense of physical and social order,

- creating a sense of ownership by students,

- sending positive messages to students,

- maximizing the presence of authority figures,

- minimizing opportunities for out-of-sight activities, and

- managing access to all school areas (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013).

Implementing all of these principles sends a message that the school may not be a desirable

target for criminal activity. The CDC suggests schools use the CPTED School Assessment

(CSA) (Appendix D) to evaluate the grounds, buildings, and interiors (Centers for Disease

Control and Prevention, 2013). While environmental design may not necessarily impact the

motives of a determined shooter, they could have an impact if a gunman is randomly selecting a

target.

School administrators need to determine which physical security features meet their

needs and their budgets. When securing a school, administrators cannot use a one-size-fits-all

approach. What may be appropriate for one school, may not work another. While schools need

to be secured, a fortress mentality is usually not an environment that is conducive to learning.

Active Shooter/Imminent Threat Response

The Department of Homeland Security (2013) defines an active shooter as "an individual

actively engaged in killing or attempting to kill people in a confined space and populated area;

active shooters use firearms and there is no pattern or method to selection of their victims" (p. 3).

Both police and civilian guidance for responding to an active shooter has changed throughout the

years. Prior to the 1999 shooting at Columbine High School in Colorado, police first responders

were trained to form a perimeter and wait for a tactical response to resolve the situation (Buerger

& Buerger, 2010, p. 1). This gave the two shooters a significant amount of time to kill 12

students and one teacher in the building (Lamb, 2008).

Today, police responding to an active shooter incident are trained to enter the building,

locate, and stop the shooter (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2013, p. 6). Training for

civilians has also evolved in active shooter incidents. Before the terrorist attacks on September

11, 2001, most people were taught to comply with a gunman (Center for Personal Protection and

Safety, 2008). The idea was that a gunman's intent was usually to take hostages and use them as

leverage. The active shooter, however, like the plane hijackers on 9/11, has the sole intent of

killing as many people as possible. Because of this, current guidance to personnel in workplaces

(U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2013, p. 4) and universities (Center for Personal

Protection and Safety, 2008) teach variations on the "Run Hide Fight" method of surviving an

active shooter incident that was recently introduced by the City of Houston (2012).

The "Run Hide Fight" method teaches people to get out of a building if possible, to hide

in a secure location if getting out is not possible, and to actively confront the gunman as a last

resort (City of Houston, 2012). The idea behind "run," or evacuation, is that it is better to not be in a building where a gunman is shooting. If someone has a clear route to escape the building, and is sure they will not encounter the shooter, it is advisable to get out as quickly as possible. If evacuating the building is not possible, then the next best option is to hide in a secure location until law enforcement arrives and can stop the shooter. This involves locking or barricading a door, turning off the lights, and spreading out if there are multiple people in the room (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2013, p. 5). Finally, as a last resort, the Department of Homeland Security (2013) gives the option of "taking action against the shooter" (p. 5). This final guidance of "fight" assumes that all other options have failed and there is a strong likelihood that your life is in imminent danger if you do not take action.

Despite the recent trends in active shooter response, K-12 schools have been slow to adopt this guidance. A review of the literature about school safety suggests that the most common way schools train to respond to an active shooter event is through "lockdowns." While Kingshott and McKenzie (2013) do acknowledge that teachers and administrators are "first responders on the scene" when an emergency or crisis of any kind happens they advise school staff not take any "reactive measures" because their role is simply to initiate the contingency plan and then "assess and advise" until law enforcement arrives (p. 224).

Buerger and Buerger (2010) assert that school safety plans need to be flexible enough to account for "broad categories of incidents" (p. 1). They also point out that students are not always in their classroom and that a "robust active-shooter protocol must encompass outdoor recess, lunch time groupings in the cafeteria, assemblies, and transition times" (Buerger & Buerger, 2010, p. 3). In the scenarios mentioned evacuation from the building or area might be the best option.

In some cases, confronting the shooter might be the best option if evacuation is not possible. In a situation where an active shooter has trapped people and there is nowhere to go and nowhere to hide, the Department of Homeland Security (2013) advises, "As a last resort, and only if your life is in imminent danger, attempt to disrupt and/or incapacitate the active shooter" (p. 5). This is basic self-defense. If someone is actively engaged in shooting, you have to assume that the shooter's intention is to cause as many casualties as possible. If an individual is face to face with an active shooter, current guidance suggests that his or her best chance at survival and helping others survive might be to attack the shooter (Center for Personal Protection and Safety, 2008).

Some reasons why schools have been slow to accept the concept of "Run Hide Fight" and train teachers in this type of response include legitimate concern that teachers and students will either not retain the information in a stressful situation, or perhaps not apply the concepts correctly. This could result in causing more harm and possibly unnecessary death (Dorn & Satterly, 2012). The concern is certainly a valid one, but ignores the fact that doing nothing could also result in death when face to face with an active shooter. Buerger and Buerger (2010) suggest that schools need to develop a "more robust response" strategy because hiding out and waiting for police may not be the best option (p. 4).

One of the biggest issues present for the trainer when providing active shooter response training for elementary school teachers is the reluctance of the teachers to implement the training they receive. Alba and Gable (2012) identified several additional barriers in a study they conducted, explaining why elementary schools seem to be behind in adopting best practices in responding to an active shooter. Those barriers included disagreements between first responders

and school district personnel, communication issues, and a lack of clarity on proper response

procedures (2012, p. 45).

With the obvious exception of prevention of an incident, training faculty and staff to

respond effectively to an active shooter incident is possibly the best way to reduce casualties.

School safety professionals continue to debate what this training should consist of and how it

should be implemented (Andersen, Hueston, & McCaleb, 2012). While the research is lacking

on the effectiveness of employing current workplace and campus guidance for responding to an

active shooter in an elementary school setting, the literature suggests several reasons to try

implementing some version of "Run Hide Fight." Training programs on lockdown procedures

are based on the assumption that there is a room with a door that can be secured. The reality is

students and teachers may not always be in that type of room when someone starts shooting.

Given this obvious fact, it only makes sense to give teachers and administrators more training on

other options so they can make the best decision to keep their students safe.

Further research is needed to gauge the effectiveness of an active shooter response

training curriculum. As more schools adopt the training model already present in workplaces

and on college campuses, more opportunities to get feedback from teachers on the practicality of

the training will likely arise, allowing for even better responses to be formed, with more

advanced training. Hopefully teachers will never have to use any of the training, but if they are

ever in an active shooter incident, the skills they learn might save their own lives and those of the

children in their care.

Emergency Management & Contingency Planning

School safety plans need to account for multiple hazards as part of the emergency

management and contingency planning process. School administrators should draw on historical

data from their community to determine what threats and hazards the school might face (U.S.

Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Safe and

Healthy Students, 2013, p. 7). Including subject-matter experts from law enforcement, fire, and

emergency medical services, and local emergency management is beneficial to this process. In

most schools, a "contingency plan" for an active shooter consists of protocols for a lockdown

only (Buerger & Buerger, 2010, p. 1).   One study of a large school district in the Midwest found

that while more than 80% of the school staff had participated in a fire drill and lockdown

exercises, only about 30% had participated in an evacuation drill in the past year (Kingshott &

McKenzie, 2013, p. 232). It should be noted that an evacuation procedure would also be used

for non-active shooter threats like a gas leak or chemical spill.

Since a critical incident at any school would require a multi-agency response including

police, fire, emergency medical services (EMS), and perhaps federal law enforcement, schools

would be advised to base their safety plan on the National Incident Management System (NIMS)

and the Incident Command System (ICS) models. According to the Federal Emergency

Management Agency (FEMA), "NIMS provides a consistent framework for incident

management at all jurisdictional levels regardless of the cause, size, or complexity of the

incident" (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2011). NIMS does not dictate a specific

response to an incident, but rather how to respond based on the size and complexity of the

incident. ICS specifies the organizational structure responding agencies should follow to ensure

functional command structure. Utilizing NIMS and ICS allows for seamless interagency

cooperation during an incident and maximizes the efficiency of resources (Federal Emergency

Management Agency, 2011). Kingshot and McKenzie (2013) explain the six major components

of NIMS:

- Command and management: This includes the incident command system, multiagency coordination systems, and public information systems.

- Preparedness: This includes planning, training, exercises, personnel qualifications, equipment acquisitions, mutual aid, and publications management.

- Resource management: This includes the steps required to describe, request, mobilize, track, and recover resources used during the incident response.

- Communications and information management: This includes radios, pagers, and protocols used to ensure that key personnel get the information they need.

- Supporting technologies: This includes voice and data communication systems.

- Ongoing management and maintenance: This provides oversight and review of NIMS to improve and refine systems (pp. 227-228).

While the language of NIMS and ICS may seem foreign to someone who is not a first responder, it is a common language that all responders understand. Since many of the agencies that may respond to an emergency at a school may not work together on a regular basis, it is critical for everyone to use the same terminology. While school personnel will not be engaged in a tactical response, they could be called upon to support the response in any number of functions in the ICS structure. School administrators should be familiar with NIMS and ICS for this reason.

Methodology

A review of a sampling of school safety plans from schools within the Archdiocese of Milwaukee indicates an urgent need for a curriculum specific to K-12 schools to assist administrators with violence prevention and intervention training. Following the presentation of a pilot training program to 42 principals from Catholic schools within the Archdiocese, this

researcher solicited feedback from the Catholic Education Leadership Institute. Among the

needs identified by Institute staff was assistance with development, review and training of a

safety plan. The in-service training program curriculum developed for this research project

incorporates extensive research on threat assessment/management, physical security

considerations, emergency management, and imminent threat response practices.

Conclusion

When this author began this project in January of 2013, very little guidance existed on

how schools should respond to an active shooter incident. While the federal Safe School

Initiative provided schools with a wealth of information on identifying and managing potential

threats, nothing in the guide addressed the important issue of how to respond to an active shooter

event in progress. It is good to know that one of the outcomes of the shootings at Columbine

High School was a greater focus on prevention, but responding to violence in our nation's

schools must utilize a holistic, research-based approach.

In June 2013, the U.S. Department of Education (ED), U.S. Department of Health and

Human Services (HHS), U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), U.S. Department of

Justice (DOJ), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and the Federal Emergency Management

Agency (FEMA), released the *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency

Operations Plans.* In many respects, the guide reflects what this author has done by taking

active shooter response best practices from law enforcement and the private sector and applying

them to the K-12 environment. While the focus of the guide is on creating a school safety plan,

or emergency operations plan (EOP), it also provides guidance on threat assessment and

management, physical security, active shooter/imminent threat response, and recovery. These

areas are guided by *Presidential Policy Directive (PPD) 8,* which defines preparedness around

the five "mission areas":

- Prevention – the action schools take to prevent a threatened or actual incident from

  occurring.

- Protection – securing schools against acts of violence and manmade or natural

  disasters.

- Mitigation – eliminating or reducing the loss of life and property damage by lessening

  the impact of an event or emergency.

- Response – stabilizing an emergency once it has happened or is certain to happen in

  an unpreventable way.

- Recovery – assisting schools affected by an emergency or event in restoring the

  learning environment (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and

  Secondary Education, Office of Safe and Healthy Students, 2013, p. 2).

Much of this effort on a national level is a result of renewed focus on school safety following the

December 2012 shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School. That event demonstrated that

security measures and threat assessment (prevention and protection) alone are not sufficient. A

safety plan, or EOP, must also address the areas of mitigation, response, and recovery.

Comprehensive prevention planning and mitigation cannot account for everything. School staff

must be prepared to respond to any number of emergency situations.

     The result of this research project is the development of a training program for Catholic

school faculty, staff, and administrators within the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. The three-hour

training session is meant to be held annually, preferably at the beginning of the school year. Four

45-minute units cover threat assessment/management, physical security, active shooter/imminent

threat response, and emergency management/contingency planning. It is important that all

employees who work at the school receive this training. Everyone is responsible for the safety

and security of the children in the school and everyone should contribute to the planning process.

Following this training, participants should have a general understanding of the topics covered.

More training is recommended on specific areas related to a participant's job description. For

instance, principals and vice principals would benefit from receiving additional training related

to incident management and threat assessment since they would likely be heavily involved in

those areas. Maintenance personnel should receive further training on physical security,

especially principles of CPTED. All school personnel should participate in scenario-based safety

drills that incorporate a number of different hazards.

As was stated previously, it is very important to leverage the experience and expertise of

first responders in the community throughout the safety planning, training, and review process.

Great progress has been made in the field of threat assessment, prevention, response, and

mitigation. While there is obviously more work to be done, schools must take advantage of the

research and training that already exists to ensure a safer learning environment.

References

Alba, D. J., & Gable, R. K. (2012). School Safety Planning: Barriers to Implementation Perceived by District Leadership and First Responders. *NERA Conference Proceedings 2012* (pp. 1-57). University of Connecticut.

Andersen, A., Hueston, H., & McCaleb, K. (2012, January 1). *Creating a curriculum for teachers to deal with classroom violence from threats to shootings.* Retrieved from The National Behavioral Intervention Team Association: http://www.nabita.org/documents/AbstractTeacherstodealwithclassroomviolencefromthreatstoshootings.pdf

Archdiocese of Milwaukee. (2013, October 1). *About Catholic Schools*. Retrieved from Archdiocese of Milwaukee: http://www.archmil.org/Catholic-Schools.htm

Archdiocese of Milwaukee. (2013). *FAQs.* Retrieved from A Vision of Greatness: http://schools.archmil.org/schools/about/FAQs.htm#Q13

Barron, J. (2012, December 15). *Children Were All Shot Multiple Times With a Semiautomatic, Officials Say*. Retrieved from The New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/16/nyregion/gunman-kills-20-children-at-school-in-connecticut-28-dead-in-all.html?_r=0

Buerger, M. E., & Buerger, G. E. (2010). Those Terrible First Few Minutes: Revisiting Active-Shooter Protocols for Schools. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 1-4.

Campbell, J. (2007). *Anticipating and managing crime, crisis and violence in our schools : a practical guide.* Youngstown, NY: Cambria Press.

Center for Personal Protection and Safety. (2008). Shots Fired on Campus: When Lightning Strikes.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2013, February 12). *CDC - Crime Prevention*

    Through Environmental Design (CPTED) - Youth Violence - Violence Prevention -

    Injury. Retrieved from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention:

    http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/youthviolence/cpted.html

De Becker, G. (1997). *The Gift of Fear: And other survival signals that protect us from violence.*

    New York: Dell Publishing.

Deisinger, G., Randazzo, M., O'Neill, D., & Savage, J. (2008). *The Handbook for Campus*

    Threat Assessment & Management Teams. Stoneham: Applied Risk Management, LLC.

Dorn, M. S., & Satterly, J. S. (2012, August 8). *Fight, Flight or Lockdown - Teaching Students*

    and Staff to Attack Active Shooters Could Result in Decreased Casualties or Needless

    Death. Retrieved from Safe Havens International:

    http://www.safehavensinternational.org/wp-

    content/uploads/2012/10/Fight_Flight_or_Lockdown-Dorn-Satterly.pdf

Ergenbright, C. E., & Hubbard, S. K. (2012, June). Defeating the Active Shooter: Applying

    Facility Upgrades in Order to Mitigate the Effects of the Active Shooter. Monterey, CA:

    Naval Postgraduate School.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2011, April 27). *Course Downloads.* Retrieved from

    FEMA: Emergency Management Institute:

    http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/is100SCalst.asp

Jones, T. (2001). *Effective response to school violence: A guide for educators and law*

    enforcement personnel. Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.

Kerr, K. M. (2010). *Workplace violence: Planning for prevention and response.* Burlington, MA:

    Butterworth-Heinemann.

Kingshott, B. F., & McKenzie, D. G. (2013). Developing Crisis Management Protocols in the

      Context of School Safety. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 222-245.

Lamb, G. (2008, April 17). *Columbine High School*. Retrieved from The New York Times:

      http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/c/columbine_high_sch

      ool/index.html

Mair, J. S., & Mair, M. (2003). Violence Prevention and Control Through Environmental

      Modifications. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 209-225.

McCann, J. T. (2002). *Threats in schools: A practical guide for managing violence.* New York:

      Haworth Press.

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. (2012). *Campus*

      Threat Assessment Case Studies: A training tool for investigation, evaluation, and

      intervention. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Roberts, M. R. (2013, March 16). Active-shooter preparedness at the local, national level. *Fire*

      Chief.

Swanson, E. (2013, April 4). *Arming Teachers*. Retrieved from The Huffington Post:

      http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/04/04/gun-poll_n_3017538.html

The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse. (2000). *United States Postal Service*

      Commission On A Safe and Secure Workplace. New York: Columbia University.

U.S Department of Homeland Security. (2013, January 16). *Department of Homeland Security:*

      Active Shooter Preparedness. Retrieved October 22, 2013, from Department of

      Homeland Security: http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/active_shooter_booklet.pdf

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Safe

and Healthy Students. (2013). *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency

Operations Plans.* Washington, D.C.

United States Postal Service. (1997, May). Threat Assessment Team Guide. *Publication 108.*

Washington, D.C.: United States Postal Service.

United States Secret Service and United States Department of Education. (2002). *The Final

Report and Findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the Prevention of

School Attacks in the United States.* Washington, D.C.: United States Department of

Education.

United States Secret Service and United States Department of Education. (2002). *Threat

Assessment in Schools: A Guide to Managing Threatening Situations and to Creating

Safe School Climates.* Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.). *Resources for Safe and Respectful Schools.*

Retrieved from Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction :

http://sspw.dpi.wi.gov/sspw_safeschool

Appendix A: In-Service PowerPoint

Presentation

Course Objective

②

Demonstrate basic knowledge of safety and security principles and how they apply to the school setting.

Participant Introductions

③

- Name, job title, and school
- Overall experience with emergency planning or incident response
- Course expectations

Instructor Expectations

4

- Be open minded to new ideas
- Participate actively in all of the discussions
- Return to class at the stated time following breaks
- Take what you learn back to your schools

Course Structure

(5)

- Unit 1: Threat Assessment/Management (45 mins)
- Unit 2: Physical Security Considerations (45 mins)
- Unit 3: Active Shooter/Imminent Threat Response (45 mins)
- Unit 4: Emergency Management/Contingency Planning (45 mins)

Successful Course Completion

(7)

- Participate in discussions
- Complete end-of-course evaluations
- Certificate of completion

In-Service Safety Training

8

UNIT 1: THREAT
ASSESSMENT/MANAGEMENT

Unit 1 Objectives

9

- Following this section, you should :
  - Have a basic understanding of threat assessment and threat management principals,
  - Know how to identify potentially threatening behavior and who to notify,
  - Know the basic makeup of a threat assessment team
  - Be aware of possible "red herrings".

Principles of Threat Assessment

10

- We cannot predict who will be violent but can focus on who might be on the path to violence
- We can:
  o Identify individuals with disruptive behavior
  o Investigate: is there the intent and ability, are there plans
  o Manage the threat

Threat Assessment Questions

11

- Has there been any mention of suicidal thoughts, plans or attempts?
- Has there been any mention of thoughts/plans of violence?
- Have there been any behaviors that cause concern for violence or the person's well being?
- Does the person have access to a weapon or are they trying to gain access to a weapon?
- Are behaviors significantly disruptive to the school or workplace?

Risk Indicators

12

- History of violent behavior
- Having a weapon or fascination with weapons
- Loss of reality, odd or bizarre beliefs
- Preoccupation with violent themes
- Intimidation, harassment of others.
- Obsessive focus on grudge
- Extreme moral righteousness
- Impulse control or interpersonal problems
- Inability to take criticism
- Isolated, loner

Potential Contributing Events

13

- Loss or perceived loss
- Pending divorce or other relational trauma
- Perceived or pending job loss
- Loss of a loved one
- Onset of a serious health problem
- Alcohol or drug relapse
- Discontinued mental health treatment or meds

Findings of the *Safe School Initiative*

(14)

- Incidents of targeted violence at school rarely are sudden, impulsive acts.
- Prior to most incidents, other people knew about the attacker's idea and/or plan to attack.
- Most attackers did not threaten their targets directly prior to advancing the attack.
- There is no accurate or useful profile of students who engaged in targeted school violence.
- Most attackers engaged in some behavior prior to the incident that caused others concern or indicated a need for help.
- Most attackers had difficulty coping with significant losses or personal failures. Moreover, many had considered or attempted suicide.
- Many attackers felt bullied, persecuted or injured by others prior to the attack.
- Most attackers had access to and had used weapons prior to the attack.
- In many cases, other students were involved in some capacity.
- Despite prompt law enforcement responses, most shooting incidents were stopped by means other than law enforcement intervention.

Possible Red Herrings

15

- Those with developmental issues
- Difference between making and posing a threat
- Those with anger issues
- Cultural considerations
- Those with mental health issues
- Investigation should resolve

Threat Assessment Teams

16

- Teachers
- Administration (principal/vice-principals)
- Media Relations
- Police/Security
- Human Resources
- Mental Health Professional

Small Group Discussion Questions

17

- Take 10 minutes to answer the following questions:
  - ○ Do you have a threat assessment team/process?
  - ○ Do you know to where to go to report concerns?
- 10 minute break

Unit 2 Objectives

19

- Following this unit, you should:
  - Be able to identify basic security features
  - Determine which features meet your school's needs
  - Demonstrate a basic understanding of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED)

Factors Affecting Safety

20

- **School security**
  - Hardware, technology, protocols, and policies
- **School design**
  - Access control, natural surveillance, and territorial reinforcement
  - Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
- **School climate**
  - Values, norms, and attitudes

General Considerations

21

- Building and grounds are well maintained.
- Students feel safe reporting crime and safety problems to staff.
- Disciplinary and safety problems are quickly and appropriately addressed.
- Access is controlled and visitors are monitored.
- All staff actively supervise students both inside and outside the classroom.
- All areas are safe by environmental design or by staff supervision.

Safe Schools Planning

22

- Establish a team
- Review research on crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED)
- Assess needs – CPTED School Assessment (CSA)
- Prioritize needs
- Develop and implement a plan

Small Group Discussion Questions

23

- Take 10 minutes to answer the following questions:
  - ○ Have you identified security concerns at your school?
  - ○ How do you address security concerns?
- 10 minute break

In-Service Safety Training

24

UNIT 3: ACTIVE SHOOTER/IMMINENT
THREAT RESPONSE

Unit 3 Objectives

(25)

- Following this unit, you should:
  - Understand the difference between an active shooter and hostage situation
  - Understand the options you have for responding to active shooter incident

Video Presentation: Shots Fired on Campus: When Lighting Strikes

Video Review & Response Considerations:

(27)

- **Survival Mindset – Trust your instincts!**
  - Awareness – attuned to environment
  - Preparation – "What if" questions to prepare mentally
  - Rehearsal – mentally and physically practice plan
- **Get Out**
  - If you can get out to a safer place, do it quickly
  - Most school shootings happen during class change or lunch time
  - Scatter and don't run in a straight line
- **Hide Out**
  - If you can't get out, stay well hidden
  - Turn off lights, silence cell phones, lock AND barricade door
  - Spread out - do not huddle together
- **Take Out**
  - Assume shooters intentions are lethal – active shooter vs. hostage situation
  - Do whatever it takes to stop the shooter
  - Throw things, yell, improvised weapons (letter opener, scissors, etc...)
  - A person with the intent to live has a good chance against an active shooter

Law Enforcement Response:

28

- Law Enforcement Training
  - Most police departments are trained in responding to an active shooter
  - Same tactics so agencies can respond together
- Initial Response
  - Do not expect officers to assist you – primary goal is to engage the shooter
  - When officers enter the room, do not present a threat to them
- Key Information
  - Name of shooter – if known
  - Number of shooters
  - Description of shooter(s)
  - Number and types of weapons carried by shooter

Beyond Lockdowns:

29

- Evacuation may be the best option if you can't get to a safe place
  - Cafeterias, Gym, Recess
- Drills should include procedures for partial or total evacuation
- Train to overcome the natural response to "Duck and Cover"
  - Cover vs. Concealment
  - Spread out
- Wisconsin Act 309
  - 118.07(4)(a) Each school board and the governing body of each private school shall have in effect a school safety plan for each public or private school in the school district within 3 years of May 27, 2010
  - ii. 118.07 (2) (a) At least twice annually, without previous warning, the person having direct charge of any public or private school shall drill all pupils in the proper method of evacuation or other appropriate action in case of a school safety incident. The public and private school safety drill shall be based on the school safety plan adopted under s.118.07 (4).

Large Group Discussion

30

- What barriers do you see in implementing these strategies?
- Do you have any questions about the options discussed?
- 10 minute break

In-Service Safety Training

31

UNIT 4: EMERGENCY
MANAGEMENT/CONTINGENCY PLANNING

Unit 4 Objectives

32

- Following this unit, you should:
  - Identify purpose of the Incident Command System (ICS).
  - Understand the value of ICS in responding to an emergency at school

What Is an Incident?

(33)

- An incident is an occurrence, caused by either human or natural phenomena, that requires response actions to prevent or minimize loss of life, or damage to property and/or the environment.

What Is ICS?

(34)

- **The Incident Command System:**
  - Is a standardized, on-scene, all-hazard incident management concept.
  - Allows its users to adopt an integrated organizational structure to match the complexities and demands of single or multiple incidents without being hindered by jurisdictional boundaries.

ICS Purposes

(35)

- Using management best practices, ICS helps to ensure:
  - The safety of responders and others.
  - The achievement of tactical objectives.
  - The efficient use of resources.

ICS Mandates

36

- NIMS requires all levels of government to:
  - × Prepare for and use ICS for all domestic responses.
  - × Adopt ICS as a condition of receiving Federal preparedness funding.
- This requirement also applies to schools and school districts receiving emergency preparedness funding including the U.S. Department of Education Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools (REMS) grants.

Summary

(37)

- ICS . . .
    - Is a standardized management tool for meeting the demands of small or large emergency or nonemergency situations.
    - Represents "best practices," and has become the standard for emergency management across the country.
    - May be used for planned events, natural disasters, and acts of terrorism.
    - Is a key feature of NIMS.

Additional Resources

38

- Department of Homeland Security: Active Shooter Preparedness
  - http://www.dhs.gov/active-shooter-preparedness
- The Final Report and Findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the Prevention of School Attacks in the United States
  - http://www.secretservice.gov/ntac/ssi_final_report.pdf
- Threat Assessment in Schools: A Guide to Managing Threatening Situations and to Creating Safe School Climates
  - http://www.secretservice.gov/ntac/ssi_guide.pdf
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction: Resources for Safe and Respectful School
  - http://sspw.dpi.wi.gov/sspw_safeschool

A list of resources and contact information will be emailed to participants

Appendix B: Instructor Outline

10/01/2013

1 ☐ **In-Service Safety Training**
COURSE INTRODUCTION

2 ☐ **Course Objective**
Demonstrate basic knowledge of safety and security principles and how they apply to the school setting.

3 ☐ **Participant Introductions**
- Name, job title, and school
- Overall experience with emergency planning or incident response
- Course expectations

4 ☐ **Instructor Expectations**
- Be open minded to new ideas
- Participate actively in all of the discussions
- Return to class at the stated time following breaks
- Take what you learn back to your schools

5 ☐ **Course Structure**
- Unit 1: Threat Assessment/Management (45 mins)
- Unit 2: Physical Security Considerations (45 mins)
- Unit 3: Active Shooter/Imminent Threat Response (45 mins)
- Unit 4: Emergency Management/Contingency Planning (45 mins)

6 ☐ **Course Logistics**
- Course agenda
- Sign-in sheet
- Housekeeping:
  O Breaks
  O Cell phone policy
  O Facilities
  O Other concerns
-

7 ☐ **Successful Course Completion**
- Participate in discussions
- Complete end-of-course evaluations
- Certificate of completion

8 ☐ **In-Service Safety Training**
UNIT 1: THREAT ASSESSMENT/MANAGEMENT

9 ☐ **Unit 1 Objectives**
- Following this section, you should :
  O Have a basic understanding of threat assessment and threat management principals,
  O Know how to identify potentially threatening behavior and who to notify,
  O Know the basic makeup of a threat assessment team
  O Be aware of possible "red herrings".

10 ☐ **Principles of Threat Assessment**
- We cannot predict who will be violent but can focus on who might be on the path to violence

10/01/2013

- We can:
  - o Identify individuals with disruptive behavior
  - o Investigate: is there the intent and ability, are there plans
  - o Manage the threat

11 ▢ **Threat Assessment Questions**
- Has there been any mention of suicidal thoughts, plans or attempts?
- Has there been any mention of thoughts/plans of violence?
- Have there been any behaviors that cause concern for violence or the person's well being?
- Does the person have access to a weapon or are they trying to gain access?
- Are behaviors significantly disruptive to the school or workplace?

12 ▢ **Risk Indicators**
- History of violent behavior
- Having a weapon or fascination
- Loss of reality, odd or bizarre beliefs
- Preoccupation with violent themes
- Intimidation, harassment of others.
- Obsessive focus on grudge
- Extreme moral righteousness
- Impulse control or interpersonal problems
- Inability to take criticism
- Isolated, loner

13 ▢ **Potential Contributing Events**
- Loss or perceived loss
- Pending divorce or other relational trauma
- Perceived or pending job loss
- Loss of a loved one
- Onset of a serious health problem
- Alcohol or drug relapse
- Discontinued mental health treatment or meds

14 ▢ **Findings of the *Safe School Initiative***
- Incidents of targeted violence at school rarely are sudden, impulsive acts.
- Prior to most incidents, other people knew about the attacker's idea and/or plan to attack.
- Most attackers did not threaten their targets directly prior to advancing the attack.
- There is no accurate or useful profile of students who engaged in targeted school violence.
- Most attackers engaged in some behavior prior to the incident that caused others concern or indicated a need for help.
- Most attackers had difficulty coping with significant losses or personal failures. Moreover, many had considered or attempted suicide.
- Many attackers felt bullied, persecuted or injured by others prior to the attack.
- Most attackers had access to and had used weapons prior to the attack.
- In many cases, other students were involved in some capacity.

▪ Despite prompt law enforcement responses, most shooting incidents were stopped by means other than law enforcement intervention.

15 ▢ Possible Red Herrings
- Those with developmental issues
- Difference between making and posing a threat
- Those with anger issues
- Cultural considerations
- Those with mental health issues
- Investigation should resolve

16 ▢ Threat Assessment Teams
- Teachers
- Administration (principal/vice-principals)
- Media Relations
- Police/Security
- Human Resources
- Mental Health Professional
-
-

17 ▢ Small Group Discussion Questions
- Take 1o minutes to answer the following questions:
  - Do you have a threat assessment team/process?
  - Do you know to where to go to report concerns?
- 10 minute break

18 ▢ In-Service Safety Training
UNIT 2: PHYSICAL SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

19 ▢ Unit 2 Objectives
- Following this unit, you should:
  - Be able to identify basic security features
  - Determine which features meet your school's needs
  - Demonstrate a basic understanding of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED)

20 ▢ Factors Affecting Safety
- School security
  - Hardware, technology, protocols, and policies
- School design
  - Access control, natural surveillance, and territorial reinforcement
  - Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
- School climate
  - Values, norms, and attitudes
  -

21 ▢ General Considerations
- Building and grounds are well maintained.
- Students feel safe reporting crime and safety problems to staff.

- Disciplinary and safety problems are quickly and appropriately addressed.
- Access is controlled and visitors are monitored.
- All staff actively supervise students both inside and outside the classroom.
- All areas are safe by design or by staff supervision.

22 ☐ **Safe Schools Planning**
- Establish a team
- Assess needs – CPTED School Assessment (CSA)
- Prioritize needs
- Develop and implement a plan

23 ☐ **Small Group Discussion Questions**
- Take 1o minutes to answer the following questions:
  O Have you identified security concerns at your school?
  O How do you address security concerns?
- 10 minute break

24 ☐ **In-Service Safety Training**
UNIT 3: ACTIVE SHOOTER/IMMINENT THREAT RESPONSE

25 ☐ **Unit 3 Objectives**
- Following this unit, you should:
  O Understand the difference between an active shooter and hostage situation
  O Understand the options you have for responding to active shooter incident
  O
  O

26 ☐ **Video Presentation: Shots Fired on Campus:**
When Lighting Strikes

27 ☐ **Video Review & Response Considerations:**
- Survival Mindset – Trust your instincts!
  O Awareness – attuned to environment
  O Preparation – "What if" questions to prepare mentally
  O Rehearsal – mentally and physically practice plan
- Get Out
  O If you can get out to a safer place, do it quickly
  O Most school shootings happen during class change or lunch time
  O Scatter and don't run in a straight line
- Hide Out
  O If you can't get out, stay well hidden
  O Turn off lights, silence cell phones, lock AND barricade door
  O Spread out - do not huddle together
- Take Out
  O Assume shooters intentions are lethal – active shooter vs. hostage situation
  O Do whatever it takes to stop the shooter
  O Throw things, yell, improvised weapons (letter opener, scissors, etc…)
  O A person with the intent to live has a good chance against an active shooter

28 ☐ **Law Enforcement Response:**

10/01/2013

- Law Enforcement Training
  - Most police departments are trained in responding to an active shooter
  - Same tactics so agencies can respond together
- Initial Response
  - Do not expect officers to assist you – primary goal is to engage the shooter
  - When officers enter the room, do not present a threat to them
- Key Information
  - Name of shooter – if known
  - Number of shooters
  - Description of shooter(s)
  - Number and types of weapons carried by shooter

29 **Beyond Lockdowns:**
- Evacuation may be the best option if you can't get to a safe place
  - Cafeterias, Gym, Recess
- Drills should include procedures for partial or total evacuation
- Train to overcome the natural response to "Duck and Cover"
  - Cover vs. Concealment
  - Spread out
- Wisconsin Act 309
  - 118.07(4)(a) Each school board and the governing body of each private school shall have in effect a school safety plan for each public or private school in the school district within 3 years of May 27, 2010
  - ii.118.07 (2) (a) At least twice annually, without previous warning, the person having direct charge of any public or private school shall drill all pupils in the proper method of evacuation or other appropriate action in case of a school safety incident. The public and private school safety drill shall be based on the school safety plan adopted under s.118.07 (4).

30 **Large Group Discussion**
- What barriers do you see in implementing these strategies?
- Do you have any questions about the options discussed?
- 10 minute break

31 **In-Service Safety Training**
UNIT 4: EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT/CONTINGENCY PLANNING

32 **Unit 4 Objectives**
- Following this unit, you should:
  - Identify purpose of the Incident Command System (ICS).
  - Understand the value of ICS in responding to an emergency at school

33 **What Is an Incident?**
- An incident is an occurrence, caused by either human or natural phenomena, that requires response actions to prevent or minimize loss of life, or damage to property and/or the environment.

34 **What Is ICS?**
- The Incident Command System:
  - Is a standardized, on-scene, all-hazard incident management concept.
  - Allows its users to adopt an integrated organizational structure to match the complexities and demands of single or multiple incidents without being hindered by jurisdictional

boundaries.

-

35 **ICS Purposes**
- Using management best practices, ICS helps to ensure:
  ○ The safety of responders and others.
  ○ The achievement of tactical objectives.
  ○ The efficient use of resources.
  ○

36 **ICS Mandates**
  ○ NIMS requires all levels of government to:
    ✕ Prepare for and use ICS for all domestic responses.
    ✕ Adopt ICS as a condition of receiving Federal preparedness funding.
  ○ This requirement also applies to schools and school districts receiving emergency preparedness funding including the U.S. Department of Education Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools (REMS) grants.

37 **Summary**
- ICS . . .
  ○ Is a standardized management tool for meeting the demands of small or large emergency or nonemergency situations.
  ○ Represents "best practices," and has become the standard for emergency management across the country.
  ○ May be used for planned events, natural disasters, and acts of terrorism.
  ○ Is a key feature of NIMS.

38 **Additional Resources**
- Department of Homeland Security: Active Shooter Preparedness
  ○ http://www.dhs.gov/active-shooter-preparedness
- The Final Report and Findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the Prevention of School Attacks in the United States
  ○ http://www.secretservice.gov/ntac/ssi_final_report.pdf
- Threat Assessment in Schools: A Guide to Managing Threatening Situations and to Creating Safe School Climates
  ○ http://www.secretservice.gov/ntac/ssi_guide.pdf
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction: Resources for Safe and Respectful School
  ○ http://sspw.dpi.wi.gov/sspw_safeschool
-

A list of resources and contact information will be emailed to participants
  ○

Appendix C: In-Service Handout

10/01/2013

In-Service Safety Training

COURSE INTRODUCTION

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Course Objective

Demonstrate basic knowledge of safety and security principles and how they apply to the school setting.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Participant Introductions

- Name, job title, and school
- Overall experience with emergency planning or incident response
- Course expectations

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10/01/2013

Instructor Expectations

- Be open minded to new ideas
- Participate actively in all of the discussions
- Return to class at the stated time following breaks
- Take what you learn back to your schools

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Course Structure

- Unit 1: Threat Assessment/Management (45 mins)
- Unit 2: Physical Security Considerations (45 mins)
- Unit 3: Active Shooter/Imminent Threat Response (45 mins)
- Unit 4: Emergency Management/Contingency Planning (45 mins)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Course Logistics

- Course agenda
- Sign-in sheet
- Housekeeping:
  - Breaks
  - Cell phone policy
  - Facilities
  - Other concerns

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10/01/2013

Successful Course Completion

- Participate in discussions
- Complete end-of-course evaluations
- Certificate of completion

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In-Service Safety Training

UNIT 1: THREAT ASSESSMENT/MANAGEMENT

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Unit 1 Objectives

- **Following this section, you should :**
  - Have a basic understanding of threat assessment and threat management principals,
  - Know how to identify potentially threatening behavior and who to notify,
  - Know the basic makeup of a threat assessment team
  - Be aware of possible "red herrings".

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10/01/2013

Principles of Threat Assessment

- We cannot predict who will be violent but can focus on who might be on the path to violence
- We can:
  - Identify individuals with disruptive behavior
  - Investigate: is there the intent and ability, are there plans
  - Manage the threat

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Threat Assessment Questions

- Has there been any mention of suicidal thoughts, plans or attempts?
- Has there been any mention of thoughts/plans of violence?
- Have there been any behaviors that cause concern for violence or the person's well being?
- Does the person have access to a weapon or are they trying to gain access?
- Are behaviors significantly disruptive to the school or workplace?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Risk Indicators

- History of violent behavior
- Having a weapon or fascination
- Loss of reality, odd or bizarre beliefs
- Preoccupation with violent themes
- Intimidation, harassment of others.
- Obsessive focus on grudge
- Extreme moral righteousness
- Impulse control or interpersonal problems
- Inability to take criticism
- Isolated, loner

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10/01/2013

Potential Contributing Events

- Loss or perceived loss
- Pending divorce or other relational trauma
- Perceived or pending job loss
- Loss of a loved one
- Onset of a serious health problem
- Alcohol or drug relapse
- Discontinued mental health treatment or meds

Findings of the *Safe School Initiative*

- Incidents of targeted violence at school rarely are sudden, impulsive acts.
- Prior to most incidents, other people knew about the attacker's idea and/or plan to attack.
- Most attackers did not threaten their targets directly prior to advancing the attack.
- There is no accurate or useful profile of students who engaged in targeted school violence.
- Most attackers engaged in some behavior prior to the incident that caused others concern or indicated a need for help.
- Most attackers had difficulty coping with significant losses or personal failures. Moreover, many had considered or attempted suicide.
- Many attackers felt bullied, persecuted or injured by others prior to the attack.
- Most attackers had access to and had used weapons prior to the attack.
- In many cases, other students were involved in some capacity.
- Despite prompt law enforcement responses, most shooting incidents were stopped by means other than law enforcement intervention.

Possible Red Herrings

- Those with developmental issues
- Difference between making and posing a threat
- Those with anger issues
- Cultural considerations
- Those with mental health issues
- Investigation should resolve

10/01/2013

Threat Assessment Teams

- Teachers
- Administration (principal/vice-principals)
- Media Relations
- Police/Security
- Human Resources
- Mental Health Professional

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Small Group Discussion Questions

- Take 10 minutes to answer the following questions:
  - Do you have a threat assessment team/process?
  - Do you know to where to go to report concerns?
- 10 minute break

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

In-Service Safety Training

UNIT 2: PHYSICAL SECURITY
CONSIDERATIONS

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

10/01/2013

Unit 2 Objectives

- Following this unit, you should:
  - Be able to identify basic security features
  - Determine which features meet your school's needs
  - Demonstrate a basic understanding of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED)

Factors Affecting Safety

- School security
  - Hardware, technology, protocols, and policies
- School design
  - Access control, natural surveillance, and territorial reinforcement
  - Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
- School climate
  - Values, norms, and attitudes

General Considerations

- Building and grounds are well maintained.
- Students feel safe reporting crime and safety problems to staff.
- Disciplinary and safety problems are quickly and appropriately addressed.
- Access is controlled and visitors are monitored.
- All staff actively supervise students both inside and outside the classroom.
- All areas are safe by design or by staff supervision.

10/01/2013

Safe Schools Planning

- Establish a team
- Assess needs – CPTED School Assessment (CSA)
- Prioritize needs
- Develop and implement a plan

Small Group Discussion Questions

- Take 10 minutes to answer the following questions:
  - Have you identified security concerns at your school?
  - How do you address security concerns?
- 10 minute break

In-Service Safety Training

UNIT 3: ACTIVE SHOOTER/IMMINENT
THREAT RESPONSE

10/01/2013

Unit 3 Objectives

25

- **Following this unit, you should:**
  - Understand the difference between an active shooter and hostage situation
  - Understand the options you have for responding to active shooter incident

---

Video Presentation: Shots Fired on Campus: When Lighting Strikes

26

SHOTS FIRED ON CAMPUS When Lighting Strikes STUDENT EDITION

Protection & Safety

PLAY ABOUT

Video Review & Response Considerations:

27

- **Survival Mindset – Trust your instincts!**
  - Awareness – attuned to environment
  - Preparation – "What if" questions to prepare mentally
  - Rehearsal – mentally and physically practice plan
- **Get Out**
  - If you can get out to a safer place, do it quickly
  - Most school shootings happen during class change or lunch time
  - Scatter and don't run in a straight line
- **Hide Out**
  - If you can't get out, stay well hidden
  - Turn off lights, silence cell phones, lock AND barricade door
  - Spread out - do not huddle together
- **Take Out**
  - Assume shooters intentions are lethal – active shooter vs. hostage situation
  - Do whatever it takes to stop the shooter
  - Throw things, yell, improvised weapons (letter opener, scissors, etc..)
  - A person with the intent to live has a good chance against an active shooter

10/01/2013

Law Enforcement Response:

- Law Enforcement Training
  - Most police departments are trained in responding to an active shooter
  - Same tactics so agencies can respond together
- Initial Response
  - Do not expect officers to assist you – primary goal is to engage the shooter
  - When officers enter the room, do not present a threat to them
- Key Information
  - Name of shooter – if known
  - Number of shooters
  - Description of shooter(s)
  - Number and types of weapons carried by shooter

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Beyond Lockdowns:

- Evacuation may be the best option if you can't get to a safe place
  - Cafeterias, Gym, Recess
- Drills should include procedures for partial or total evacuation
- Train to overcome the natural response to "Duck and Cover"
  - Cover vs. Concealment
  - Spread out
- Wisconsin Act 309
  - 118.07(4)(a) Each school board and the governing body of each private school shall have in effect a school safety plan for each public or private school in the school district within 3 years of May 27, 2010
  - ii. 118.07(2)(a) At least twice annually, without previous warning, the person having direct charge of any public or private school shall drill all pupils in the proper method of evacuation or other appropriate action in case of a school safety incident. The public and private school safety drill shall be based on the school safety plan adopted under s.118.07(4).

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Large Group Discussion

- What barriers do you see in implementing these strategies?
- Do you have any questions about the options discussed?
- 10 minute break

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10/01/2013

In-Service Safety Training

UNIT 4: EMERGENCY
MANAGEMENT/CONTINGENCY PLANNING

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Unit 4 Objectives

- Following this unit, you should:
  - Identify purpose of the Incident Command System (ICS).
  - Understand the value of ICS in responding to an emergency at school

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What Is an Incident?

- An incident is an occurrence, caused by either human or natural phenomena, that requires response actions to prevent or minimize loss of life, or damage to property and/or the environment.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10/01/2013

What Is ICS?

- The Incident Command System:
  - Is a standardized, on-scene, all-hazard incident management concept.
  - Allows its users to adopt an integrated organizational structure to match the complexities and demands of single or multiple incidents without being hindered by jurisdictional boundaries.

ICS Purposes

- Using management best practices, ICS helps to ensure:
  - The safety of responders and others.
  - The achievement of tactical objectives.
  - The efficient use of resources.

ICS Mandates

- NIMS requires all levels of government to:
  - Prepare for and use ICS for all domestic responses.
  - Adopt ICS as a condition of receiving Federal preparedness funding.
- This requirement also applies to schools and school districts receiving emergency preparedness funding including the U.S. Department of Education Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools (REMS) grants.

10/01/2013

Summary

37

- ICS . . .
  - Is a standardized management tool for meeting the demands of small or large emergency or nonemergency situations.
  - Represents "best practices," and has become the standard for emergency management across the country.
  - May be used for planned events, natural disasters, and acts of terrorism.
  - Is a key feature of NIMS.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Additional Resources

38

- Department of Homeland Security: Active Shooter Preparedness
  - http://www.dhs.gov/active-shooter-preparedness
- The Final Report and Findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the Prevention of School Attacks in the United States
  - http://www.secretservice.gov/ntac/ssi_final_report.pdf
- Threat Assessment in Schools: A Guide to Managing Threatening Situations and to Creating Safe School Climates
  - http://www.secretservice.gov/ntac/ssi_guide.pdf
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction: Resources for Safe and Respectful School
  - http://sspw.dpi.wi.gov/sspw_safeschool

A list of resources and contact information will be emailed to participants

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____