Student Safety: Parents' and School Principals' Perceptions

Michael Ewton
Whitfield County School District, Georgia

Introduction

A safe and secure school environment is essential to successful student learning. Students who are stressed or preoccupied with concerns of their physical safety cannot achieve to their fullest academic ability. The definition of school safety and security is open to subjective interpretation. Conditions that are acceptable in one community or on a particular campus may be viewed as unreasonably dangerous in another. Likewise, following high profile acts of violence or natural disasters affecting schools, there may be reactions calling for safety measures that would have been unthinkable prior to the events taking place.

In addition to what students may observe or experience at school, their perceptions of their safety on campus may be directly impacted by the perceptions and opinions of their parents, teachers, and school administrators. In the spirit of school improvement, it is important for principals to understand parents' views on student safety and vice versa.

The purpose of this research study was to determine what parents and school principals view as being serious threats to school safety, how they believe these threats should be addressed, and whether or not their perceptions vary depending on the level of the school. In particular, answers to the following questions were sought.

1. What do school principals and parents perceive as serious threats to student safety?
2. What do principals and parents perceive as effective strategies to secure student safety?
3. What do principals and parents perceive to be appropriate strategies to secure student safety?
4. Do principals' and parents' perception of student safety threats differ by school level?
5. Do principals' and parent's perceptions of effective and appropriate safety strategies differ by school level?

Review of Related Literature

A safe learning environment is foundational to student achievement. School shootings and other devastating, yet infrequently occurring, incidents profoundly impacting public perception of school safety have made school violence a topic of concern for students, educators, parents, politicians, and the general public for over a decade (Robers, Zhang, & Truman, 2012). Significant research exists on the perception of students and teachers relating to their safety at school (Hong & Eamon, 2011). The focus of this study was to determine what parents and school principals perceive to be serious threats to student safety, what strategies they believe are effective and appropriate in securing student safety, and to determine if these perceptions differ between parents and school principals of children in different school levels.

Concerns about Student Safety at School

According to the American Crime Prevention Institute (ACPI), "Children ages 12 to 18 are almost three times as likely to be victims of serious violent crime when they are away from school than at school" (ACPI, 2001). This statistic does not necessarily reflect parents' perceptions of student safety at school. A series of high-profile mass killings at schools across America from the

1990s through the present have served to change public perception about the safety of our nation's public schools. Such high impact, yet low frequency, events have played a large part in safety and physical security enhancements to school facilities that would have been rare in past decades.

Between the years of 1999 and 2010, the percentage of schools which controlled access to the building during school hours increased from 75% to 92%. During the same time period, the required wear of faculty photo identification badges increased from a reported 25% to 63%. In 1999, only 19% of public school campuses in the United States utilized video cameras. By 2010, 61% of all American K-12 campuses were using video cameras (Robers, Zhang, & Truman, 2012).

Other factors such as bullying have frequently been cited as contributing to both student homicides and suicides. Unfortunately, the term "bullying" is used to mean a wide range of behaviors by various groups and individuals (Olweus, 1993). States have recently began to more clearly define what bullying is and what must be done about it in public schools. A widely accepted definition for the term comes from the Olweus Anti-bullying Program. Dan Olweus states, "A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students" (Olweus 1993). It is not uncommon to read tragic accounts of juvenile suicide and sometimes homicide blamed on persistent bullying at school. Although clearly important, a thorough discussion of student safety and security cannot be limited to these topics.

Additional student safety hazards that must be discussed include natural disasters, fires, thefts, acts of terrorism, hazardous materials spills, bus accidents, playground injuries, tornados, and many other possibilities. The point of this discussion is not to create an atmosphere of paranoia or hyper-vigilance, but to understand that there are many potential hazards beyond active shooters that may affect students at school or at a school-related event.

Parent and Principal Perceptions of Serious Threats to Students Safety

Following the notorious mass murder at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, in April of 1999 and a series of other school mass-shootings during the 1990s, more state governments around the country began to require school safety or "crisis management" plans to address potential threats to student safety in public schools. Many of these plans were drafted with active shooters as the primary anticipated threat. It could be argued that the emphasis on mass school homicide was not proportionate to the likelihood of such an event occurring in a given school. A review of the three suicides and fourteen homicides involving school aged individuals that occurred on a school campus in the United States during the 2005-2006 school year indicated that the rate of occurrence for violent deaths at school was 1 in 3.2 million (Dinkes, Cataldi, & Lin-Kelly, 2007).

In addition to mass shootings and other acts of targeted violence, many other hazards have the potential of affecting the safety of public school facilities and students on any given day. Although emergency procedures for most schools and first responder agencies have changed over the preceding decade, some hazards may go unrecognized by school administrators and parents who are not specifically trained in school emergency management procedures (Duda, Shepherd, Dorn, Wong, & Thomas, 2004). Identifying trends in perceptions may serve to identify training needs for school administrators and/or safety education opportunities for parents that were previously not recognized.

With the added emphasis placed on parental involvement in the academic life of children in recent years, it is just as important to understand what parents perceive to be safe schools and what they believe to be serious threats to the safety of students. The perceptions of parents may also

strongly influence whether or not their children feel safe at school (Hong & Eamon, 2011). It is understandable children may believe what their parents say about the perceived climate relating to safety at their school.

It is primarily the responsibility of the principal to inform parents and the community about teaching, learning, and student achievement initiatives and accomplishments within the school. So too should the principal be the advocate for ensuring that parents and the community are confident that the safety of all students, staff members, and visitors is a priority at the school and school district levels. In order to understand what information principals need to be able to communicate with parents and others about the safety of their facilities, it is important to first understand what principals themselves perceive to be threats to student safety and what are the best practices for mitigating those threats. The academic literature studying parent and principal perceptions of student safety is limited as compared to available research exploring student and teacher perceptions of school safety and security.

Effective and Appropriate Strategies to Secure Student Safety

Recommendations for school emergency operations or crisis management plan components have evolved beyond basic crisis response plans. Federal guidelines recommend schools develop and maintain plans for four phases of emergency management. The phases are prevention/mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery (U.S. DOE, 2003). Also specifically recommended is that school and school system emergency plans address "all-hazards." While no single document could ever address every possible hazard that a school may face, the comprehensive all-hazards plan is designed to focus on natural disasters, accidents, illness, utility and mechanical failures, hazardous materials spills, fires, acts of violence and terrorism along with other situations determined by the individual school staff and community to be potential hazards that could be faced by its students, staff, and visitors.

Prevention plans document the various programs, procedures, and equipment in place designed to prevent hazardous situations or to mitigate those that cannot be prevented. Examples of common prevention measures found in public schools include physical security measures such as sign-in, name badge, and perimeter security procedures, video surveillance systems, electronic access control systems, metal detectors, assignment of school resource officers (SROs), and adoption Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) concepts. Examples of CPTED measures include providing natural surveillance, eliminating dead space where students and others may congregate without adequate supervision, and maintaining perimeter security with a secure and "celebrated" entryway (McLester, 2011). Other common prevention and mitigation measures are bullying prevention programs, the installation of automated external defibrillators (AEDs), adherence to life safety (fire) codes, etc. Some of the most important prevention strategies do not involve the implementation of specialized equipment or technical expertise. In preventing targeted violence, schools are encouraged to foster a culture and atmosphere that encourages student reporting of potential violent or otherwise dangerous situations (Stone & Isaacs, 2002).

Preparedness plans generally include the annual or periodic update of emergency response plans and the conducting of drills and training. The response plan lays out instructions and guidelines for responding to various types of emergencies and disasters. Recovery plans are initiated when the response to an emergency is over. Recovery measures may range from a staff debriefing after a student medical emergency to the temporary relocation and total reconstruction of a school facility following a natural disaster or fire (U.S. D.O.E. 2003). These four phases are thought to be a cycle with recovery leading right back to prevention/mitigation.

It is recommended that schools choose the safety and security strategies that will be effective for their individual school environment and situation. The various procedures and equipment choices listed above should be viewed as a toolbox. Only those tools or combination of tools that may be necessary for the individual school situation should be utilized (Shelton, Owens, & Song, 2009). Even for schools that do not fully implement all of the procedures and examples listed above, much time and many resources must be expended beyond the core business of teaching and learning. With an ever-increasing number of state and federal mandates being passed down to local school systems, safety and security can become one of many competing priorities for school administrators. The level to which individual principals will adopt various strategies to secure student safety will depend on factors such as safety procedures mandated by the school district, administrator accountability for compliance, parental and community expectations, and the administrator's perception of serious threats to student safety. Outcomes of this study will help better define what principals actually know and believe about student safety threats and countermeasures as compared to what is assumed by system level administration that principals know and believe.

Student Safety by School Level

Given the differences in age, level of required parental care, and social norms between Pre-Kindergarten and 12th grade students, conventional wisdom might suggest that there are significant differences in what parents and school principals perceive to be serious safety threats and what are appropriate and effective strategies used to secure student safety. Installation of walk-through metal detectors, for example, might be viewed as appropriate for a high school in a given community. Metal detectors may not, however, be perceived to be appropriate at another high school or in elementary schools by some community standards.

Although it may not be an indicator of parental perception, differences among students in various school levels regarding their perception of safety at school is evident. A 2009 study indicated that 6% of sixth and seventh grade students surveyed reported that they were often afraid of attack or harm at school compared to 3% reported by eleventh graders in the same study (Robers, Zhang, & Truman, 2011).

A question on the 2012 Victoria Bernhardt survey conducted annually by Whitfield County Schools asked responding parents to rate the statement "my child is safe at school" on a 0 to 5 scale. Zero on the scale represented the response "strongly disagree" with five representing "strongly agree." The average response by parents of students in different school levels were: elementary school 4.3, middle school 3.75, and high school 3.95 (Bernhardt, 2012). These data would suggest that parents of elementary level students are more confident in the safety of their children's school than those parents of middle and high school students. It should be noted that this survey was conducted prior to the mass murder of elementary school students and staff members at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, in December 2012. These data also demonstrate that high school parents perceive that their students are safer than middle school parents believe their children are. There are many limitations with this data. It is not indicated on the report how many parents from each school responded, it is possible that some parents may have answered the survey more than one time, some respondents may not have been parents at all, and the survey was not validated for reliability.

The Need for Additional Research

Existing academic literature has little to say about parent and school principal perceptions of serious school safety threats or appropriate and effective measures designed to maintain student safety and security. Further study of parent and principal perceptions will help to contribute to an area of the academic literature that is presently limited. A survey instrument was developed to aid in answering these research questions. Participants in the study were principals and school council parent members of Whitfield County School System schools.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined as follows.

Appropriate Strategies to Secure Student Safety

Those measures perceived by the respondent to be appropriate at an individual school. This study examined the differences in perception among principals and parents considering the effectiveness of a safety strategy compared to its appropriateness in a given school setting.

Effective Strategies to Secure Student Safety

These are steps taken to prevent and/or mitigate unsafe conditions or circumstances at school or at school-sponsored events that may place students in unnecessary peril. The strategies listed in the survey instrument were selected from national standards and industry-accepted best practices for crime and injury prevention in schools (Duda, Shepherd, Dorn, Wong, & Thomas, 2004).

Physical Security

Consists of countermeasures designed for the protection of property, facilities, and persons. These measures include strategies designed to deter trespassers and those wishing to do violence, commit acts of theft, or to damage property.

Serious Threats to Student Safety

These are defined in this study as situations or circumstances that are perceived to present the potential for serious physical danger to students at or on their way to or from school as well as at school-sponsored events.

Research Methodology

A quantitative descriptive research approach was used to solicit responses through an electronic survey designed to analyze the perceptions of school principals and parents. The self-administered research instrument was completed online by parents who were members of school councils at the various elementary, middle, and high schools within the school district. Also solicited for responses were principals of all schools within the same school district. Of the 24 principals in the school system, 17 responded to the survey. Twenty-six parents responded.

Data for this survey were collected by using Survey Monkey. Data collection utilizing this type of online survey application is inexpensive to conduct and provides a convenient means for respondents to participate (Cresswell, 2009). Emails were sent to all principals within the school district requesting that they and parent members of their respective school councils complete the survey.

Survey

In order to objectively analyze and compare responses by the various respondent groups and to prioritize the perceived threats and countermeasures, quantitative scales were included in two separate survey instruments. The first instrument was entitled "Parent Perceptions of Student Safety Survey" with the other being the "School Principal Perceptions of Student Safety Survey." Both surveys contained similar question content with appropriate wording differences included based on the target audience for each survey instrument.

Both instruments asked respondents to list in rank order "potential threats to student safety" from a list of ten hazards commonly included in school safety plans (U.S. D.O.E., 2003). Respondents were then asked to classify the level to which they believed it was likely that each of the ten potential threats would occur at their school or at their child's school. The potential responses ranged from "extremely unlikely" to "certain to occur" on a four-point Likert scale. The following two survey questions listed twelve safety and security measures that are commonly utilized in schools or are currently discussed in the mainstream news media relating to school safety and security. Survey participants were asked to categorize their perception of how effective and how appropriate each of the choices was at their school or at the school where their child attends. These responses were also charted on a four-point Likert scale as were the final two survey questions. The final two questions inquired about the level of emphasis placed on student safety and how safe parents and principals believe their students were at school. A final demographic question asked respondents which school level they represented either as a school principal or school council parent member (see instruments attached).

Data Analysis

Survey data were analyzed to determine which potential threats to student safety respondents perceived to be significant and how likely they were to affect student safety at their schools. Further analysis was used to determine what strategies were believed to be effective and which were appropriate in mitigating student safety risks in their respective school settings. Analysis was also conducted to compare the responses based on school levels and to understand more about the perceptions each group had about the level of safety emphasis, communication, and feeling of student safety at the various schools.

Findings

Quantitative Data Analysis

Of the 24 school principals surveyed, 17 responded to all questions on the survey. Among the respondents, three were high school principals, two represented middle schools, and 12 were administrators of elementary schools. A total of 26 parents responded to the survey, eight from high schools, five from middle schools, and 13 from elementary schools. Mean ranking scores of perceived threats to student safety were compiled on a four-point Likert scale, with 1 representing the most serious hazard and 4 the least. The mean rankings between principals' and parents' rankings of the situations were then compared to see if there were any significant differences. Although both groups perceived "on-campus shooting incidents" to be among the most serious threats to student safety, other similarities between the perceptions of school principals and parents were limited (see Table 1).

Table 1. Mean Comparison - Perceived Threats to Student Safety in Rank Order

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parent	Tornado	Shooting	Fire	Disease	BusAcc	PE Acc	Earthquake	Chemical	Terror	Theft
Mean	3.31	3.31	4.2	4.65	4.65	6.31	6.85	6.96	7.12	7.65
Principal	Shooting	Disease	Theft	PE Acc	Terror	Chemical	Tornado	Earthquake	BusAcc	Fire
Mean	3.41	3.94	4.1	4.47	5.12	5.53	5.59	7.06	7.24	8.47

Respondents were also asked to rank what they believed to be the likelihood of each of the same critical events taking place or affecting their school or that of their child. Both groups listed physical education, playground, and athletic injuries as the most likely incident to affect student safety. Parent perception mean score was 1.730 with principals rating averaging at 1.529 (see Table 2).

Table 2. Mean Comparison - Perceived Likelihood of Incidents Affecting Student Safety

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parent	PE Acc	Theft	Disease	Tornado	BusAcc	Fire	Shooting	Earthquake	Chemical	Terrorism
Mean	1.73	2.23	2.50	2.52	2.69	3.11	3.12	3.42	3.58	3.62
Principal	PE Acc	Shooting	Terrorism	Theft	Disease	Chemical	Earthquake	Tornado	Fire	Bus Acc
Mean	1.53	1.53	1.82	2.35	2.82	3.00	3.24	3.29	3.53	3.70

In order to evaluate the question of what were perceived to be the most effective and appropriate methods of securing student safety, survey participants were given a variety of school safety and security measures to evaluate on the four-point scale. The safety measures ranged from national standards and best practices to more radical measures that have been seen in the mainstream media in recent months. Both groups believed that emergency drills and staff safety training were among the top three most effective safety measures. The three least effective measures were armed civilians, armed school administrators and walk-through metal detectors on campus (see Table 3).

Table 3. Mean Comparison - Perceived Effectiveness of School Safety and Security Measures

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Parent	Emerg. Drills	Emerg. Plans	Staff Training	Public Safety Collab.	Armed Police	Video	Building Entrance Security	Consistent Discipline	Antibully Programs	Armed Admin.	Armed Civilians	Metal Det.
Mean	1.31	1.42	1.46	1.50	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	2.04	2.54	2.69	2.81
Principal	Staff Training	Emerg. Drills	Video	Building Entrance Security	Consistent Discipline	Armed Police	Emerg. Plans	Public Safety Collab.	Antibully Programs	Metal Det.	Armed Civilians	Armed Admin.
Mean	1.18	1.18	1.24	1.35	1.35	1.53	1.70	1.76	1.88	2.41	2.88	3.00

When asked to respond about how appropriate each of the listed school safety and security measures were at their schools, mean responses indicated that both survey groups were consistent

in their feeling that emergency drills and staff training were among the most appropriate, while armed civilian volunteers, armed school administrators, and installation of walk-through metal detectors were perceived by both groups to be the least appropriate in their school settings. Principals found video surveillance systems and emergency drills to be most appropriate, both with a mean of 1.177 and armed school administrators to be the least appropriate with a mean response score of 3.412. Parents believed emergency planning and emergency drills to be the most appropriate measure to secure student safety with a mean score of 1.231. They found the idea of having armed civilian volunteers patrolling the school campus to be the least appropriate with a mean of 3.115 (see Table 4).

Table 4. Mean Comparison - Perceived Appropriateness of School Safety and Security Measures

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Parent	EOP	Drills	Staff Training	Public Safety Collab.	Consistent Discipline	Antibully Programs	Entryway Security	Video	Police	Armed Admin.	Metal Det.	Armed Civilians
Mean	1.23	1.23	1.27	1.38	1.58	1.65	1.65	1.73	2.23	2.80	3.08	3.12
Principal	Video	Drills	Staff Training	Entryway Security	Consistent Discipline	EOP	Public Safety Collab.	Police	Antibully Programs	Metal Det.	Armed Civilians	Armed Admin.
Mean	1.18	1.18	1.24	1.47	1.47	1.59	1.59	1.76	1.76	2.82	3.18	3.41

Parents and principals were asked to what degree they felt like their schools placed emphasis on student safety. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze responses. On the four-point Likert scale, parents and principals of all three school levels indicated that they believed that their schools placed an appropriate level of emphasis on safety ("Appropriate = 2 on the scale). Elementary school parents ranked their schools as having a slightly lower safety emphasis than middle and high schools with a mean score of 2.154. High school principals' rating exceeded the rating of "appropriate" emphasis with a 1.667 mean score (see Table 5).

Table 5. Mean Comparison - Perception of Safety Emphasis at School - on Four Point Likert Scale

	Overall	HS	MS	ES
Parent	2.08	2	2	2.15
Principal	1.94	1.67	2	2

Parents and principals were asked how safe students were at their schools. Results of data analysis indicated that elementary school parents perceived a slightly higher level of confidence that their children were safe at school than did middle and high school parents. Principals of all levels consistently indicated that they believed students were safer at school than parents perceived (see Table 6)

Table 6. Mean Comparison - Perception of Feeling that Students are Safe at School - on Four Point Likert Scale

	Overall	HS	MS	ES
Parent	1.92	2	2	1.85
Principal	1.65	1.33	1.5	1.75

Parents were asked how they were informed about student safety at their children's schools. Principals were asked how well they believed they kept parents informed. Principals perceived that they kept parents better informed about matters of safety than parents believed. Middle and high school parents indicated a higher degree of being informed than elementary school parents did (see Table 7).

Table 7. Mean Comparison - Perception of Keeping Parents Informed of Safety Information - on Four Point Likert Scale

	Overall	HS	MS	ES
Parent	1.96	1.75	1.8	2.15
Principal	1.76	1.67	1.5	1.83

Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study indicate that both parents and school principals have some perceptions regarding student safety that are not necessarily grounded in facts. It is, for example, not unrealistic to expect parents to rank on-campus shootings as among the most serious threats to student safety. With the high level of media exposure given to incidences of mass killing at schools and elsewhere, some parents may not have the information needed to understand the low rate of occurrence for such events. It was, however, unexpected that principals rated school shootings as the number one threat to school safety and the second most likely hazardous event to occur that would affect student safety at school or at a school-related function. Given the comparative rarity of murders in schools, school principals should realize how likely it is that different types of events could occur during the school day. This misconception likely indicates a lack of safety training provided to principals from the school district level.

Both parents and principals indicated that they perceived that allowing armed civilian security volunteers to patrol school campuses, arming school administrators, and installing walk-through metal detectors in all schools would not be effective nor would it be appropriate as compared to other available school safety measures. Hardly imaginable as a legitimate discussion a few months ago, these potential measures have received much media and political attention since the December 14, 2012 mass shooting at an elementary school in Newtown, Connecticut.

Communication between schools and parents is recognized as essential to student success. Improving communication regarding safety measures, needs, and concerns is equally as important to ensuring student safety and instilling confidence in parents and the community. This study indicated that middle and high school parents felt that they were adequately informed about student safety related topics and information overall, while parents of elementary school students believed they were not adequately informed. Since principals at all levels indicated that they believed they

did a better than adequate job of communicating with parents about student safety issues and information, there was an apparent lapse in communication between the groups that could be improved upon.

Implications/Recommendations

In light of the findings of this study, it is recommended that other school districts conduct similar surveys to determine parent and principal perceptions at their own schools. It is also advisable to repeat this type of survey periodically to maintain a continual gauge on these important factors. Lastly, additional training for principals as well as enhanced communication and safety education for parents of children in the school district examined in this study are needed. School principals have an ever-increasing number of tasks for which they are responsible. It is often necessary to delegate some of these tasks. In the case of safety, although many of the hands-on tasks may be delegated to assistant principals or other administrators, principals must have a strong understanding of the hazards that threaten student safety as well as the appropriate and effective measures for dealing with them.

Significance of the Study

Given the dire consequences that come from real or perceived lapses in the management of safety and security procedures in schools, it is imperative to understand the safety related expectations and perceptions of parents of and the principals of their schools. In order for school principals to ensure that the strategies they implement and maintain to keep students safe are recognized as acceptable by parents and for parents to be confident that reasonable measures are being taken to ensure the safety of their children while at school, it is important that each respondent group understand what each group's perceptions related to school safety and security are. Trust being essential to positive parent-school administration relations, this information may help to bolster communication and education between school principals and parents by recognizing misconceptions or genuine needs for enhance student safety measures.

Conclusion

Responsibility for the prevention and mitigation of and preparedness for student safety emergencies is incumbent upon all educators. A significant portion of this responsibility involves continually examining existing measures meant to secure student safety and to challenge assumptions. This study served to challenge the possible assumption that school administrators understand what they need to do about student safety, that they are doing those things, and that parents understand what is being done in schools. By identifying stakeholder perceptions of what constitutes a threat and what should be done to counter such threats in schools, plans, policies, and training can be adapted to affect current concerns rather than addressing the assumptions of the past.

References

American Crime Prevention Institute (2001). *The complete school safety and security manual.* Louisville, KY: American Crime Prevention Institute.

Bernhardt Survey (2012). *Survey of school climate in Whitfield County Schools*. Retrieved from http://www.whitfield.k12.ga.us/WebFiles/survey/2012/EMS_Parent_Total.pdf

Cresswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA, p. 149

Dinkes, R., Cataldi, E. F., & Lin-Kelly, W. (2007). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2007.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Duda, R., Shepherd, S., Dorn, M., Wong, M., & Thomas, G. (2004) *Teachers' safety guide.* Surrey, UK: Jane's Information Group.

Hong, S., & Eamon, M. (2011). *Students' perceptions of unsafe schools: An ecological systems analysis.* Springer Science & Business Media, DOI 10.1007/s10826-0611-9494-8

McLester, S. (2011, September) Designing safe schools, *District Administration Magazine*, pp. 71-78.

Olweus, D. (1993) *Bullying at school.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Robers, S., Zhang, J., & Truman, J. (2012). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2011* (NCES 2012-002/NCJ 236021). National Center for Education Statistics, U.S.

Shelton, A., Owens, E., & Song, H. (2009, January), An examination of public school safety measures across geographic settings. *Journal of School Health*, 79(1)29.

Stone, C., & Isaacs, M. L. (2002). Involving students in violence prevention: Anonymous reporting and the need to promote and protect confidences. *NASSP Bulletin, 86*(633), 54–65.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools (2003). *Practical information on crisis planning: A guide for schools and communities,* Washington, D.C.

Survey 1

Parent Perceptions of Student Safety Survey

1. Please rank the potential threats to student safety listed below in order from the most serious threats to those that you believe are the least serious. (#1 = Most Serious, #10 = Least Serious)

    - ____ Chemical Spill
    - ____ Spread of Infectious Diseases
    - ____ Fire on Campus
    - ____ School Bus Accident
    - ____ Tornado
    - ____ Theft of Personal Property
    - ____ Earthquake
    - ____ Athletic, Physical Education, or Playground Accident
    - ____ On-campus Shooting
    - ____ Terrorist Attack

2. How likely is it that the following incident types may occur at your child's school?

Incident Type	Extremely Unlikely (4)	Somewhat Unlikely (3)	Likely to Occur (2)	Certain to Occur (1)
Chemical Spill				
Spread of Infectious Diseases				
Fire on Campus				
School bus Accident				
Tornado				
Theft of Personal Property				
Earthquake				
Athletic, Physical Education, or Playground Accident				
On-Campus Shooting				
Terrorist Attack				

3. In what level of schools do you have children go to?

___ High School   ____ Middle School   ____ Elementary School

4. Emphasis on safety and security at my child's school is:

___ Non-Existent (4)   ____ Lacking (3)   ____ Appropriate (2)   ____ Overboard (1)

5. How safe do you feel your child is while they are at school?

___ Not safe (4)   ____ Somewhat safe (3)   ____ Satisfactorily safe (2)   ____ Extremely safe (1)

6. I feel that I am well informed regarding safety and security measures at my child's school.

____ Strongly Disagree (4)   ____ Disagree (3)   ____ Agree (2)   ____ Strongly Agree (1)

7. How effective is or would each of the following safety and security measures be in enhancing student safety at your child's school?

Safety and Security Measures	Ineffective (4)	Somewhat Effective (3)	Adequately Effective (2)	Extremely Effective (1)
Updated Emergency Operations Plan				
Armed Police Officers on Campus				
Video Surveillance Systems				
Anti-Bullying Programs				
Staff Training on Safety Procedures				
Safety and Security Drills				
Armed Security Volunteers on Campus				
Entry Way Security Systems ("buzzers" security vestibules, etc.)				
Firm, Fair, and Consistent Discipline				
Walk-through Metal Detectors				
Collaboration with Public Safety Agencies				
Armed School Administrators on Campus				

8. To what extent do you believe that the following measures are, or would be appropriate in your child's school?

Safety and Security Measures	Inappropriate (4)	Somewhat Appropriate or Appropriate under Certain Circumstances (3)	Appropriate (2)	Essential (1)
Updated Emergency Operations Plan				
Armed Police Officers on Campus				
Video Surveillance Systems				
Anti-Bullying Programs				
Staff Training on Safety Procedures				
Safety and Security Drills				
Armed Security Volunteers on Campus				
Entry Way Security Systems ("buzzers" security vestibules, etc.)				
Firm, Fair, and Consistent Discipline				
Walk-through Metal Detectors				
Collaboration with Public Safety Agencies				
Armed School Administrators on Campus				

Survey 2

School Principal Perceptions of Student Safety Survey

1. Please rank the potential threats to student safety listed below in order from the most serious threats to those which you believe are the least serious. (#1 = Most Serious, #10 = Least Serious)

    *   ____ Chemical Spill
    *   ____ Spread of Infectious Diseases
    *   ____ Fire on Campus
    *   ____ School Bus Accident
    *   ____ Tornado
    *   ____ Theft of Personal Property
    *   ____ Earthquake
    *   ____ Athletic, Physical Education, or Playground Accident
    *   ____ On-campus Shooting
    *   ____ Terrorist Attack

2. How likely is it that the following incident types may occur at your school?

Incident Type	Extremely Unlikely (4)	Somewhat Unlikely (3)	Likely to Occur (2)	Certain to Occur (1)
Chemical Spill				
Spread of Infectious Diseases				
Fire on Campus				
School bus Accident				
Tornado				
Theft of Personal Property				
Earthquake				
Athletic, Physical Education, or Playground Accident				
On-Campus Shooting				
Terrorist Attack				

3. In what level of schools do you represent?

    ___ High School   _____ Middle School   ____ Elementary School

4. Emphasis on safety and security at my school is:

    ___ Non-Existent (4)   ____ Lacking (3)   ____ Appropriate (2)   ____ Overboard (1)

5. How safe are the students while they are at school?

    ___ Not safe (4)   ____ Somewhat safe (3)   ____ Satisfactorily safe (2)   ____ Extremely safe (1)

6. I feel that I keep parents well informed regarding safety and security issues that may affect
    student safety in our school.

    ____ Strongly Disagree (4)   ____ Disagree (3)   ____ Agree (2)   ____ Strongly Agree (1)

7. How effective is or would each of the following safety and security measures be in enhancing
    student safety at your school?

Safety and Security Measures	Ineffective (4)	Somewhat Effective (3)	Adequately Effective (2)	Extremely Effective (1)
Updated Emergency Operations Plan				
Armed Police Officers on Campus				
Video Surveillance Systems				
Anti-Bullying Programs				
Staff Training on Safety Procedures				
Safety and Security Drills				
Armed Security Volunteers on Campus				
Entry Way Security Systems ("buzzers" security vestibules, etc.)				
Firm, Fair, and Consistent Discipline				
Walk-through Metal Detectors				
Collaboration with Public Safety Agencies				
Armed School Administrators on Campus				

8. To what extent do you believe that the following measures are, or would be appropriate in school?

Safety and Security Measures	Inappropriate (4)	Somewhat Appropriate or Appropriate under Certain Circumstances (3)	Appropriate (2)	Essential (1)
Updated Emergency Operations Plan				
Armed Police Officers on Campus				
Video Surveillance Systems				
Anti-Bullying Programs				
Staff Training on Safety Procedures				
Safety and Security Drills				
Armed Security Volunteers on Campus				
Entry Way Security Systems ("buzzers" security vestibules, etc.)				
Firm, Fair, and Consistent Discipline				
Walk-through Metal Detectors				
Collaboration with Public Safety Agencies				
Armed School Administrators on Campus				