



Susan Montee, CPA
Missouri State Auditor

Safe Schools Initiatives



August 2008

Report No. 2008-52

auditor.mo.gov



Office of
Missouri State Auditor
Susan Montee, CPA

August 2008

Our office conducted an audit of the Safe Schools Initiatives.

The audit of Safe Schools Initiatives identified significant weaknesses in school districts' safe schools policies, procedures, and programs. These weaknesses include incomplete discipline policies, inadequate communication of said policies, and inaccurate incident data. There are insufficient violence prevention programs, anti-bullying policies, safety procedures and programs, and emergency management plans and drills. In addition, Missouri school districts need to better address Internet safety, sex offenders, and the state violence hotline (866-748-7047), and should consider evaluating their policies, procedures, and programs to determine the extent to which improvements are needed. These weaknesses should also be considered when safe schools issues and programs are proposed, discussed, evaluated, and monitored by school districts, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, other state agencies, and the General Assembly.

The state should also improve its oversight of school safety issues both at the school district and state level. A comprehensive, coordinated safe schools program may help assist school districts in improving safety, and additional laws or regulations may be needed to address significant safe schools issues such as emergency management plans and emergency drills.

The DESE should better monitor school districts' policies and procedures related to safe schools issues, ensure school districts report complete and accurate data in its Core Data system, and increase the level of discipline incident detail in the system. In addition, the department needs to better communicate the Missouri Violence Prevention Curriculum Framework to school districts, evaluate school districts' violence prevention programs, evaluate the effectiveness of the framework and better publicize the state violence hotline. Finally, the DESE should document their determination of persistently dangerous schools, and ensure reports of school discipline data are accurate and complete.

All reports are available on our Web site: www.auditor.mo.gov

YELLOW SHEET

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATE AUDITOR'S REPORT	1-3
MANAGEMENT ADVISORY REPORT - STATE AUDITOR'S FINDINGS	4-26
Background Information	6
Scope and Methodology	6
Problems Identified and Recommendations	7
School Districts	7
State	16
HISTORY AND STATISTICAL INFORMATION	27-68
<u>Appendix</u>	
A Overview of Safe Schools Provisions.....	33-38
B Schedule of Results of School District Reviews	39-43
C Schedule of School Districts Reviewed.....	44
D Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Survey Results, Six School Years 2001-2002 through 2006-2007.....	45-47
E School Safety Survey Results	48-49
F Schedule of Student Discipline Incidents by School District Five School Years 2002-2003 through 2006-2007.....	50-60
G Schedule of State Safe Schools Programs	61-68

STATE AUDITOR'S REPORT



SUSAN MONTEE, CPA
Missouri State Auditor

Honorable Matt Blunt, Governor
and
Members of the General Assembly
and
D. Kent King, Commissioner
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
and
Mark S. James, Director
Department of Public Safety
Jefferson City, Missouri

We have audited Missouri's Safe Schools Initiatives. The scope of our audit included, but was not necessarily limited to, the years ended June 30, 2007 and 2006, and included certain activities/programs dating back to 2002. This report is the second of two reports on the Missouri Safe Schools Act and other programs designed to protect Missouri's school children. The objectives of our audit were to:

1. Determine Missouri school districts' and state agencies' compliance with the Safe Schools Act, and certain other laws, regulations, and policies/guidelines as they relate to school safety.
2. Determine and report state agencies' programs that relate to school safety.
3. Review certain policies, procedures, and controls related to significant safe schools initiatives and to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of these initiatives.
4. Compare Missouri's initiatives related to safe schools with safe school efforts and results in other states.
5. Determine the extent students, teachers, and other members of the school community feel safe at school.

Our methodology included reviewing minutes of the Homeland Security Advisory Council, Safe Schools Working Group meetings; written policies and procedures, financial records, and other pertinent documents of school districts and state agencies; interviewing various school district and state agency personnel, as well as certain external parties; and an

analysis of comparative data obtained from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and external sources.

We obtained an understanding of internal controls that are significant within the context of the audit objectives and assessed whether such controls have been properly designed and placed in operation. However, providing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal controls was not an objective of our audit and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

We obtained an understanding of legal provisions that are significant within the context of the audit objectives, and we assessed the risk that illegal acts, including fraud, and violations of contract, grant agreement, or other legal provisions could occur. Based on that risk assessment, we designed and performed procedures to provide reasonable assurance of detecting instances of noncompliance significant to those provisions. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Abuse, which refers to behavior that is deficient or improper when compared with behavior that a prudent person would consider reasonable and necessary given the facts and circumstances, does not necessarily involve noncompliance with legal provisions. Because the determination of abuse is subjective, our audit is not required to provide reasonable assurance of detecting abuse.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform our audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides such a basis.

The accompanying History and Statistical Information is presented for informational purposes. This information was obtained from the management of various state agencies and other external sources and was not subjected to the procedures applied in our audit of Missouri's Safe Schools Initiatives.

The accompanying Management Advisory Report presents our findings arising from our audit of the state's Safe Schools Initiatives.



Susan Montee, CPA
State Auditor

The following auditors participated in the preparation of this report:

Director of Audits:	Kenneth W. Kuster, CPA
Audit Manager:	Toni M. Crabtree, CPA
In-Charge Auditor:	Kim Spraggs, CPA
Audit Staff:	Cara Hoff
	Rebecca Harris
	Tanisha Ursery
	Connie Johnson

MANAGEMENT ADVISORY REPORT -
STATE AUDITOR'S FINDINGS

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
MANAGEMENT ADVISORY REPORT -
STATE AUDITOR'S FINDINGS

Safe Schools Initiatives

Although the state of Missouri and the state's school districts have made numerous efforts to meet the challenges of providing safe schools, our audit found that improvements and continued efforts are needed. School districts often do not comply with state laws and guidelines applicable to school safety. In addition, the state does not have a comprehensive, coordinated program to assist school districts with improving school safety, and there is little communication and coordination between state agencies regarding safe schools programs/initiatives available to school districts. Also, it appears the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) should establish school safety as a higher priority in its communication with and monitoring of school districts.

Schools are responsible for providing a safe environment so that students and teachers maximize the education experience. However, schools serving students in kindergarten through twelfth (K-12) grade are faced with numerous issues involving school safety. From preparing for natural disasters to preventing school violence and protecting students from illnesses, school administrators are responsible for ensuring students are safe at school.

Many school administrators and law enforcement personnel believe that overall, schools are among the safest places for children to be each day. However, most also acknowledge improvements are needed to ensure students are adequately protected from harm. School district officials told us they are faced with a variety of school safety issues, including: prevention of unauthorized entry, vandalism, and theft; alcohol and drug usage; fighting; disrespect of school personnel; weapons brought to school; lack of funding to purchase equipment and security services needed; and denial that a school violence situation could occur. In addition, Missouri school districts have reported numerous incidents of violent and risky behaviors occurring in schools, such as possession of weapons, various violent acts, and drug, alcohol, and tobacco use. Also, when surveyed, 12 percent of Missouri students said they do not feel safe at school. Studies show student learning is affected by the students' and teachers' feelings on safety.

This report is the second of two reports on the state's Safe Schools Act and other programs/initiatives designed to protect Missouri school children. Our previous report evaluated the DESE's Safe Schools Grant Program¹, which is authorized by the Safe Schools Act. That report disclosed the DESE needed to improve its oversight and management of this grant program.

¹ *Elementary and Secondary Education, Safe Schools Grant Program*, SAO, December 2007, (Report No. 2007-85).

This report addresses other school district and state agency policies, procedures, programs, and initiatives pursuant to the Safe Schools Act and other state laws, as well as general safety issues, such as emergency preparedness and Internet safety. In addition, we previously issued three other reports addressing school safety: Educator Certification Background Checks², School Bus Safety³, and Analysis of School Bus Driver Compliance Requirements⁴. Also, we are currently conducting another audit addressing school safety: childhood immunizations.

Background Information

As discussed more fully in the History and Statistical Section of this report, the Safe Schools Act, which passed in 1996 and amended in 2000, provides requirements on various school safety issues, including the requirement that students who bring a weapon on school property be suspended for one year. The requirements of the Safe Schools Act, together with other laws that cover school safety issues, are referred to in this report as "safe schools provisions". As noted in Appendix A of this report, the safe schools provisions provide requirements for school districts, law enforcement officials, and some state agencies.

To assist school districts in improving school safety, in April 2006, the Governor's Homeland Security Advisory Council established the Safe Schools Working Group. This group, which is co-chaired by the Department of Public Safety (DPS), Office of Homeland Security, and DESE consists of representatives from school districts, law enforcement agencies, emergency responders, state agencies, and other related entities from across the state.

Scope and Methodology

We interviewed school district personnel from 25 school districts and reviewed related policies and procedures, and other documents supporting the school districts' programs involving safety. We also reviewed DESE's Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) reports for these school districts for issues related to school safety. In addition, we surveyed various state agencies regarding their programs related to school safety. We obtained and analyzed school district discipline incident data from the DESE's Core Data⁵ system for the five school years 2002-2003 through 2006-2007; reviewed its policies and procedures for this data and its monitoring of school districts' safety procedures. Furthermore, we reviewed the Missouri Center for Safe Schools (MCSS) reports for school safety reviews conducted at 24 school districts during the 2006-2007 school year. Finally, we interviewed officials from 11 other state education departments

² *Elementary and Secondary Education, Educator Certification Background Checks*, SAO, August 2007, (Report No. 2007-32).

³ *School Bus Safety*, SAO, April 2003, (Report No. 2003-35).

⁴ *Analysis of School Bus Driver Compliance Requirements*, SAO, June 2008, (Report No. 2008-36).

⁵ Core Data is used to collect and archive financial and statistical data for all school districts throughout the state.

and/or school safety centers⁶ regarding those states' school safety programs, laws and procedures.

Problems Identified and Recommendations

School Districts

- A. We identified weaknesses, inconsistencies, and improvements needed in school districts' policies, procedures, and programs related to school safety. Since Missouri school districts are governed by local school boards, our findings for school districts are informational and should be considered by the school districts; DESE; DPS, Office of Homeland Security; other state agencies; and the General Assembly when safe schools issues and programs are proposed, discussed, evaluated, and monitored.

Significant problems related to safe schools issues include:

1. For the school districts reviewed, the discipline policies were not always complete or clear and sometimes did not comply with the safe schools provisions. Although most school districts developed their policies through policy subscription services from outside vendors, most policies still contained areas in need of improvement. Additionally, many MCSS reports identified problems with discipline policies. These weaknesses we noted include:
 - Although each act of misconduct was listed, many policies did not clearly outline the consequences for each act of misconduct.
 - Many policies did not require school administrators to report student acts of school violence to teachers and other school district employees who interact with that student. In addition, most MCSS reports noted problems with school districts' procedures for maintaining records of students who received long-term suspensions, and passing that information to teachers and other school district employees responsible for the student as the student is promoted or transferred.
 - Many policies did not provide that students suspended for serious violations of the discipline policies were prohibited from being within 1,000 feet of any school within the school district during the suspension period. Some MCSS reports also noted that this requirement was not in place.

⁶ Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia, and Washington.

- Although one policy did provide for a one-year suspension for students who brought a firearm on school property, the policy did not provide for a one-year suspension for other types of weapons as required by the Safe Schools Act. Many MCSS reports identified weaknesses with policies regarding weapons.

Section 160.261, RSMo, provides 1) school districts should "clearly establish a written policy of discipline, including the school district's determination on the use of corporal punishment and the procedures in which punishment will be applied", 2) the policy should require school administrators to report acts of school violence to teachers and other employees who are directly responsible for the student's education or who otherwise interact with the student on a professional basis while acting within the scope of their assigned duties, 3) the policy should require that certain suspended students are "not allowed, while on suspension, to be within one thousand feet of any public school in the school district" , and 4) the policy should provide for a suspension for a period of not less than one year, or expulsion, for a student who is determined to have brought a weapon (defined as gun, firearm, blackjack, explosive weapon, knife, knuckles, projectile weapon, etc.) on school property or to a school activity. The length of suspension may be modified by the superintendent on a case-by-case basis.

When we discussed these weaknesses with school districts' officials, some officials indicated they were not aware of certain discipline policy requirements.

School district administrators are responsible for ensuring students have an opportunity to learn in an emotionally and physically safe place; and the foundation for providing such an environment lies in the school district's policies and procedures. Comprehensive discipline policies, which comply with the safe schools provisions, can benefit both the students and the school district employees by outlining the school district's expectations for student conduct and consequences for violating the policies. In addition, clear and complete policies would help ensure policies are fairly and consistently applied to all students.

2. School districts are not always adequately communicating behavior expectations and consequences for acts of misconduct to students and parents. Officials from all school districts interviewed indicated they distribute their discipline policy annually to students and parents in a summary form in documents such as the student handbooks and/or discipline guides.

Our review of the documents disseminated by these school districts revealed that in many instances the documents conflicted with or did not

contain all information from the school district's discipline policy and/or were not in compliance with safe schools provisions.

For example, one school district gave a discipline guide to parents and students and also included its discipline policy in student handbooks. While acts of misconduct and consequences listed in the discipline guide agreed to the discipline policy, some information in the student handbooks did not agree with the discipline guide or the policy. Another school district's discipline guide included in elementary/middle school student handbooks was incomplete and contained information which conflicted with the policy; while the version of the guide included in the high school handbook was outdated. Although a third school district's discipline policy complied with the requirement of a one-year suspension or expulsion for weapons, the student handbook only addressed this requirement for firearms, not other weapons. Many MCSS reports also noted similar problems with the discipline policy documentation distributed by school districts.

In addition, many school district websites did not include a complete record of the school district's discipline policies and/or did not include the student handbooks and/or discipline guides for all schools in the school district. Also, a few MSIP reports noted school districts were not obtaining signatures from parents and students acknowledging receipt of the discipline policy.

Section 160.261.1 RSMo, provides that "a written copy of the school district's discipline policy and corporal punishment procedures if applicable, shall be provided to the pupil and parent or legal guardian of every pupil enrolled in the school district the beginning of each school year and also made available in the office of the superintendent of such school district, during normal business hours, for public inspection." Additionally, for those school districts with a website, Section 162.208, RSMO, provides that school districts post their policies and handbooks on their website.

Although distributing summary documentation, rather than the actual discipline policies, to students and parents may be efficient; this practice, without careful review to ensure compliance with the policy, increases the risk that students and parents are not adequately informed about discipline policies.

3. School districts have not established adequate procedures to ensure discipline incident data reported on the DESE's Core Data system is accurate.

Many school districts incorrectly reported discipline data during the 2004-2005 and/or 2005-2006 school years. One school district, the second largest in the state, failed to record any discipline incidents for the 2004-2005 school year. Officials from that school district indicated they could not determine why the approximately 3,400 incidents were not reported that year. Also, approximately 43 percent of school districts did not report any incidents in one of the past five years. We found, for school districts reviewed which had not reported any incidents, there were incidents which should have been reported.

It appears most of the errors occurred because 1) there were problems with the data transfers from the school districts to the DESE system, or 2) school districts did not follow and/or understand Core Data manual instructions.

Section 160.522, RSMo, requires the DESE to produce, at least annually, a school accountability report card for each school building in the state. The report card lists various school statistics including the number and rate of suspension of ten days or longer and expulsion of pupils. To comply with this requirement, the DESE requires school districts to enter certain data into its Core Data system which the DESE utilizes to prepare the school accountability report card.

School districts need to establish procedures to ensure the discipline incident data recorded on the DESE's system is complete and accurate.

4. School districts' progress towards implementing school violence prevention programs varies, and many school districts have not established violence prevention programs in accordance with safe schools provisions and/or DESE guidelines.

Many school administrators told us their school district had not developed violence prevention programs in accordance with the Missouri Violence Prevention Curriculum Framework guidelines. Some administrators acknowledged that improvements were needed in their program(s) and changes were planned for the future. However, other administrators indicated they were not familiar with the framework guidelines. Most MCSS reports noted significant weaknesses in school districts' violence prevention programs. Also, some MSIP reports indicated a lack of violence prevention training for staff and other reports revealed the frequency of training sessions and percentage of staff trained varied between school districts.

Section 161.650, RSMo, provides the DESE adopt a program of educational instruction regarding violence prevention to be administered by school districts. Pursuant to this section, the DESE adopted the

Missouri Violence Prevention Curriculum Framework in 1998. This framework includes components such as character education, discipline, anger management, conflict resolution, and problem solving. In addition, the guidelines suggest the programs engage the entire school community—teachers, students, parents, principals, and support staff. School districts may administer the program to students at the K-12 grade levels and provide training for school district employees directly responsible for educating students.

Effective school violence prevention programs can provide a foundation for a safer environment for students to learn. It is important that all students, teachers, and staff are trained to recognize and respond accordingly to the signals of potential problems related to violent behavior. School districts need to consider adopting violence prevention programs in accordance with the Missouri Violence Prevention Curriculum Framework guidelines.

5. School districts' policies and programs to prevent bullying are not always adequate. Many school districts' anti-bullying policies lacked significant provisions, such as a requirement that school district employees report instances of bullying and/or employee training on the policy. In addition, one school district had not adopted anti-bullying policies.

Section 160.775, RSMo, requires each school district to adopt an anti-bullying policy by September 1, 2007. The policy may address age appropriate differences and must contain the consequences of bullying. Also, the policy must require school district employees to report any known instances of bullying and include training of employees on the policy.

National studies show that many students do not attend school because of the fear of being bullied and that many school shooters felt bullied at school. According to the MCSS, school districts' programs to prevent bullying are not always adequate. Thus, the MCSS, in collaboration with the Safe Schools Working Group, is currently preparing guidance for school districts to utilize in developing bullying prevention programs.

To provide a safe environment where students are comfortable to learn, school districts need to establish adequate policies and programs which prohibit bullying and provide students a safe means for reporting instances of bullying. At a minimum, school districts need to adopt anti-bullying policies in accordance with state law.

6. Not all school districts have established a safety committee.

Some school districts interviewed indicated they did not have a safety committee. For those school districts with a safety committee, the

frequency of the meetings varied, ranging from once a month to once a year. The MCSS reports also noted many school districts had not established a safety committee; and for many of the school districts with a safety committee, improvements were needed in the representation on the committee and frequency of committee meetings. The MSIP provides that school districts have actively functioning safety committees.

According to MCSS personnel, safety planning benefits from the experience and perceptions of a diverse team; and the MCSS recommends a designated safety coordinator and adequate representation such as administrators, teachers, school resource officers, nurses, counselors, bus drivers, custodial and maintenance staff, students, parents, and local law enforcement and emergency services personnel on the safety committee. Also, the committee should meet at least twice a year, evaluate various school district safety issues, establish plans for action, and ensure that those plans are implemented.

School districts should appoint a safety committee to review and evaluate safety issues. The committee should meet at least twice a year.

7. School districts' emergency management plans need improvement. Also, some school districts have not adequately trained their staff regarding their emergency plans.

Although school districts interviewed indicated their emergency management plans were developed in coordination with local law enforcement and emergency responders, all MCSS reports noted weaknesses in the school districts' plans and procedures to respond to emergency situations.

The MCSS reviews include a comprehensive review of emergency planning and preparedness procedures. Weaknesses identified in school districts' plans included lack of coordination with city/county emergency plans and personnel, lack of coverage of all hazards, inconsistencies with Incident Command System concepts being utilized throughout the United States, and failure to provide emergency quick reference guides to teachers and bus drivers summarizing procedures to be followed. Additionally, the MCSS recommended school districts better train and prepare staff for threatening and emergency situations such as fight intervention; fire extinguisher training; bomb threats; and shut off of gas, water, and electricity in certain situations. Also, safety information needed to be included in employee handbooks.

The Safe Schools Working Group saw the need for consistent and comprehensive emergency management plans and developed an Emergency Response Information Plan (ERIP) as a tool to help emergency

school planning. The ERIP is free to public and non-public K-12 schools, higher education institutions, and licensed child care centers to assist in planning and training for all types of emergency events; and will allow law enforcement, fire and other emergency responders to access participating schools' floor plans and other critical information via the web portal when responding to school emergencies. The ERIP was available to K-12 schools and higher education institutions in the fall 2007.

Although there are no state laws or regulations which require school districts to have emergency management plans, school districts need emergency management plans for the safety of the school community. The emergency management plans need to be comprehensive and developed in collaboration with other appropriate entities. Plans should be periodically reviewed and updated and all school district staff should receive training on how to implement the plans.

8. School districts do not conduct safety drills for many types of hazards.

The MSIP reports indicate many school districts do not conduct periodic drills for intruders, bomb threats, and/or environmental hazards. In addition, many MCSS reports noted deficiencies in the number of fire, tornado, and earthquake drills performed and/or in drill procedures and records. The reports also noted many school districts do not periodically conduct other emergency exercises (such as tabletop, functional, or full scale exercises) in addition to drills.

Although the MCSS encourages intruder, bomb threat, and environmental hazards drills, there is no state law requiring that these types of drills be performed. School districts need to evaluate the various types of hazards faced and conduct appropriate drills.

9. School districts need to improve their safety inspection policies and procedures. Many school districts have not developed adequate safety inspection policies and procedures, obtained external safety inspections on a timely basis, and/or analyzed/evaluated accident information to determine needed improvements to ensure the safety of school property.

The MCSS reports noted many school districts did not conduct periodic safety inspections of the buildings and grounds. For those school districts which had performed safety inspections, improvements such as increasing the frequency of inspections and safety meetings, improving inspection procedures, and/or maintaining documentation of inspections were needed. Most reports also noted various inspections of school district facilities, such as asbestos abatement, carbon monoxide and radon, drinking water from wells, and fire were not performed by external inspectors.

Additionally, all MCSS reports listed various physical safety hazards on school property. The most common hazards included: dangerous objects and lack of sufficient ground cushioning on playgrounds, hazardous chemicals in the science labs, unsecured knives in certain classrooms, lack of sanitization of shared eye protection gear in shops, lack of material safety data sheets posted in the areas where the hazardous materials were stored, lack of a pest management program, and electrical hazards. Furthermore, many reports indicated school districts were not adequately collecting and analyzing data on accidents which occurred on school district property; and utilizing the data to develop strategies to reduce accidents.

School districts should develop inspection policies and procedures, perform routine inspections of school property, and ensure that all necessary external inspections are performed on a regular basis. In addition, accident information should be collected and analyzed to determine needed improvements of safety policies, procedures, and programs. Records of the inspections and the analyses of accident data should be maintained.

10. School districts do not have adequate procedures to ensure school buildings are secure from unauthorized entry.

Many MCSS reports noted improvements in the procedures to control access to all school buildings and instructional areas were needed. Also, several school districts told us 1) they have difficulties ensuring all instructional areas are secured from unauthorized entry, 2) access control is particularly a challenge for older school buildings and classrooms in trailers, and 3) that improvements would be costly.

School districts need to develop policies and procedures to help ensure school buildings are secure from unauthorized entry to the extent possible.

11. School districts need to provide Internet safety training.

Many school districts interviewed indicated they did not provide Internet safety training for students, staff, and/or parents. Most MCSS reports also found Internet safety training programs did not exist or were inadequate; and contained suggestions that school districts utilize free training programs and resources available from various entities, including the University of Missouri, DESE Regional Professional Development Centers, and MCSS.

According to the officials from the University of Missouri program, MORENet, children are often not aware of the risks associated with

Internet social networking, and schools should educate students on these risks and how to protect themselves when using the Internet.

School districts need to develop Internet safety training procedures and programs for students, parents, and employees.

12. School districts may need to better monitor sex offender registries for sex offenders living near or coming onto school property.

Although all school districts interviewed indicated they established procedures to monitor sex offender registries, the frequency of the monitoring varied from once a month to once a year. Many MCSS reports included recommendations to improve monitoring of sex offender registries for sex offenders that live near and/or come onto school property and to report sex offender information to law enforcement. The MCSS recommends school districts monitor the sex offender registries two times a year.

Section 566.147, RSMo, provides certain sex offenders should not reside within 1,000 feet of any public or private school or child care facility, and Section 566.149, RSMo, provides sex offenders should not come within 500 feet of school property; except for sex offenders who are parents or guardians of students and have received permission from the school district superintendent or board.

Although school districts do not have the authority to enforce these laws, to ensure the safety of students, school district officials need to identify and report noncompliance to law enforcement. School districts should consider monitoring sex offender registries at least twice a year.

13. School districts need to better publicize the Missouri School Violence Hotline (866-748-7047) to students, parents, school district personnel, and the public.

Many school districts interviewed indicated they did not inform the school community of the availability of the state hotline. Our review of school districts' websites and student handbooks noted most did not include the state hotline number on their website and/or in the student handbooks. In addition, most MCSS reports included recommendations to add instructions to student handbooks to take threats seriously and promptly report them to a school official and to promote/better promote the state hotline in student and staff handbooks.

Some school districts interviewed indicated they were not aware of the hotline, while others stated that they did not publicize the hotline because they believed it was not effective. Also, some school districts indicated

they established their own hotline number or utilized a hotline number maintained by local law enforcement instead.

The state hotline is toll-free and is a resource available to all Missouri residents to anonymously report threats or incidents on public/private K-12 school property, buses, or at events. The hotline forwards the information to the appropriate school and law enforcement agency. Many people believe a hotline helps create an environment where students and others may feel more comfortable coming forward with information that could prevent an unsafe situation.

School districts should better publicize the state school violence hotline.

School districts should evaluate their individual policies and procedures to determine the extent improvements are needed in the problem areas identified above. Also, school districts should consider conducting periodic, comprehensive reviews of discipline policies, violence prevention programs, incident reporting procedures, emergency plans, and safety procedures. The MCSS has prepared a comprehensive safety review checklist that may aid school districts in such an evaluation. The checklist is available upon request. With adequate safety and security policies and procedures in place, students and school personnel could feel more safe at school which may provide for an improved learning environment.

WE RECOMMEND the DESE, in conjunction with the General Assembly; DPS, Office of Homeland Security; other state agencies; and school districts develop state laws and regulations, guidelines, or procedures, as needed, to address the weaknesses identified in the school districts' safe schools policies, procedures, and programs. Also, Missouri school districts should evaluate their individual policies and procedures to determine the extent improvements are needed in the problem areas identified.

AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

DESE will take this under advisement.

State

- B. The state could provide more guidance and monitoring of school districts' policies, procedures, and programs related to safe schools issues. Plus, state agencies need to better collaborate/coordinate safe schools programs provided to school districts.

Also, it appears the DESE, as school districts' oversight agency, could establish school safety as a higher priority in its communication with and monitoring of school districts. According to DESE personnel, most safe schools provisions are the responsibility of school districts and the DESE's oversight policies and procedures are primarily limited to monitoring to ensure school districts establish

required policies provided by state laws and regulations, and not ensuring compliance with the school districts' policies or state laws and regulations.

Following are concerns regarding the state's oversight of safe schools issues:

1. Missouri does not have a comprehensive, coordinated statewide safe schools program. The state also has not appointed a state agency and/or other entity as the designated entity responsible for assisting and monitoring school districts for sufficient safety policies, procedures, and programs or compliance with state laws and regulations. It appears both state agencies and school districts need to be better informed about school safety programs available.

As listed in Appendix G of this report, 9 state agencies spent at least \$64 million in almost 50 programs during the past six years. However, for some programs reviewed, there was little and/or no communication between agencies. For example, the Missouri School-Based Prevention Intervention and Resources Initiative, funded by the Department of Mental Health (DMH), provided violence prevention programs at several school districts; however, DMH personnel did not ensure the program complied with the Missouri Violence Prevention Curriculum Framework adopted by the DESE.

While each program focuses on the individual aspects of the particular program, these programs may be more effective if coordinated with other programs offered by other state agencies. Additionally, discussions with school district officials found that they were not always aware of the various programs available to their district.

Surveys of other states found that many states have safe schools centers which coordinate with their various state agencies and other entities that provide services to their school districts. Recent House Bill No. 2124, which did not pass, would have provided the DESE establish a statewide center for school safety and school violence prevention. The center would have offered safety-related services and resources to all public schools in the state.

It appears a comprehensive, coordinated program would help ensure all school districts are informed of relevant school safety issues, programs, laws, and regulations. Also, a coordinated program could more readily evaluate whether programs are working as intended and identify areas for improvement on a statewide basis. In addition, the General Assembly, schools, other entities, and the public would have a single resource regarding safety in schools.

2. State laws and regulations do not address certain significant safe schools issues. For example, there is no state law or requirement that school districts have emergency management plans or conduct drills addressing emergencies such as natural disasters (other than earthquakes), intruders, bombs or bomb threats, and other threatening situations.

According to a report, issued by the U.S. Government Accountability Office⁷ (GAO) in June 2007, 32 states have laws or other policies requiring schools to have a written emergency management plan. Additionally, a few states reported providing state funding to school districts for emergency management planning. Also, one state contacted reported reviewing and approving school districts' safety plans. A second state required school districts to annually certify to the state that their school board approved their crisis plan and a third state required school districts to conduct tornado, fire, and manmade occurrence (such as student disturbance, weapon, and hostage incidents) drills.

State laws and regulations addressing school safety issues establish the foundation for school districts to maintain a safe and secure educational environment. These laws may need to be expanded to better address school safety issues. The General Assembly; DPS, Office of Homeland Security; DESE; and other state agencies should consider whether additional laws or regulations are needed to help strengthen security and safety of Missouri schools.

3. The DESE needs to improve its oversight of school districts' policies, procedures, and programs related to school safety. The DESE's primary oversight/monitoring of school districts' safety procedures is performed through the MSIP process. However, the MSIP procedures do not always adequately ensure school districts' policies and procedures are complete, comprehensive, or sufficient, and comply with safe schools provisions, if applicable.

Our review found there was little documentation of the procedures performed by the MSIP review team; thus, making it unclear if sufficient procedures were performed to ensure school district safety procedures were adequate and in place. Areas of concern include: 1) discipline policies and procedures, 2) security and crisis management plans for each school building, 3) responses by school districts to survey results, 4) various safety inspections, and 5) certain safety procedures, such as background checks for employees other than teachers and bus drivers,

⁷ *Emergency Management, Most School Districts Have Developed Emergency Management Plans, but Would Benefit from Additional Federal Guidance*, GAO, June 2007 (Report No. GAO-07-609).

monitoring for sex offenders, and analyzing and using accident data to improve safety.

Also, even when safety procedure weaknesses were identified, the weaknesses were not always reported as concerns which the school districts were required to address in their corrective action plans.

In addition, neither the DESE or school districts make the MSIP reports readily available to the public. The reports are not included on the DESE's website and none of the school districts interviewed had posted their most recent MSIP review on their website. According to DESE personnel, the MSIP reports are not on their website because the reports are complex electronic merge documents; however, hard copies of the reports are available upon request.

Because the MSIP process involves a comprehensive review of all school district responsibilities, we acknowledge that it may be difficult for the MSIP review to include an in-depth review of safety issues. However, as noted above, a comprehensive, detailed evaluation of school districts' safety policies and procedures would assist in identifying those areas where safety procedures could be improved.

One state interviewed requires school districts conduct annual self-assessments of the school district's current safety and security practices, and develop strategies and activities to improve school safety and security. Three other states approve safety assessment tools for school districts to utilize.

The DESE should consider requiring school districts periodically conduct a self assessment of safety procedures. This self assessment could be evaluated by the DESE during the MSIP process or at another time to ensure school districts are conducting safety reviews and following up on weaknesses noted.

Additionally, the DESE needs to improve its documentation of MSIP procedures performed. Without adequate documentation it is difficult to determine if procedures performed were adequate. Also, to more fully inform parents and the public, the DESE and school districts should consider making MSIP reports and/or significant portions of the reports available on their websites.

4. The DESE does not analyze school districts' MSIP survey results or ensure school districts use their results to make necessary policy changes to improve safety.

The MSIP review process includes surveying students, parents, and school district personnel regarding their feelings on school safety and the

condition of the school buildings. As included in Appendix D in this report, for the 2002 through 2006 school years, 12 percent of students did not feel safe at school, while 17 percent did not believe their school building was in good repair. Parents, faculty, and support staff generally believed schools were safer and buildings were in better condition than students.

Analyzing and evaluating feelings on school safety issues may help school districts to better address specific areas of concern. Additionally, the DESE should analyze the survey results on a statewide basis to evaluate the perceptions of safety within Missouri schools and identify areas that may need addressed on a statewide basis.

5. The DESE needs to strengthen its discipline incident reporting system policies and procedures to ensure accurate and sufficiently detailed data is received from school districts. Also, the DESE should consider requiring school districts to analyze and evaluate incident data to modify school safety programs, as needed.

- The DESE needs to improve its procedures to ensure school districts' discipline incident data is accurately entered on its Core Data system.

For example, the DESE does not perform a year-to-year comparison of Core Data incidents by school district or utilize other methods to ensure the accuracy of the incidents reported. Additionally, the MSIP review does not evaluate the discipline incident data reported. As noted above, school districts did not always accurately report discipline incidents to the DESE and we found little communication between the DESE and school district when the school district reported no and/or few incidents.

Our analysis of the incident data included at Appendix F for the five years 2002-2003 through 2006-2007 found approximately 43 percent of Missouri school districts did not report incidents during 1 or more years and 21 school districts did not report any incidents in any of the 5 years. There was no documentation the DESE followed up with these school districts regarding the potential unreported incidents. Review of incident documentation and interviews with some of these districts found these districts had unreported incidents.

- Because of inaccurate discipline incident data on the Core Data system, various reports prepared from this data cannot be relied upon.

The DESE uses the Core Data system to prepare annual school accountability report cards as required by the Safe Schools Act and various reports to the federal government such as the annual Gun-Free

Schools Act (GFSA) report. In addition, the DESE utilizes the data to identify schools considered persistently dangerous as required by federal and state law.

- The Core Data system needs additional detail of discipline incidents to permit more effective analysis. The discipline incidents are categorized in only six types of offenses: 1) weapons, 2) alcohol, 3) drugs, 4) tobacco, 5) violent act, and 6) other. According to DESE personnel, only the minimum information required by the Safe Schools Act and the federal government is collected.

Our review of the data found most discipline incidents were reported as other. Of the approximately 350,000 incidents reported for the 2006-2007 school year, 333,000 (95 percent) of the incidents were reported as other. Officials from school districts interviewed indicated a wide range of incidents are reported as other including: disruptive behavior, bullying, insubordination, tardiness, profanity, and fighting. Several school districts indicated they evaluated data from their internal system rather than the Core Data system because the level of detail on the Core Data system was not sufficient for an effective analysis.

- The DESE does not ensure school districts are analyzing and utilizing the discipline data to improve school safety. According to officials from a few school districts interviewed, the school district did not analyze their discipline incidents and utilize the results to improve school district programs.

Although the MSIP standards prior to the 2006-2007 school year provided school districts use discipline data to modify programs and strategies to ensure safe and orderly schools, the DESE did not monitor to ensure school districts did this. The MSIP review procedures were limited to obtaining information from the school districts regarding any modifications to safety programs. According to DESE personnel, the MSIP review did not determine if school districts analyzed discipline incident data because there is no state law or regulation that requires school districts do this. Beginning in the 2006-2007 school year, the districts' use of discipline incident data is no longer addressed in the MSIP standards.

The failure to ensure the accuracy of the discipline incident data reported by the school districts prevents the DESE, school districts, General Assembly, and other interested parties from conducting an accurate analysis of the data and making an informed decision regarding school safety. Because reports on discipline data are used for various purposes, the DESE needs to ensure its reports are as accurate as possible. In order

to effectively analyze the incident data, it should be adequately detailed. Additionally, the DESE should require each school district evaluate its incident data and modify its safety programs, as needed.

6. The DESE needs to better communicate the Missouri Violence Prevention Curriculum Framework to the school districts, and monitor school districts' violence prevention programs. According to DESE personnel, the violence prevention framework is a resource for school districts to use in their violence prevention program(s).

- School districts may not be fully informed about the framework. From discussions with various DESE personnel, it appears the primary communication with school districts regarding the violence prevention framework occurred when the framework was adopted in 1998. The DESE does not include the framework on its website or include a review of the framework in its MSIP standards. As noted above, some school districts indicated they were not aware of the framework.
- The MSIP review does not evaluate school districts' violence prevention programs for compliance with the violence prevention framework. Many school districts interviewed indicated they had not adopted violence prevention programs in compliance with the violence prevention framework.

Beginning in the 2006-2007 school year, violence prevention programs were included in the MSIP standards and the MSIP procedures required the review of documentation supporting violence prevention programs for students and staff. However, there was no criteria for evaluating the adequacy of the programs for issues such as program content and objectives, grade levels trained, and percentage of students trained. Prior to the 2006-2007 school year, the review of violence prevention programs was limited to obtaining a list of staff programs provided and percentage of staff trained. We also noted that in two of three school districts which did not have violence prevention programs, the lack of such programs was not identified as a concern in the MSIP reports.

- The DESE has not obtained or otherwise evaluated school districts' data to determine whether the violence prevention framework adopted has been effective or successful. In response to this observation, DESE personnel indicated the framework is a guideline for the school districts; however, the school districts are not required to use it.

To assist school districts in developing effective violence prevention programs, the DESE needs to better communicate the Missouri Violence Prevention Curriculum Framework to the school districts and establish

procedures to monitor school district programs for compliance and adequacy. Also, the DESE should periodically evaluate if the framework is effective and successful in preventing and/or reducing school violence.

7. The Missouri School Violence Hotline may be underutilized. As noted above, some school districts and/or law enforcement agencies are operating their own school safety hotlines rather than using the state hotline and school districts are not adequately publicizing the state hotline.

The Department of Social Services (DSS), through a grant from the DPS, operates the state violence hotline. According to DSS records, the number of hotline calls received has increased each year, with almost 1,400 calls received in the 2006-2007 school year. However, each year, only approximately 250-380 calls were related to school violence incidents which were referred to schools and law enforcement. The DSS's most recent survey of people who called the hotline and the schools or law enforcement agencies the calls were referred to, indicated satisfaction with the hotline services.

According to DESE personnel, the department does not determine whether school districts are adequately communicating the state hotline to students, staff, and parents because there is no requirement in state laws or regulations that school districts utilize the hotline. However, the Safe Schools Working Group has recently identified the lack of publication of the availability of the hotline as a problem and is currently evaluating low-cost means of better publicizing the hotline number to Missouri residents. As noted above, many people believe a hotline helps create a safe environment for students and others.

The DESE and DSS should consider performing an evaluation of the publication of the hotline's availability by school districts and determine if improvements may be needed to increase awareness of the hotline.

8. The DESE did not adequately document its evaluations and determinations of persistently dangerous schools for fiscal years 2006 and 2007. To determine if a school meets the definition of a persistently dangerous school, the DESE analyzes the discipline incidents from its Core Data system.

Pursuant to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 5 CSR 50-355.100 defines persistently dangerous schools and allows a student who attends a persistently dangerous school, or students who become victims of a violent criminal offense while on school grounds, to attend a safe school within the district. A Missouri public elementary or secondary school is considered persistently dangerous if 1) in each of three consecutive years the school has a federal/state gun-free school violation or a violent

criminal offense such as murder, kidnapping, assault, forcible rape or sodomy, burglary, robbery, distribution of drugs, arson, sexual assault, child molestation, or sexual abuse committed on school property and 2) in any two years of the three year period, school expulsions for drug, alcohol, weapons or violence exceed certain rates.

The DESE's spreadsheets used to evaluate and determine persistently dangerous schools did not include all relevant information such as weapons violations by school and enrollment data for all required years. In addition, the DESE did not maintain documentation of follow-up performed by area supervisors, when an initial evaluation indicated a school might meet the persistently dangerous school criteria. According to DESE personnel, no Missouri school has been identified as a persistently dangerous school.

The DESE needs to ensure the annual reviews and determinations of persistently dangerous schools are adequately documented.

9. The DESE did not accurately report the number of incidents where students brought firearms to school to the federal government in the 2005-2006 school year GFSA report. The GFSA report listed only 9 firearm incidents, while the Core Data system showed 110 firearm incidents. However, because of the deficiencies with the discipline incident data in the Core Data system noted above, it is unclear how many firearms incidents actually occurred in the 2005-2006 school year.⁸

According to DESE personnel, the department changed its procedures to report only firearm incidents involving an expulsion rather than reporting all firearm incidents. However, the report instructions state "any student found to have brought a firearm to school or possessed a firearm at school should be reported as an infraction, even if the expulsion is shortened or no penalty is imposed."

The DESE should consider amending the 2005-2006 GFSA report and ensure future reports include all firearm incidents as instructed.

⁸ The 2006-2007 school year report had not been submitted at the time of our review.

WE RECOMMEND the DESE:

- B.1 In conjunction with the General Assembly and DPS, Office of Homeland Security, designate an entity to coordinate and monitor safe schools programs, initiatives, and funding. State agencies also need to coordinate their various safe schools programs available to school districts and to improve collaboration among agencies to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the safe schools programs.
2. In conjunction with the General Assembly; DPS, Office of Homeland Security; other state agencies; and school districts consider whether additional laws or regulations are needed to help strengthen the security and safety of Missouri schools.
3. Improve its policies and procedures used to review and monitor school districts' safe schools issues. The DESE should also consider requiring school districts to periodically conduct self assessments of safety policies and procedures and evaluate the assessments during the MSIP review or at another time. Additionally, the MSIP procedures performed should be sufficiently documented and the DESE should consider making MSIP reports and/or significant portions of the reports available on their website.
4. Analyze the MSIP survey results on a statewide basis to evaluate the perception of safety in schools and to identify areas that may need improvement. Also, the DESE should consider requiring school districts to use the survey results for needed changes to their safety policies, procedures, and programs.
5. Establish policies and procedures to ensure school districts accurately report their discipline incident data, and require each school district evaluate its incident data and modify its safety programs, as needed. Also, the DESE should consider expanding the type of offenses which should be reported.
6. Increase guidance to school districts regarding the Missouri Violence Prevention Curriculum Framework requirements and evaluate whether school districts' programs are adequate. The DESE should also consider periodically evaluating whether the framework is effective and successful in preventing and reducing school violence.
7. In conjunction with the DSS and DPS, Office of Homeland Security, periodically evaluate the utilization of the state school violence hotline to determine if improvement may be needed to increase awareness of the hotline.
8. Adequately document its evaluation and determination of whether a school is a persistently dangerous school.

9. Consider amending the 2005-2006 GFSA report. Also, the DESE needs to ensure all firearm incidents are included in future reports, as provided by the report instructions.

AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

B.1-3,

6&7. DESE will take these under advisement.

B.4. DESE currently analyzes the survey results on a statewide basis. Districts are required to address survey results as part of their accountability plan through the Regional School Improvement Teams (RSIT) process.

B.5. DESE currently has policies and procedures in place to enable school districts to report timely, accurate data.

B.8. DESE has taken steps to collect the data needed to make this determination.

B.9. DESE will make the amendment to the 2005-2006 GFSA report.

AUDITEE'S OVERALL RESPONSE

DESE has the following overall concerns with the audit report:

- The use of "often," "many," and "most" appeared arbitrary and did not accurately reflect the number of occurrences for each issue. For example, the report cited: "The MCSS reports noted **many** school districts did not conduct periodic safety inspections of the buildings and grounds."*
- The items listed under "significant problems related to safe schools issues" were based more on the Missouri Center for Safe Schools (MCSS) standards rather than upon statute or DESE policy.*
- MCSS findings were cited throughout the report. MCSS is a private entity and has established its own standards and recommendations for school safety. MCSS standards are not exclusively statutory nor are they governed by DESE.*

AUDITOR'S COMMENT TO AUDITEE'S OVERALL RESPONSE

The perimeters for our use of the terms "few", "some", "many", and "most" are clearly defined in Appendix B of this report, along with the school safety issues reviewed and the number of exceptions in each case. Since all of this information was provided to officials of the DESE, the basis for their response is not clear.

Since the MCSS plays a significant role in school district safety issues and training and has received substantial funding from the DESE to carry out these functions, it only seemed appropriate that we consider information related to the MCSS when reviewing safe schools initiatives.

HISTORY AND
STATISTICAL INFORMATION

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES HISTORY AND STATISTICAL INFORMATION

The Missouri Safe Schools Act was passed in 1996 to satisfy the requirements of the federal Gun-Free Schools Act (GFSA) of 1994. The GFSA requires that each state receiving federal education funds must have a state law requiring local educational agencies to expel for a period of not less than one year a student who brings a weapon to school. However, superintendents are allowed to alter the penalty on a case-by-case basis. The Safe Schools Act addressed this requirement, as well as many other school safety issues.

The Safe Schools Act originated from House Bill No. 1298 and 1301 and has been subsequently amended, with significant changes in 2000 by Senate Bill No. 944. While there are other state laws addressing school safety, most are outlined in this act. The requirements of the Safe Schools Act, together with these other laws are referred to in this report as "safe schools provisions". The safe schools provisions provide requirements for school districts, law enforcement officials, and some state agencies. School district requirements primarily include: policy development, student admission and enrollment, reporting and record keeping, and certain areas of school safety. Law enforcement requirements address reporting of crimes committed by students. State agency requirements primarily include: teacher background checks, violence prevention programs, school district monitoring, grants to school districts and services to students, immunization requirements, and information sharing.

With the exception of the Safe Schools Grant Program funding, the safe schools provisions did not provide funding to school districts or state agencies to implement the requirements and programs outlined in the provisions. In addition, during the years subsequent to the passing of the act, the state as well as school districts experienced budget reductions, providing financial challenges to complying with the act's provisions. As a result, some programs provided by the act have been discontinued or were never implemented. For example, Section 160.700, RSMo, provided for the establishment of the National Guard Pilot Instruction Program to serve public middle school students using military training and motivation methods, and Section 161.235, RSMo, provided for the Department of Secondary and Elementary Education (DESE) to establish a grant program for student suicide prevention programs. Neither of these programs were ever established because of the lack of funding.

Recent Legislative Initiatives

Several bills addressing school safety issues were introduced in the 2008 legislative session; however, only one of these bills passed. These bills include:

- Senate Bill No. 818 amended the Safe Schools Act by adding harassment and stalking to the list of crimes that school administrators must report to appropriate law enforcement agencies.
- House Bill No. 1722 would have amended various sections of the Safe Schools Act and included the requirement that the DESE add to the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) a provision to the school facilities and safety criteria that certain

drills be conducted at least annually and that staff receive sufficient training on school districts' security and crisis management plan.

- House Bill No. 2124 would have provided \$1.5 million annually beginning in fiscal year 2010 to the DESE to establish a statewide center for school safety and school violence prevention. The center would offer safety-related services and resources to all public schools in the state. Also, the School Safety and School Violence Prevention Fund would have been created.
- Senate Bill No. 715 would have provided \$9 million to school districts (distributed based on attendance) for salaries, equipment, training, and other expenses to improve school safety, and would have required school districts to establish intruder lock-down procedures and annual drills to receive funding.
- Senate Bill No. 762 and House Bill No. 2316 would have modified the definition of "bullying" to include cyber bullying and electronic communications.
- Senate Bill No. 1212 (Student Protection Act) would have 1) amended the Safe Schools Act to require school district superintendents to forward student reports of alleged sexual misconduct by a teacher or other school employee to the Department of Social Services, Children's Division within 24 hours; 2) required school districts to develop written policies concerning teacher-student communication and employee-student communications by January 1, 2009; 3) required school districts to include in teacher and employee training a component that provides information on identifying signs of sexual abuse in children and of potentially abusive relationships between children and adults, with an emphasis on mandatory reporting by January 1, 2009; 4) required crimes of sexual contact with a student while on public school property as well as second and third degree sexual misconduct to be added to the offenses for which a teacher's license or certificate may be revoked; and 5) required certain state agencies to improve background check procedures of teachers and other school district employees.

State Initiatives

Recent state initiatives to assist school districts in improving school safety include:

- In April 2006, the Governor's Homeland Security Advisory Council established the Safe Schools Working Group. This group, which is co-chaired by the Department of Public Safety (DPS), Office of Homeland Security and the DESE, consists of representatives from school districts, law enforcement agencies, emergency responders, state agencies, and other related entities across the state, and meets every other month. The group has worked on various school safety-related issues, including school emergency planning tools and systems, hazardous chemicals in schools, bullying in the classroom, and pandemic influenza planning.

- A significant safe schools initiative led by the Safe Schools Working Group is the expansion of a web-based emergency school planning tool, Emergency Response Information Plan (ERIP), which will address all hazards. The development of the ERIP was funded with federal homeland security monies.

The ERIP is free to public and non-public K-12 schools, higher education institutions, and licensed childcare centers to assist in planning and training for all types of emergency events; and will allow law enforcement, fire, and other emergency responders to access participating schools' floor plans and other critical information via the web portal when responding to school emergencies. The ERIP was available to K-12 schools and higher education institutions in the fall 2007 and will be available to licensed childcare centers in the spring 2008.

According to DPS officials, as of March 2008, approximately 52 percent of Missouri public school districts (educating 76 percent of public school students), 18 private school districts, and 19 higher education institutions have begun utilizing the ERIP system.

- In fall 2007, through a partnership with the DPS and the Missouri School Boards' Association (MSBA), the Missouri Alert Network was implemented. This network is a rapid notification system for K-12 schools and higher education institutions.

In the event of a statewide emergency or other situation that might have an impact on school security, the DPS can simultaneously deliver a message to officials at participating schools and higher education institutions. Messages would be delivered by telephone (landline or cellular), text, and/or email. School districts (public and non-public) and higher education institutions are provided this service for one contact person, and may purchase the service from the MSBA for \$100 per year for each additional contact. According to DPS officials, as of March 2008, 91 percent of Missouri public school districts and 17 higher education institutions were registered with the Missouri Alert Network.

- The MSBA partnered with the DPS, Office of Homeland Security, and Department of Health and Senior Services to host the First Annual Conference on Coordinated School Safety and Security in August 2007. School districts were invited to attend and learn about various issues involving school safety. A second conference is planned for August 2008.
- In April 2007, the Governor appointed the Missouri Campus Security Task Force to evaluate Missouri's campus emergency response plans, identify best practices, and make recommendations for ways to ensure Missouri college campuses are safe. The task force issued a report¹ of its findings and recommendations in August 2007.

¹ *Securing Our Future: Making colleges and universities safe places to learn and grow, Report on Findings and Recommendations*, Missouri Campus Security Task Force, August 21, 2007.

Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP)

Missouri school districts receive a MSIP review once in a five-year cycle. The MSIP objectives include: assessing the strengths and needed improvements in educational programs and services, organizing staff and other resources to support school improvement efforts, and developing and implementing a formal plan to improve educational programs. The review process covers all significant aspects of school districts' responsibilities, including student performance, course offerings and curriculum, class sizes, staffing, and school services.

During the most recently completed MSIP cycle (2002 to 2006 school years), school districts received either a full review or a full waiver. A full review consisted of a several-day review conducted by a team of DESE employees and educators from across the state selected by the DESE. The results of the review were documented in a report. A full waiver consisted of a visit by the school district's DESE area supervisor, who documented his/her review by completing a limited MSIP checklist. About 39 percent of school districts received a MSIP full waiver in the most recently completed 5-year cycle, while all other school districts received a full review. Beginning with the current MSIP cycle (2007 to 2011 school years), DESE has made changes to the procedures for scheduling MSIP reviews and has increased the types of reviews performed based on the needs of the school districts.

Missouri Center for Safe Schools (MCSS)

The DESE has funded the MCSS with professional development grant funds since 1995. The MCSS provides various services to school districts including safety reviews; safety coordinator training; and training on the issues of violence prevention, bullying prevention, Internet safety, emergency response, fight intervention, conflict resolution, and other aspects of school safety.

The criteria used in the school safety reviews include: MSIP standards, Missouri Public Schools Safe Facilities Guide; Missouri Secondary Science Safety Manual; Uniform Building Code; publications and standards from other entities such as the Missouri School Boards Association, National Recreation and Park Association, National Fire Protection Association, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Education, Safety and Health Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency; and various state and federal laws and regulations.

In addition, the MCSS issues a quarterly newsletter and maintains a website² of resources for school districts to utilize. Also, the MCSS is represented on various boards and committees that address school safety. Since fiscal year 2002, the DESE has paid the MCSS over \$1.2 million.

Violence and Risky Behavior in Missouri Schools

According to DESE statistics collected in its discipline incident reporting system, for the 2006-2007 school year, Missouri school districts reported almost 350,000 school discipline incidents

² <http://education.umkc.edu/safe-school/>

in which students were suspended for one-half day or more. A schedule of discipline incidents reported by school districts for the last five years is included in Appendix F of this report.

Many of those incidents involved weapons; violent acts (acts resulting in a serious bodily injury that involves a substantial risk of death; extreme physical pain; protracted and obvious physical disfigurement; or protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ or faculty), or possession or illegal use of drugs, alcohol, and tobacco.

For school districts reviewed, students who brought weapons to school received varying lengths and types of suspensions. Superintendents frequently modified the penalties, as allowed by the Safe Schools Act. School administrators stated that factors including the age of the child, type of weapon, and the intent are considered when determining the punishment for weapons violations. They also indicated they believed a student's education should be disrupted as little as possible, not only for the student's benefit, but for the community as a whole.

In addition to discipline incidents, surveys taken by students and school district personnel confirm student violence and other risky behavior is occurring in Missouri schools. As included in Appendix E of this report, students reported carrying a weapon to school, being in a physical fight and/or being threatened or injured with a weapon, or using alcohol, drugs, or tobacco at school. Teachers also reported violent behavior at school, including being physically attacked by a student and threatened with injury by a student.

Additionally, school districts' alternative education programs for disruptive students are inconsistent throughout the state and students suspended or expelled may not be receiving alternative education. The Safe Schools Act provides that school districts may enroll students who have been suspended or expelled in an alternative education program if they determine the enrollment is appropriate. According to school districts' incident data reported to DESE, only a few students suspended or expelled during the 2006-2007 school year were provided with an alternative placement.

Students' Feelings about Safety

As included in Appendix D in this report, 12 percent of the students indicated they do not feel safe at school, and 17 percent indicated they do not believe their school buildings were in good condition. Also, some students did not go to school because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to or from school. Although the percentage of respondents from school districts within cities who believed their schools were safe and the buildings were in good condition was generally lower than respondents from school districts within rural areas, towns, and suburbs, the differences were not significant.

The DESE and school district officials indicated student feelings on being safe at school were affected by factors relating to both school and non-school issues. For example, DESE officials believed that nationwide issues involving school safety, such as school shootings in other schools in other states, affect the Missouri students' feelings on safety. Some school district officials believed students' feelings on safety in their community and at home also affect their feelings about safety at school.

Appendix A

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES OVERVIEW OF SAFE SCHOOLS PROVISIONS

The Missouri Safe Schools Act, which passed in 1996, originated from House Bill No. 1298 and 1301. There have been subsequent amendments to the act with significant changes made by Senate Bill No. 944 in 2000. The requirements of the Safe Schools Act, together with other laws that cover school safety issues are referred to in this report as "safe schools provisions". Following is an overview of the significant safe schools provisions. Refer to the Missouri Revised Statutes (RSMo) for specific statutory language. Statutes included in House Bill Numbers 1298 and 1301 and Senate Bill Number 994 are identified with an "*".

RSMo

Reference

Summary

Requirements of School Districts

160.261* School districts must establish a written discipline policy containing the following requirements:

- 1) School administrators must report certain acts of school violence to school district employees with a need to know. Need to know employees are directly responsible for the student's education or interact with the student on a professional basis while acting within the scope of their assigned duties.
- 2) School administrators must report to the appropriate law enforcement agency, certain felonies committed on school property or while involved in school activities.
- 3) With exceptions, any student suspended for a Safe Schools Act violation should not be allowed to be within 1,000 feet of any school in the district while suspended.
- 4) A student who brings a gun to school or a school activity must be suspended for a period of not less than one year, or expelled. The superintendent may modify such suspension on a case-by-case basis.

Also, the policy must address the school district's position on corporal punishment and be distributed to students and parents at the beginning of each year. Annually, all district employees must be trained on the policy.

167.117* School principals must immediately report to law enforcement and the superintendent certain incidents occurring on school property or while involved in school activities including: first, second, or third degree assault; sexual assault; or deviate sexual assault against a student or school employee and if a student has possession of certain controlled substances or weapons. A teacher must report to the principal any of the designated incidents or a pupil in possession of a controlled substance or weapon.

Appendix A

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES OVERVIEW OF SAFE SCHOOLS PROVISIONS

RSMo Reference	Summary
167.161*	School districts may, after notice and a hearing, suspend or expel a pupil for conduct which is "prejudicial to good order and discipline in the schools or which tends to impair the morale or good conduct of the pupils". Also, school districts may authorize the removal of a student if the student poses a threat of harm to his/herself or others. Removal of a student with a disability is subject to state and federal procedural rights. In addition, school districts, after notice and a hearing, may suspend a student if the student has been charged, convicted or pled guilty in a court of a felony criminal violation of law.
167.115*	School districts must notify the appropriate division of juvenile or family court if a student is suspended for more than 10 days or expelled if the school district is aware the student is under the court's jurisdiction.
167.171*	When a student is suspended for more than 10 school days, the student has the right to appeal the suspension to the school board. Prior to readmitting or enrolling a student who has been suspended for more than 10 consecutive school days for certain acts of school violence, a conference must be held to review the conduct which resulted in the suspension. School districts cannot, however, readmit or enroll a student who had been convicted of, been charged with, or had a petition filed alleging certain acts including: murder, assault, forcible or statutory rape, robbery, distribution of drugs to a minor, arson, or kidnapping. This section does not apply to a student with a disability if the action was related to the disability. School district may carry out a suspension or expulsion imposed by another in-state or out-of-state school district, private or public school if similar conduct in that school district would also have resulted in suspension or expulsion. Also, school districts may enroll the student in an alternative education program if they determine the enrollment is appropriate.
160.522*	School districts should report to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) the number and rate of suspensions of 10 days or longer and expulsions of students.
160.660*	School districts' designated safety coordinator should have a thorough knowledge of all federal, state, and local school violence prevention programs and resources available. School districts are to use all such programs and resources that are determined to be necessary and cost-effective for the district.

Appendix A

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES OVERVIEW OF SAFE SCHOOLS PROVISIONS

RSMo Reference	Summary
162.680*	School districts, to the maximum extent appropriate, must educate disabled and severely disabled children along with children who do not have disabilities in regular classes, except when a disability results in violent behavior which causes a substantial likelihood of injury to the student or others. Then the school district must remove the child to a more appropriate placement.
167.020,* 167.023,* 475.060,* and 475.070*	A student must establish proof of residency in order to register in a school district or request a waiver prior to enrollment. Prior to enrolling a student, school districts may require the parent/legal guardian to provide a sworn statement indicating whether the student has been expelled from any public or private school for a violation of a weapons, alcohol or drug policy or for the willful infliction of injury to another. School districts must request within two business days of enrollment the student's records, including discipline records, from all schools attended within the past twelve months. School districts receiving the request must respond within five days. Any person may file a petition for the appointment a guardian of a minor for the sole and specific purpose of school registration.
160.480	In the case of a natural disaster or other community emergency, school districts are authorized to adopt an emergency preparedness plan allowing the use of school resources, including school facilities, commodity foods, school buses, and equipment.
160.775	School districts must adopt an antibullying policy by September 1, 2007. The policy may address age appropriate differences and must contain the consequences of bullying. In addition, the policy must 1) require school district employees to report any instance of bullying of which the employee has firsthand knowledge and 2) include training of employees on the policy.
168.133	School districts must ensure criminal background checks are conducted on new employees prior to having contact with a student. Individuals required to have a background check include, but are not limited to, administrators, teachers, assistants, aides, secretaries, cooks, custodians, bus drivers, and nurses.
302.272*	School bus drivers must 1) have received a school bus endorsement from the Department of Revenue (DOR), 2) comply with the pertinent rules and regulations of the DOR and any final rule issued by the U.S. Department of Transportation, or 3) have a valid school bus endorsement on a valid commercial driver's license issued by another state.

Appendix A

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES OVERVIEW OF SAFE SCHOOLS PROVISIONS

RSMo Reference	Summary
160.451, 160.453, 160.455, and 160.457	Certain school districts located in the area of the New Madrid Fault must establish, with the assistance of the state emergency management agency and any local emergency management agency, an earthquake emergency procedure system. The system should include, at a minimum: 1) a school building disaster plan; 2) semi-annual earthquake emergency drills; 3) protective measures to be taken before, during and following an earthquake; and 4) training on the system. At the beginning of each school year, each school district in the state must distribute certain earthquake safety materials to each student. School districts not located in the area of the New Madrid fault may elect to prepare an earthquake emergency procedure system.
167.627*	School districts must grant students authorization for possession and self-administration of medication to treat asthma or anaphylaxis if certain requirements are met.
167.624*	School districts may implement a program to train students in cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and other lifesaving methods. Completion of the program may be a requirement for graduation.
167.166	A strip search of a student may be conducted by, or under the authority of, a law enforcement officer. No employee of or volunteer at public and charter schools may perform a strip search of any student unless a law enforcement officer is not available and if the school employee reasonably believes that a student possesses a weapon, explosive, or substance that poses an imminent threat of physical harm to himself/herself or others. A strip search may not "include the removal of clothing in order to investigate the potential abuse or neglect of a student; give medical attention to a student; provide health services to a student; or screen a student for medical conditions."
167.029*	The St. Louis school district may adopt a policy requiring school uniforms.
304.076*	Buses transporting children to or from a federal Head Start program must have signs indicating that it is a Head Start school bus.
170.260*	With certain conditions, school districts may offer motivated classes and/or programs.

Appendix A

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES OVERVIEW OF SAFE SCHOOLS PROVISIONS

RSMo

Reference

Summary

Requirements of State Agencies

- 168.021 and 168.071 The DESE must conduct background checks on applicants prior to issuing teaching certificates, and may suspend, revoke, or refuse educator certificates if an individual has pled or been found guilty of a felony or a crime involving moral turpitude. The DESE also has the authority to determine if an individual with a criminal history should be issued a certificate to teach or if the holder of an educator certificate should be disciplined.
- 161.650* The DESE must adopt a violence prevention program(s) for use in public school districts. The program is to encourage nonviolent conflict resolution, alternative constructive activities, and community participation. School districts may, but are not required, to administer this program.
- 160.660* The DESE must include school facilities and safety criteria in the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP).
- 167.026* The DESE must adopt a policy regarding the expungement of discipline records. School districts may adopt an expungement policy consistent with the DESE policy.
- 167.335* The Safe Schools Grant Program, within the DESE, was established to award grants to school districts to provide alternative educational opportunities for students which cannot be adequately served in the traditional classroom setting due to disruptive behavior.
- 161.235* A grant program, within the DESE, was established to award grants to school districts and other entities to provide student suicide prevention programs.
- 160.700* A pilot instruction program was established for public middle school students using military training and motivation methods. The program was to be administered jointly by the DESE, Department of Social Services (DSS), and national guard.
- 167.181 The Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) must prepare, supervise and enforce rules and regulations governing the immunization of children attending public and private schools against certain diseases. Children may be exempt from immunization under certain criteria.

Appendix A

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES OVERVIEW OF SAFE SCHOOLS PROVISIONS

RSMo Reference	Summary
210.865*	Certain state agencies including the DSS, DESE, DHSS, and Department of Mental Health (DMH), juvenile courts, and school districts are required to share information regarding individual children who have received services from these agencies and courts. The sharing of information is subject to all existing laws pertaining to the confidentiality of information.

Requirements of Law Enforcement Agencies

167.115*	A juvenile officer, sheriff, chief of police, or other appropriate law enforcement authority must notify school districts, as soon as reasonably practical, when a student has committed certain acts including: murder, kidnapping, assault, forcible rape, burglary or robbery, distribution of drugs to a minor, manslaughter, sexual assault, possession of a weapon, and sexual misconduct involving a child. School districts must report such information to teachers and other school district employees with a need to know. After the disposition of the case, the school district should also receive written notification, including a brief summary of relevant facts, no later than five days following the disposition of the case.
----------	--

The safe schools provisions also outline the requirements and penalties for the following crimes:

195.214*	Distribution of a controlled substance near schools.
565.075*	Assault while on school property.
566.086	Sexual contact with a student while on public school property.
569.155*	Trespass of a school bus.
571.030*	Unlawful use of weapons.
574.085*	Institutional vandalism.
574.115*	Making a terrorist threat.
575.090*	Making a false bomb report.
566.147 and 566.149	Certain sexual offenders are not to reside within 1,000 feet of a school or childcare facility or be present within 500 feet of school property.

Appendix B

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES SCHEDULE OF RESULTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REVIEWS

We interviewed school district personnel from 25 school districts, included at Appendix C, and reviewed related policies and procedures, and other documents supporting the school districts' programs involving safety. In addition, we reviewed the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) review reports for these school districts conducted during the 2002-2003 through 2006-2007 school years by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) for issues related to school safety. We also reviewed the Missouri Center for Safe Schools (MCSS) school safety review reports conducted at 24 school districts during the 2006-2007 school year.

In this report, we considered the error rate up to 10 percent to be few exceptions, the error rate between 11 percent to 25 percent to be some exceptions, the error rate of 26 percent to 75 percent to be many exceptions, and the error rate of 76 percent to 99 percent to be most exceptions.

The results of the interviews and reviews are documented below:

Safe Schools Issues Reviewed	Number of Exceptions
School District Discipline Policies	
School district discipline policies did not clearly outline the consequences for each act of misconduct.	9
School district discipline policies did not require school administrators to report student acts of school violence to teachers and other school district employees who interact with that student.	10
MCSS report noted problems with school district's procedures for maintaining records of students who received long-term suspensions, and passing that information to teachers and other school district employees responsible for the student as the student is promoted or transferred.	18
School district discipline policies did not provide that students suspended for serious violations of the discipline policies were prohibited from being within 1,000 feet of any school within the school district during the suspension period.	7
MCSS report noted the 1,000 feet requirement (see above) was not in the school district's policy.	3
School district discipline policies did not provide for a one-year suspension for all applicable types of weapons required by the Safe Schools Act.	1
MCSS report identified weaknesses with policies regarding weapons.	8

Appendix B

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF RESULTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REVIEWS

Safe Schools Issues Reviewed	Number of Exceptions
School district discipline documents distributed to students and parents conflicted with or did not contain all information from the school district's discipline policy and/or were not in compliance with the safe schools provisions.	15
MCSS report noted weaknesses in the discipline policy documentation distributed by the school districts.	14
School district website* did not include a complete record of the school district's discipline policies.	8
School district website* did not include the student handbooks and/or discipline guides for all schools in the district.	8
MSIP review report noted school district was not obtaining signatures from parents and students acknowledging receipt of the discipline policy.	2
Discipline Incident Data	
School district incorrectly reported discipline data for the 2004-2005 and/or 2005-2006 school year.	10
School District Violence Prevention Programs	
School district had not developed violence prevention programs in accordance with the Missouri Violence Prevention Curriculum Framework guidelines.	15
MCSS report noted significant weakness in school district's violence prevention programs.	20
MSIP report indicated a lack of violence prevention training for staff.	4
MSIP report noted the frequency of training sessions and percentage of staff trained varied between school districts.	7
Antibullying Policies	
School district's antibullying policies lacked significant provisions such as a requirement that school district employees report instances of bullying and/or employee training on the policy.	8
School district had not adopted antibullying policies.	1

Appendix B

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF RESULTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REVIEWS

Safe Schools Issues Reviewed	Number of Exceptions
Safety Committees	
School district indicated they did not have a safety committee.	3
MCSS report noted school district had not established a safety committee.	7
MCSS report noted, for school districts with a safety committee, improvements were needed in the representation on the committee and frequency of committee meetings.	12
Emergency Management Plans	
MCSS report noted weaknesses in the school district's plans and procedures to respond to emergency situations.	24
MCSS report recommended school district better train and prepare school district staff for threatening and emergency situations.	24
MCSS report recommended safety information be included in employee handbooks.	22
Intruder, Bomb Threat, and Environmental Hazard Drills	
MSIP report indicated school district did not conduct periodic drills for intruders.	9
MSIP report indicated school district did not conduct periodic drills for bomb threats.	10
MSIP report indicated school district did not conduct periodic drills for environmental hazards.	17
MCSS report noted deficiencies in the number of fire, tornado, and earthquake drills performed and/or in drill procedures and records.	14
MCSS report noted school district was not periodically conducting other emergency exercises (such as tabletop, functional, or full scale exercises) in addition to drills.	15
Safety Reviews	
MCSS report noted school district had not conducted periodic safety inspections of the building grounds.	8

Appendix B

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF RESULTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REVIEWS

Safe Schools Issues Reviewed	Number of Exceptions
MCSS report noted, for school districts which had performed safety inspections, improvements such as increasing the frequency of inspections and safety meetings, improving inspection procedures, and/or maintaining documentation of inspections were needed.	7
MCSS report noted various inspections of school district facilities such as asbestos abatement, carbon monoxide and radon, drinking water from wells, and fire were not performed by external inspectors.	22
MCSS report listed various physical safety hazards on school property.	24
MCSS report indicated school district was not adequately collecting and analyzing data on accidents which occurred on school district property; and utilizing the data to develop strategies to reduce accidents.	9
Control Access to School Buildings	
MCSS report noted improvement in the procedures to control access to all school buildings and instructional areas was needed.	12
Internet Safety	
School district indicated it did not provide Internet safety training for students, staff, and/or parents.	10
MCSS report noted Internet safety training programs did not exist or were inadequate; and contained suggestions that school district utilize free training programs and resources available from various entities.	18
Sex Offender Registries	
MCSS report included recommendations to improve monitoring of sex offender registries for sex offenders that live near and/or come onto school property and to report sex offender information to law enforcement.	8
School Violence Hotline	
School district indicated it did not inform the school community of the availability of the Missouri School Violence Hotline (state).	9
School district website* did not include the state hotline number.	21
School district student handbooks did not include the state hotline number.	22

Appendix B

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF RESULTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REVIEWS

Safe Schools Issues Reviewed	Number of Exceptions
MCSS report included recommendations to add instructions to student handbooks to take threats seriously and promptly report them to a school official and to promote/better promote the state hotline in student handbooks, staff handbooks, and/or posters or other materials available from the hotline.	21

*23 school districts had websites.

Appendix C

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS REVIEWED

	<u>County</u>	<u>School District</u>	<u>2006-2007 School Year Enrollment</u>
1	Bates	Rich Hill R-IV	423
2	Boone	Columbia 93	17,090
3	Butler	Poplar Bluff R-I	4,849
4	Cass	Harrisonville R-IX	2,613
5	Clay	Liberty 53	9,277
6	Cole	Jefferson City	8,235
7	Franklin	Meramec Valley R-III	3,664
8	Franklin	Union R-XI	2,913
9	Harrison	Gilman City R-IV	154
10	Jackson	Kansas City 33	26,943
11	Lafayette	Concordia R-II	534
12	Lafayette	Lafayette Co. C-1	1,050
13	Maries	Maries Co. R-I	577
14	Morgan	Morgan Co. R-I	739
15	Pemiscot	Hayti R-II	865
16	Pemiscot	Pemiscot Co. R-III	142
17	Polk	Bolivar R-I	2,581
18	Pulaski	Richland R-IV	657
19	St. Louis	Hazelwood	19,269
20	St. Louis	Maplewood-Richmond Heights	1,024
21	St. Louis	Special School District St. Louis Co.	2,087
22	St. Louis	Wellston	633
23	Texas	Summersville R-II	432
24	Vernon	Nevada R-V	2,664
25	Washington	Kingston K-14	806

Appendix D

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
 DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
 MISSOURI SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MSIP) SURVEY RESULTS

Respondent	2001-2002 through 2005-2006 School Years			2006-2007 School Year		
	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Neutral	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Neutral	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
Students (1)	<i>Question: I feel safe at school.</i>					
Rural	71%	18%	11%	69%	20%	11%
Town	68%	20%	12%	67%	21%	12%
Suburb	69%	20%	11%	70%	20%	10%
City	65%	21%	14%	74%	17%	9%
Statewide	69%	19%	12%	69%	20%	11%
Parents	<i>Question: I feel my child is safe at school.</i>					
Rural	82%	13%	5%	82%	13%	5%
Town	79%	15%	6%	80%	14%	6%
Suburb	82%	13%	5%	87%	10%	3%
City	77%	16%	7%	85%	12%	3%
Statewide	81%	14%	5%	83%	12%	5%
Faculty	<i>Question: I feel safe at this school.</i>					
Rural	97%	2%	1%	94%	4%	2%
Town	96%	3%	1%	93%	4%	3%
Suburb	94%	4%	2%	93%	5%	2%
City	92%	5%	3%	88%	9%	3%
Statewide	95%	3%	2%	93%	5%	2%
Support Staff	<i>Question: I feel safe at this school.</i>					
Rural	92%	6%	2%	88%	9%	3%
Town	88%	8%	4%	84%	11%	5%
Suburb	86%	9%	5%	85%	10%	5%
City	85%	10%	5%	*	*	*
Statewide	88%	8%	4%	86%	10%	4%

(1) Students in grades 3-12

* No respondents for this location.

Appendix D

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
MISSOURI SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MSIP) SURVEY RESULTS

Respondent	2001-2002 through 2005-2006 School Years			2006-2007 School Year		
	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Neutral	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Neutral	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
Students (2)	<i>Question: My school building is in good condition.</i>					
Rural	62%	22%	16%	58%	23%	19%
Town	59%	23%	18%	53%	26%	21%
Suburb	62%	22%	16%	58%	26%	16%
City	56%	24%	20%	*	*	*
Statewide	61%	22%	17%	57%	25%	18%
Parents	<i>Question: My child's school building is in good condition.</i>					
Rural	77%	14%	9%	76%	15%	9%
Town	76%	14%	10%	76%	13%	11%
Suburb	82%	12%	6%	87%	9%	4%
City	73%	17%	10%	88%	9%	3%
Statewide	78%	14%	8%	80%	12%	8%
Faculty	<i>Question: Overall, my school building is in good condition.</i>					
Rural	84%	8%	8%	80%	9%	11%
Town	78%	10%	12%	76%	10%	14%
Suburb	80%	9%	11%	85%	8%	7%
City	79%	10%	11%	79%	11%	10%
Statewide	81%	9%	10%	81%	9%	10%
Support Staff	<i>Question: Overall, my school building is in good repair. (3)</i>					
Rural	75%	14%	11%	76%	14%	10%
Town	68%	18%	14%	68%	18%	14%
Suburb	71%	17%	12%	77%	14%	9%
City	71%	17%	12%	*	*	*
Statewide	72%	16%	12%	74%	15%	11%

(2) Students in grades 6-12 were surveyed in the 2001-2002 through 2005-2006 school years and students in grades 9-12 were surveyed in the 2006-2007 school year.

(3) Question was modified in the 2006-2007 school year to "Overall, my school building is in good condition".

Appendix D

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
 DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
 MISSOURI SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MSIP) SURVEY RESULTS

SURVEY RESPONSES

Responses were received from 101 and 521 school districts in the 2006-2007 and 2001-2002 through 2005-2006 school years, respectively. The tables below identify the total number of responses received by type of respondent for each question.

Question on feeling safe

	Number of Survey Respondents	
	School Year	
	2001-2002 through 2005-2006	2006-2007
Students	1,122,163	210,870
Parents	802,475	150,159
Faculty	123,689	23,162
Support staff	29,019	5,501
Total	2,077,346	389,692

Question on building condition

	Number of Survey Respondents	
	School Year	
	2001-2002 through 2005-2006	2006-2007
Students	722,599	80,954
Parents	799,804	150,207
Faculty	123,529	23,193
Support staff	28,535	5,470
Total	1,674,467	259,824

Surveys are administered at each school district once in a five-year cycle as part of the MSIP review process. MSIP Cycle Three included the 2001-2002 through 2005-2006 school years, and MSIP Cycle Four currently includes the 2006-2007 through 2010-2011 school years. Survey results for MSIP Cycle Three represent the feelings of individuals from all school districts, while survey results for MSIP Cycle Four represent the feelings of individuals from school districts which had a review in the 2006-2007 school year only.

LOCATION DEFINITIONS

- Rural** Territory outside an urbanized area and outside an urban cluster. Includes schools in rural areas up to 5 miles from an urbanized area and 2.5 miles from an urban cluster (e.g. Boonville R-I School District), rural areas between 5 and 25 miles from an urbanized area and between 2.5 and 10 miles from an urban cluster (e.g. Harrisburg R-VIII School District), and rural areas more than 25 miles from an urbanized area and 10 miles from an urban cluster (e.g. Dadeville R-II School District).
- Town** Territory outside an urbanized area and inside an urban cluster. Includes schools within towns up to 10 miles of from an urbanized area (e.g. Meramec Valley R-III School District), towns between 10 and 35 miles from an urbanized area (e.g. Warrensburg R-VI School District), and towns more than 35 miles from an urbanized area (e.g. Hayti R-II School District).
- Suburb** Territory inside an urbanized area and outside a principal city. Includes schools within large suburbs with a population of 250,000 or more (e.g. Kirkwood R-VII School District), midsize suburbs with a population between 100,000 and 250,000 (e.g. Nixa R-II School District), and small suburbs with a population of less than 100,000 (e.g. Lee’s Summit R-VII School District).
- City** Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city. Includes schools within large cities with a population of 250,000 or more (e.g. St. Louis City School District), midsize cities with a population between 100,000 and 250,000 (e.g. Springfield R-XII School District), and small cities with a population of less than 100,000 (e.g. St. Joseph School District).

Appendix E

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES SCHOOL SAFETY SURVEY RESULTS

The Department of Elementary of Secondary Education and the Department of Mental Health conduct a joint Missouri Student Survey every two years showing trends in health-related behaviors of students in the state. The 2006 survey¹ (the most current report available) included approximately 69,000 students from school districts which volunteered to participate in the survey. Students were asked questions regarding activities occurring inside and outside of school.

Also, various federal agencies survey students and school districts' staff regarding school safety issues across the United States. The results of these surveys and other related statistics gathered by the agencies are reported annually in the Indicators of School Crime and Safety report² produced jointly by the U.S. Department of Education and Department of Justice. The 2007 report contained survey information collected from 2003 through 2006 regarding numerous types of school safety issues, including fights, carrying weapons, bullying, threats to teachers and students, and alcohol and drug use. The report lists survey results nationwide and by state.

Following is a summary of some significant results from these two surveys relating to student behavior at school:

Activity/Behavior	Missouri Student Survey	Indicators of School Crime and Safety	
	Missouri	Missouri	United States
Weapons/Threatening Situations			
Percentage of students reported carrying a weapon to school at least one day during the previous 30 days	NA	7.3	6.5
Percentage of students reported carrying a weapon to school within the past year	1.7	NA	NA
Percentage of students reported having been in a physical fight at school during the previous 12 months	NA	10.2	13.6
Percentage of students reported having been threatened or injured with a weapon at school during the previous 12 months	NA	9.1	7.9
Percentage of students reported they did not go to school because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to school during the previous 30 days	NA	5.4	6
	Missouri Student	Indicators of School	

¹ 2006 Missouri Student Survey, Children and Family Mental Health Services Research, Missouri Institute of Mental Health, University of Missouri-Columbia School of Medicine, December 2006.

² Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2007, U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, December 2007, (Report Nos. NCES 2008-021 and NCJ 219553)

Appendix E

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHOOL SAFETY SURVEY RESULTS

Activity/Behavior	Survey	Crime and Safety	
	Missouri	Missouri	United States
Percentage of teachers reported having been physically attacked by a student during the previous 12 months	NA	5.5	3.7
Percentage of teachers reported having been threatened with injury by a student during the previous 12 months	NA	8.3	7.5
Drugs/Alcohol/Tobacco Usage			
Percentage of students reported using marijuana at school during the previous 30 days	1.7	4	4.5
Percentage of students reported having been offered, sold, or given an illegal drug at school by someone during the past 12 months	NA	18.2	25.4
Percentage of students reported using alcohol at school during the previous 30 days	2.5	3.3	4.3
Percentage of students reported having smoked cigarettes at school on one or more of the past 30 days	3.4	6.2	6.8
Percentage of students reported having used chewing tobacco, snuff, or dip at school on one or more of the past 30 days	3.1	3.9	5

The Missouri Student Survey includes middle/junior and high school aged youth while the Indicators of School Crime and Safety report includes high school aged youth.

NA Survey did not include a comparable question.

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Incident Rate														
		Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students
Adair	Adair Co. R-I	52	293	17.7	80	303	26.4	2	307	0.7	0	311	0.0	1	315	0.3
	Adair Co. R-II	59	249	23.7	61	248	24.6	5	252	2.0	1	258	0.4	0	257	0.0
	Kirksville R-III	1,416	2,569	55.1	1,233	2,443	50.5	4	2,421	0.2	5	2,394	0.2	0	2,396	0.0
Andrew	Avenue City R-IX	5	137	3.6	5	134	3.7	0	117	0.0	0	120	0.0	0	129	0.0
	North Andrew Co. R-VI	153	390	39.2	128	399	32.1	2	369	0.5	8	379	2.1	1	367	0.3
	Savannah R-III	289	2,362	12.2	186	2,351	7.9	22	2,378	0.9	22	2,387	0.9	21	2,391	0.9
Atchison	Fairfax R-III	56	170	32.9	38	150	25.3	0	160	0.0	1	167	0.6	0	155	0.0
	Rock Port R-II	118	360	32.8	0	354	0.0	0	355	0.0	1	369	0.3	0	369	0.0
	Tarkio R-I	51	422	12.1	95	417	22.8	12	439	2.7	0	561	0.0	1	605	0.2
Audrain	Community R-VI	56	348	16.1	78	372	21.0	0	370	0.0	0	356	0.0	0	361	0.0
	Mexico 59	1,355	2,482	54.6	2,004	2,378	84.3	80	2,393	3.3	130	2,433	5.3	153	2,455	6.2
	Van-Far R-I	126	604	20.9	188	621	30.3	8	626	1.3	1	630	0.2	2	633	0.3
Barry	Cassville R-IV	817	2,112	38.7	564	2,019	27.9	34	2,042	1.7	31	1,995	1.6	20	2,015	1.0
	Exeter R-VI	10	330	3.0	18	336	5.4	0	322	0.0	1	331	0.3	1	301	0.3
	Monett R-I	367	2,150	17.1	286	2,021	14.2	24	1,996	1.2	31	1,975	1.6	30	2,016	1.5
	Purdy R-II	43	739	5.8	109	753	14.5	0	715	0.0	0	730	0.0	8	702	1.1
	Shell Knob 78	25	165	15.2	53	189	28.0	0	197	0.0	2	204	1.0	3	217	1.4
	Southwest R-V	271	886	30.6	316	856	36.9	10	831	1.2	6	856	0.7	6	863	0.7
	Wheaton R-III	14	455	3.1	27	452	6.0	9	425	2.1	4	434	0.9	3	438	0.7
Barton	Golden City R-III	76	265	28.7	86	293	29.4	2	310	0.6	2	290	0.7	0	276	0.0
	Lamar R-I	712	1,316	54.1	101	1,351	7.5	0	1,310	0.0	7	1,358	0.5	1	1,379	0.1
	Liberal R-II	109	554	19.7	117	550	21.3	3	543	0.6	4	524	0.8	18	532	3.4
Bates	Adrian R-III	174	722	24.1	135	697	19.4	5	678	0.7	4	686	0.6	14	657	2.1
	Ballard R-II	7	135	5.2	10	142	7.0	5	144	3.5	0	172	0.0	0	165	0.0
	Butler R-V	264	1,059	24.9	261	1,083	24.1	19	1,096	1.7	13	1,093	1.2	18	1,154	1.6
	Hudson R-IX	3	60	5.0	1	58	1.7	0	62	0.0	0	63	0.0	0	53	0.0
	Hume R-VIII	23	153	15.0	7	142	4.9	6	139	4.3	4	141	2.8	1	142	0.7
	Miami R-I	99	244	40.6	128	239	53.6	3	228	1.3	1	231	0.4	5	239	2.1
	Rich Hill R-IV	174	423	41.1	326	436	74.8	12	469	2.6	0	494	0.0	40	485	8.2
Benton	Cole Camp R-I	152	773	19.7	193	735	26.3	5	769	0.7	9	807	1.1	5	741	0.7
	Lincoln R-II	599	558	107.3	81	578	14.0	16	593	2.7	4	587	0.7	2	572	0.3
	Warsaw R-IX	499	1,438	34.7	158	1,380	11.4	27	1,396	1.9	21	1,362	1.5	26	1,362	1.9
Bollinger	Leopold R-III	16	202	7.9	0	207	0.0	0	214	0.0	0	213	0.0	0	220	0.0
	Meadow Heights R-II	76	608	12.5	78	573	13.6	8	575	1.4	5	573	0.9	8	603	1.3
	Woodland R-IV	208	947	22.0	286	940	30.4	10	911	1.1	25	930	2.7	29	957	3.0
	Zalma R-V	9	241	3.7	21	241	8.7	0	245	0.0	0	270	0.0	0	272	0.0
Boone	Centralia R-VI	220	1,334	16.5	142	1,341	10.6	13	1,360	1.0	10	1,362	0.7	10	1,338	0.7
	Columbia 93	8,323	17,090	48.7	6,672	16,369	40.8	81	16,052	0.5	33	15,982	0.2	44	16,076	0.3
	Hallsville R-IV	266	1,252	21.2	332	1,196	27.8	24	1,163	2.1	24	1,174	2.0	4	1,185	0.3
	Harrisburg R-VIII	178	608	29.3	180	612	29.4	1	605	0.2	4	588	0.7	3	583	0.5
	Southern Boone Co. R-I	446	1,396	31.9	454	1,354	33.5	9	1,281	0.7	5	1,299	0.4	7	1,254	0.6
	Sturgeon R-V	69	446	15.5	62	459	13.5	8	494	1.6	4	504	0.8	15	472	3.2
Buchanan	Buchanan Co. R-IV	39	381	10.2	21	339	6.2	0	355	0.0	0	357	0.0	1	369	0.3
	East Buchanan Co. C-1	211	740	28.5	124	751	16.5	3	722	0.4	7	720	1.0	8	713	1.1
	Mid-Buchanan Co. R-V	102	701	14.6	50	698	7.2	0	674	0.0	0	713	0.0	4	768	0.5
	St. Joseph	5,202	11,718	44.4	5,446	11,363	47.9	151	11,402	1.3	176	11,559	1.5	101	11,658	0.9
Butler	Neelyville R-IV	71	664	10.7	185	658	28.1	3	686	0.4	13	696	1.9	11	696	1.6
	Poplar Bluff R-I	1,791	4,849	36.9	1,459	4,596	31.7	158	4,556	3.5	131	4,479	2.9	144	4,576	3.1
	Twin Rivers R-X	435	990	43.9	325	1,021	31.8	4	994	0.4	6	999	0.6	6	1,015	0.6

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students
Caldwell	Braymer C-4	17	372	4.6	0	355	0.0	1	341	0.3	0	370	0.0	0	365	0.0
	Breckenridge R-I	0	113	0.0	8	109	7.3	0	105	0.0	0	111	0.0	0	108	0.0
	Cowgill R-VI	0	34	0.0	0	43	0.0	0	49	0.0	0	52	0.0	0	59	0.0
	Hamilton R-II	287	721	39.8	411	714	57.6	5	709	0.7	10	703	1.4	8	711	1.1
	Kingston 42	1	52	1.9	0	41	0.0	0	38	0.0	0	43	0.0	0	38	0.0
	Mirabile C-1	1	60	1.7	1	48	2.1	0	44	0.0	0	37	0.0	0	22	0.0
	New York R-IV	0	30	0.0	0	31	0.0	0	36	0.0	0	46	0.0	0	44	0.0
Callaway	Polo R-VII	90	395	22.8	102	416	24.5	7	388	1.8	6	401	1.5	4	397	1.0
	Fulton 58	773	2,217	34.9	882	2,233	39.5	90	2,269	4.0	74	2,278	3.2	74	2,308	3.2
	Missouri School For The Deaf	0	98	0.0	10	107	9.3	0	112	0.0	0	120	0.0	0	*	NA
	New Bloomfield R-III	605	764	79.2	651	737	88.3	2	731	0.3	0	703	0.0	9	743	1.2
	North Callaway Co. R-I	554	1,355	40.9	608	1,343	45.3	21	1,306	1.6	43	1,292	3.3	36	1,322	2.7
Camden	South Callaway Co. R-II	179	964	18.6	256	953	26.9	11	934	1.2	11	937	1.2	2	948	0.2
	Camdenton R-III	1,703	4,223	40.3	1,362	4,130	33.0	52	4,037	1.3	91	4,010	2.3	65	4,071	1.6
	Climax Springs R-IV	124	238	52.1	209	242	86.4	3	231	1.3	0	242	0.0	2	235	0.9
	Macks Creek R-V	99	319	31.0	375	353	106.2	5	351	1.4	3	352	0.9	4	391	1.0
	Stoutland R-II	71	535	13.3	222	532	41.7	2	535	0.4	0	525	0.0	0	527	0.0
Cape Girardeau	Cape Girardeau 63	2,712	3,971	68.3	2,358	4,019	58.7	144	4,048	3.6	146	4,049	3.6	258	3,998	6.5
	Delta R-V	0	334	0.0	6	334	1.8	0	315	0.0	0	333	0.0	0	325	0.0
	Jackson R-II	1,135	4,675	24.3	912	4,576	19.9	41	4,548	0.9	27	4,585	0.6	17	4,623	0.4
	Nell Holcomb R-IV	6	325	1.8	12	340	3.5	2	340	0.6	2	345	0.6	1	339	0.3
	Oak Ridge R-VI	49	353	13.9	71	356	19.9	0	373	0.0	0	378	0.0	0	383	0.0
	Bosworth R-V	4	138	2.9	3	133	2.3	0	148	0.0	0	162	0.0	0	164	0.0
	Carrollton R-VII	160	1,035	15.5	278	1,011	27.5	44	1,027	4.3	16	1,009	1.6	13	1,030	1.3
Carroll	Hale R-I	30	201	14.9	29	151	19.2	0	148	0.0	0	149	0.0	0	163	0.0
	Norborne R-VIII	79	207	38.2	97	220	44.1	0	233	0.0	0	208	0.0	0	210	0.0
	Tina-Avalon R-II	73	214	34.1	80	201	39.8	1	197	0.5	0	197	0.0	0	200	0.0
	East Carter Co. R-II	363	837	43.4	287	829	34.6	10	794	1.3	5	790	0.6	8	772	1.0
	Van Buren R-I	5	528	0.9	3	532	0.6	1	527	0.2	1	563	0.2	1	517	0.2
Cass	Archie R-V	165	623	26.5	310	570	54.4	1	525	0.2	0	528	0.0	3	548	0.5
	Belton 124	1,441	4,892	29.5	1,557	4,587	33.9	68	4,591	1.5	42	4,547	0.9	35	4,573	0.8
	Drexel R-IV	53	319	16.6	56	346	16.2	3	360	0.8	0	374	0.0	1	370	0.3
	East Lynne 40	23	162	14.2	1	136	0.7	0	164	0.0	0	166	0.0	0	161	0.0
	Harrisonville R-IX	421	2,613	16.1	741	2,437	30.4	25	2,442	1.0	35	2,415	1.4	18	2,328	0.8
	Midway R-I	50	571	8.8	43	567	7.6	0	561	0.0	1	576	0.2	0	580	0.0
	Pleasant Hill R-III	197	2,211	8.9	167	2,130	7.8	13	2,103	0.6	19	2,026	0.9	14	1,972	0.7
	Raymore-Peculiar R-II	2,811	5,638	49.9	2,334	5,368	43.5	40	5,169	0.8	47	4,886	1.0	76	4,627	1.6
	Sherwood Cass R-VIII	70	904	7.7	52	924	5.6	5	913	0.5	14	926	1.5	13	924	1.4
	Strasburg C-3	0	81	0.0	5	94	5.3	0	107	0.0	0	116	0.0	0	117	0.0
Cedar	El Dorado Springs R-II	127	1,253	10.1	733	1,254	58.5	13	1,270	1.0	16	1,305	1.2	8	1,287	0.6
	Stockton R-I	329	1,056	31.2	338	1,080	31.3	5	1,053	0.5	1	1,043	0.1	0	1,064	0.0
Chariton	Brunswick R-II	16	292	5.5	40	260	15.4	7	270	2.6	3	269	1.1	8	278	2.9
	Keytesville R-III	36	185	19.5	51	185	27.6	0	190	1.6	1	177	0.6	0	176	0.0
	Northwestern R-I	28	199	14.1	15	179	8.4	0	177	0.0	0	187	0.0	0	197	0.0
	Salisbury R-IV	58	480	12.1	69	481	14.3	0	544	0.0	0	509	0.0	4	566	0.7
	Billings R-IV	221	473	46.7	171	478	35.8	5	426	1.2	1	430	0.2	2	452	0.4
	Chadwick R-I	33	212	15.6	30	196	15.3	4	209	1.9	0	210	0.0	0	226	0.0
	Clever R-V	201	877	22.9	219	798	27.4	1	737	0.1	2	680	0.3	0	641	0.0
	Nixa R-II	1,458	5,090	28.6	1,330	4,677	28.4	30	4,371	0.7	17	4,184	0.4	37	4,002	0.9
	Ozark R-VI	921	4,903	18.8	520	4,633	11.2	63	4,403	1.4	66	4,135	1.6	49	3,925	1.2
	Sparta R-III	104	776	13.4	271	712	38.1	8	701	1.1	7	717	1.0	15	688	2.2
	Spokane R-VII	387	748	51.7	313	705	44.4	1	704	0.1	4	717	0.6	7	730	1.0

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Incident Rate														
		Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students
Clark	Clark Co. R-I	419	1,014	41.3	409	1,011	40.5	17	1,036	1.6	2	1,064	0.2	15	1,106	1.4
	Luray 33	0	60	0.0	2	39	5.1	0	40	0.0	1	43	2.3	0	45	0.0
	Revere C-3	1	53	1.9	3	42	7.1	0	49	0.0	0	50	0.0	0	51	0.0
	Wyaconda C-1	0	33	0.0	0	37	0.0	0	34	0.0	0	40	0.0	0	45	0.0
Clay	Excelsior Springs 40		3,052	0.0	2,362	3,228	73.2	49	3,284	1.5	72	3,269	2.2	38	3,321	1.1
	Kearney R-I	1,054	3,549	29.7	1,090	3,417	31.9	22	3,374	0.7	15	3,379	0.4	6	3,308	0.2
	Liberty 53	1,352	9,277	14.6	1,720	8,463	20.3	62	7,982	0.8	135	7,640	1.8	57	7,428	0.8
	Missouri City 56	0	35	0.0	0	39	0.0	0	39	0.0	2	50	4.0	0	47	0.0
	North Kansas City 74	5,717	17,715	32.3	6,700	17,369	38.6	271	17,193	1.6	349	17,003	2.1	262	17,030	1.5
	Smithville R-II	257	2,203	11.7	145	2,071	7.0	6	1,955	0.3	11	1,876	0.6	4	1,789	0.2
Clinton	Cameron R-I	320	1,774	18.0	447	1,715	26.1	9	1,683	0.5	17	1,631	1.0	18	1,603	1.1
	Clinton Co. R-III	254	866	29.3	116	868	13.4	6	840	0.7	23	829	2.8	23	838	2.7
	Lathrop R-II	189	872	21.7	140	860	16.3	3	852	0.4	18	890	2.0	16	864	1.9
Cole	Blair Oaks R-II	106	854	12.4	201	741	27.1	4	693	0.7	4	641	0.6	1	616	0.2
	Cole Co. R-I	366	759	48.2	381	738	51.6	9	745	1.2	17	723	2.4	0	715	0.0
	Cole Co. R-V	179	709	25.2	173	747	23.2	7	751	0.9	9	745	1.2	10	783	1.3
	Jefferson City	3,997	8,235	48.5	5,156	8,268	62.4	258	8,210	3.1	161	8,228	2.0	103	8,263	1.2
Cooper	Blackwater R-II		110	0.0	0	120	0.0	0	135	0.0	0	134	0.0	0	137	0.0
	Boonville R-I	241	1,604	15.0	383	1,579	24.3	12	1,507	0.8	11	1,472	0.7	11	1,486	0.7
	Cooper Co. R-IV	42	166	25.3	52	186	28.0	1	200	0.5	1	199	0.5	0	192	0.0
	Otterville R-VI	64	263	24.3	71	279	25.4	0	275	0.0	0	280	0.0	0	260	0.0
	Pilot Grove C-4	7	306	2.3	33	285	11.6	0	292	0.0	0	284	0.0	0	262	0.0
	Prairie Home R-V	17	152	11.2	21	155	13.5	1	156	0.6	2	161	1.2	1	155	0.6
Crawford	Crawford Co. R-I	637	1,099	58.0	1,190	1,029	115.6	35	1,078	3.2	14	1,078	1.3	19	1,083	1.8
	Crawford Co. R-II	1,216	1,442	84.3	969	1,386	69.9	21	1,368	1.5	15	1,401	1.1	27	1,405	1.9
	Steelville R-III	0	986	0.0	751	969	77.5	6	985	0.6	9	953	0.9	8	939	0.9
Dade	Dadeville R-II	12	172	7.0	36	180	20.0	0	195	0.0	4	195	2.1	0	201	0.0
	Everton R-III	9	193	4.7	18	217	8.3	4	200	2.0	0	220	0.0	0	224	0.0
	Greenfield R-IV	0	478	0.0	16	496	3.2	3	487	0.6	2	471	0.4	5	485	1.0
	Lockwood R-I	36	359	10.0	30	368	8.2	0	362	0.0	0	336	0.0	0	334	0.0
Dallas	Dallas Co. R-I	900	1,864	48.3	274	1,918	14.3	45	1,919	2.3	49	2,018	2.4	36	2,074	1.7
Daviess	Gallatin R-V	137	615	22.3	397	609	65.2	1	626	0.2	11	638	1.7	0	610	0.0
	North Daviess R-III	17	93	18.3	56	89	62.9	0	112	0.0	0	114	0.0	0	124	0.0
	Pattonburg R-II	11	173	6.4	20	169	11.8	1	189	0.5	0	204	0.0	0	206	0.0
	Tri-County R-VII	103	218	47.2	17	211	8.1	2	210	1.0	1	195	0.5	0	203	0.0
	Winston R-VI	107	192	55.7	103	186	55.4	3	192	1.6	5	202	2.5	0	196	0.0
Dekalb	Maysville R-I	128	640	20.0	1	672	0.1	4	677	0.6	0	693	0.0	0	700	0.0
	Osborn R-O	11	125	8.8	39	136	28.7	1	144	0.7	2	155	1.3	2	182	1.1
	Stewartville C-2	79	281	28.1	9	274	3.3	0	285	0.0	0	300	0.0	0	294	0.0
	Union Star R-II	46	149	30.9	41	159	25.8	0	141	0.0	0	144	0.0	0	154	0.0
Dent	Dent-Phelps R-III	27	257	10.5	23	259	8.9	0	249	0.0	2	266	0.8	0	295	0.0
	Green Forest R-II	27	179	15.1	93	184	50.5	0	201	0.0	2	198	1.0	0	199	0.0
	North Wood R-IV	56	217	25.8	154	200	77.0	1	215	0.5	1	209	0.5	0	217	0.0
	Oak Hill R-I	57	135	42.2	30	124	24.2	0	132	0.0	0	138	0.0	1	155	0.6
	Salem R-80	1,195	1,501	79.6	840	1,574	53.4	6	1,513	0.4	5	1,501	0.3	10	1,508	0.7
Douglas	Ava R-I	1,199	1,497	80.1	865	1,486	58.2	2	1,517	0.1	2	1,509	0.1	4	1,569	0.3
	Plainview R-VIII	0	89	0.0	0	91	0.0	0	95	0.0	0	83	0.0	0	88	0.0
	Skyline R-II	88	103	85.4	60	103	58.3	0	97	0.0	1	101	1.0	0	102	0.0

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students
Dunklin	Campbell R-II	251	667	37.6	198	672	29.5	18	629	2.9	13	648	2.0	17	648	2.6
	Clarkton C-4	255	381	66.9	5	372	1.3	19	364	5.2	9	382	2.4	1	385	0.3
	Holcomb R-III	75	635	11.8	38	612	6.2	1	562	0.2	1	550	0.2	0	532	0.0
	Kennett 39	1,752	2,064	84.9	2,579	2,023	127.5	83	2,060	4.0	104	2,114	4.9	70	2,094	3.3
Franklin	Malden R-I	1,214	1,134	107.1	1,234	1,076	114.7	29	1,062	2.7	37	1,066	3.5	20	1,103	1.8
	Senath-Hornersville C-8	438	824	53.2	152	859	17.7	9	801	1.1	6	779	0.8	5	781	0.6
	Southland C-9	76	365	20.8	237	362	65.5	1	358	0.3	9	365	2.5	0	388	0.0
	Franklin Co. R-II	1	164	0.6	0	160	0.0	0	171	0.0	0	176	0.0	1	171	0.6
	Lonedell R-XIV	257	399	64.4	261	408	64.0	12	424	2.8	2	437	0.5	1	455	0.2
	Meramec Valley R-III	3,387	3,664	92.4	3,635	3,613	100.6	50	3,622	1.4	69	3,697	1.9	58	3,743	1.5
	New Haven	70	453	15.5	88	465	18.9	3	444	0.7	2	461	0.4	2	480	0.4
	Spring Bluff R-XV	14	249	5.6	20	246	8.1	0	261	0.0	0	244	0.0	0	242	0.0
	St. Clair R-XIII	1,456	2,426	60.0	210	2,423	8.7	62	2,375	2.6	77	2,356	3.3	79	2,363	3.3
	Strain-Japan R-XVI	23	80	28.8	30	78	38.5	0	80	0.0	0	97	0.0	0	87	0.0
	Sullivan	1,102	2,229	49.4	964	2,136	45.1	35	2,094	1.7	15	2,036	0.7	31	2,057	1.5
	Union R-XI	1,109	2,913	38.1	874	2,887	30.3	85	2,870	3.0	71	2,938	2.4	70	3,012	2.3
	Washington	1,655	4,334	38.2	1,546	3,992	38.7	53	3,982	1.3	15	3,910	0.4	12	3,870	0.3
Gasconade	Gasconade Co. R-I	229	1,108	20.7	286	1,108	25.8	29	1,120	2.6	10	1,139	0.9	7	1,142	0.6
	Gasconade Co. R-II	752	1,982	37.9	821	2,002	41.0	36	1,978	1.8	22	1,976	1.1	17	1,958	0.9
Gentry	Albany R-III	89	465	19.1	79	489	16.2	2	493	0.4	2	496	0.4	4	528	0.8
	King City R-I	27	369	7.3	36	338	10.7	0	351	0.0	0	375	0.0	0	372	0.0
	Stanberry R-II	16	362	4.4	20	345	5.8	0	338	0.0	0	347	0.0	0	358	0.0
Greene	Ash Grove R-IV	200	908	22.0	182	885	20.6	1	869	0.1	5	858	0.6	2	883	0.2
	Fair Grove R-X	93	1,175	7.9	196	1,139	17.2	4	1,069	0.4	4	1,061	0.4	10	1,012	1.0
	Logan-Rogersville R-VIII	543	2,057	26.4	511	1,984	25.8	22	1,922	1.1	10	1,892	0.5	15	1,883	0.8
	Republic R-III	483	3,812	12.7	324	3,466	9.3	34	3,370	1.0	44	3,269	1.3	29	3,151	0.9
	Springfield R-XII	15,017	24,696	60.8	16,203	24,258	66.8	1,058	24,119	4.4	665	24,285	2.7	449	24,356	1.8
	Strafford R-VI	271	1,198	22.6	313	1,098	28.5	12	1,126	1.1	12	1,114	1.1	4	1,060	0.4
	Walnut Grove R-V	128	282	45.4	1	282	0.4	1	300	0.3	1	312	0.3	2	314	0.6
Grundy	Willard R-II	853	3,853	22.1	928	3,696	25.1	36	3,508	1.0	182	3,441	5.3	63	3,313	1.9
	Grundy Co. R-V	124	178	69.7	172	176	97.7	2	202	1.0	6	210	2.9	2	205	1.0
	Laredo R-VII	2	44	4.5	0	36	0.0	0	42	0.0	0	44	0.0	1	47	2.1
	Pleasant View R-VI	0	124	0.0	0	72	0.0	0	81	0.0	1	80	1.3	0	83	0.0
	Spickard R-II	11	59	18.6	9	54	16.7	1	51	2.0	1	57	1.8	1	58	1.7
Harrison	Trenton R-IX	807	1,182	68.3	569	1,191	47.8	19	1,207	1.6	19	1,178	1.6	27	1,223	2.2
	Cainsville R-I	0	114	0.0	1	96	1.0	0	106	0.0	0	104	0.0	0	111	0.0
	Gilman City R-IV	105	154	68.2	197	136	144.9	4	125	3.2	0	125	0.0	0	129	0.0
	North Harrison R-III	50	226	22.1	35	219	16.0	1	218	0.5	3	244	1.2	0	235	0.0
	Ridgeway R-V	29	108	26.9	17	101	16.8	0	103	0.0	1	99	1.0	0	109	0.0
Henry	South Harrison Co. R-II	234	870	26.9	248	820	30.2	3	823	0.4	1	821	0.1	2	823	0.2
	Calhoun R-VIII	138	194	71.1	66	207	31.9	12	198	6.1	0	210	0.0	3	233	1.3
	Clinton	1,434	1,888	76.0	1,658	1,796	92.3	58	1,857	3.1	90	1,919	4.7	58	1,952	3.0
	Davis R-XII	7	29	24.1	4	38	10.5	0	39	0.0	0	46	0.0	0	43	0.0
	Henry Co. R-I	0	698	0.0	107	685	15.6	5	673	0.7	9	704	1.3	3	723	0.4
	Leesville R-IX	5	86	5.8	3	77	3.9	0	83	0.0	0	97	0.0	3	95	3.2
	Montrose R-XIV	0	106	0.0	19	124	15.3	0	130	0.0	0	130	0.0	0	122	0.0
Hickory	Shawnee R-III	21	63	33.3	10	61	16.4	0	58	0.0	0	56	0.0	0	54	0.0
	Hermitage R-IV	64	363	17.6	162	346	46.8	1	321	0.3	2	317	0.6	3	288	1.0
	Hickory Co. R-I	200	807	24.8	200	849	23.6	5	811	0.6	0	813	0.0	2	812	0.2
	Weaubleau R-III	13	425	3.1	5	437	1.1	8	457	1.8	8	458	1.7	7	455	1.5
	Wheatland R-II	162	310	52.3	134	297	45.1	3	318	0.9	5	311	1.6	4	319	1.3

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students
Holt	Craig R-III	8	108	7.4	9	120	7.5	0	127	0.0	0	127	0.0	0	148	0.0
	Mound City R-II	8	292	2.7	28	254	11.0	0	286	0.0	0	286	0.0	0	281	0.0
	South Holt Co. R-I	44	299	14.7	42	317	13.2	2	332	0.6	3	357	0.8	2	383	0.5
Howard	Fayette R-III	298	672	44.3	353	653	54.1	17	674	2.5	12	711	1.7	6	723	0.8
	Howard Co. R-II	34	270	12.6	52	261	19.9	0	266	0.0	0	277	0.0	0	309	0.0
	New Franklin R-I	87	441	19.7	189	460	41.1	1	441	0.2	0	447	0.0	0	438	0.0
Howell	Fairview R-XI	86	557	15.4	96	567	16.9	4	564	0.7	4	561	0.7	0	545	0.0
	Glenwood R-VIII	0	265	0.0	0	265	0.0	0	253	0.0	0	268	0.0	0	258	0.0
	Howell Valley R-I	3	222	1.4	30	243	12.3	0	225	0.0	0	239	0.0	0	238	0.0
	Junction Hill C-12	18	219	8.2	15	234	6.4	1	224	0.4	4	249	1.6	2	274	0.7
	Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III	25	1,379	1.8	620	1,330	46.6	23	1,351	1.7	31	1,353	2.3	16	1,300	1.2
	Richards R-V	23	385	6.0	13	400	3.3	0	390	0.0	2	394	0.5	0	389	0.0
	West Plains R-VII	242	2,561	9.4	1,551	2,491	62.3	37	2,529	1.5	27	2,504	1.1	18	2,508	0.7
	Willow Springs R-IV	335	1,333	25.1	865	1,279	67.6	7	1,262	0.6	11	1,245	0.9	9	1,274	0.7
Iron	Arcadia Valley R-II	299	1,161	25.8	182	1,163	15.6	17	1,163	1.5	9	1,134	0.8	7	1,106	0.6
	Bellevue R-III	20	122	16.4	59	129	45.7	0	134	0.0	3	129	2.3	4	136	2.9
	Iron Co. C-4	87	470	18.5	69	491	14.1	8	487	1.6	14	521	2.7	16	519	3.1
	South Iron Co. R-I	186	418	44.5	106	431	24.6	0	426	0.0	3	453	0.7	3	436	0.7
Jackson	Blue Springs R-IV	3,603	13,696	26.3	3,606	13,339	27.0	136	13,237	1.0	131	12,923	1.0	116	12,862	0.9
	Center 58	2,139	2,475	86.4	2,232	2,424	92.1	95	2,372	4.0	126	2,497	5.0	127	2,562	5.0
	Fort Osage R-I	1,332	4,923	27.1	1,399	4,877	28.7	53	4,852	1.1	54	4,859	1.1	37	4,875	0.8
	Grain Valley R-V	657	2,819	23.3	509	2,554	19.9	27	2,344	1.2	35	2,164	1.6	47	2,030	2.3
	Grandview C-4	3,352	4,070	82.4	2,928	4,120	71.1	92	4,184	2.2	156	4,229	3.7	173	4,225	4.1
	Hickman Mills C-1	3,423	6,949	49.3	7,764	6,920	112.2	7,046	7,094	99.3	7,323	7,250	101.0	573	7,478	7.7
	Independence 30	4,782	11,268	42.4	4,208	10,935	38.5	336	10,920	3.1	345	11,059	3.1	304	11,201	2.7
	Kansas City 33	24,073	26,943	89.3	21,052	25,766	81.7	0	27,190	0.0	2,888	26,966	10.7	1,835	26,948	6.8
	Kansas City Charter Schools	2,505	6,111	41.0	198	6,428	3.1	0	5,493	0.0	428	6,692	6.4	0	6,696	0.0
	Lee's Summit R-VII	3,462	16,965	20.4	3,554	16,458	21.6	142	15,934	0.9	129	15,496	0.8	115	14,861	0.8
	Lone Jack C-6	57	591	9.6	78	535	14.6	1	502	0.2	1	498	0.2	4	479	0.8
	Oak Grove R-VI	173	2,106	8.2	177	2,040	8.7	16	2,060	0.8	12	1,974	0.6	9	1,960	0.5
	Raytown C-2	6,409	8,915	71.9	6,282	8,765	71.7	702	8,664	8.1	618	8,570	7.2	465	8,548	5.4
Jasper	Avilla R-XIII	5	164	3.0	2	142	1.4	2	149	1.3	0	151	0.0	1	159	0.6
	Carl Junction R-I	1,450	3,154	46.0	1,614	2,944	54.8	35	2,871	1.2	19	2,794	0.7	19	2,708	0.7
	Carthage R-IX	1,875	4,007	46.8	1,123	3,898	28.8	25	3,710	0.7	56	3,619	1.5	40	3,602	1.1
	Jasper Co. R-V	0	510	0.0	108	499	21.6	5	534	0.9	3	521	0.6	1	498	0.2
	Joplin R-VIII	4,614	7,585	60.8	4,037	7,301	55.3	244	7,245	3.4	159	7,234	2.2	98	7,166	1.4
	Sarcoxie R-II	156	826	18.9	88	820	10.7	1	816	0.1	3	794	0.4	2	750	0.3
	Webb City R-VII	558	3,885	14.4	456	3,782	12.1	46	3,800	1.2	31	3,715	0.8	48	3,667	1.3
Jefferson	Crystal City 47	140	716	19.6	674	673	100.1	18	645	2.8	3	639	0.5	6	686	0.9
	DeSoto 73	3,200	2,860	111.9	3,146	2,869	109.7	71	2,788	2.5	47	2,773	1.7	47	2,829	1.7
	Dunklin R-V	712	1,343	53.0	648	1,350	48.0	24	1,329	1.8	38	1,397	2.7	14	1,471	1.0
	Festus R-VI	1,359	3,117	43.6	1,461	3,041	48.0	51	2,912	1.8	31	2,770	1.1	39	2,672	1.5
	Fox C-6	5,684	11,619	48.9	4,599	11,434	40.2	204	11,239	1.8	241	11,307	2.1	215	11,185	1.9
	Grandview R-II	257	830	31.0	432	817	52.9	3	861	0.3	10	904	1.1	10	929	1.1
	Hillsboro R-III	861	3,691	23.3	713	3,717	19.2	71	3,632	2.0	74	3,604	2.1	64	3,592	1.8
	Jefferson Co. R-VII	77	750	10.3	19	667	2.8	1	656	0.2	0	676	0.0	1	702	0.1
	Northwest R-I	2,060	7,045	29.2	2,249	7,079	31.8	236	7,169	3.3	414	7,385	5.6	426	7,509	5.7
	Sunrise R-IX	378	351	107.7	256	324	79.0	4	349	1.1	1	332	0.3	4	343	1.2
	Windsor C-1	2,038	2,992	68.1	1,695	3,023	56.1	42	2,975	1.4	21	2,965	0.7	33	2,922	1.1

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students
Johnson	Chilhowee R-IV	65	157	41.4	65	140	46.4	2	137	1.5	2	141	1.4	1	145	0.7
	Holden R-III	800	1,527	52.4	293	1,443	20.3	17	1,446	1.2	20	1,372	1.5	7	1,388	0.5
	Johnson Co. R-VII	209	645	32.4	377	665	56.7	4	679	0.6	11	652	1.7	5	618	0.8
	Kingsville R-I	77	268	28.7	77	269	28.6	0	287	0.0	1	293	0.3	0	295	0.0
	Knob Noster R-VIII	241	1,591	15.1	224	1,595	14.0	4	1,665	0.2	2	1,710	0.1	2	1,819	0.1
	Leeton R-X	314	377	83.3	184	350	52.6	1	343	0.3	9	351	2.6	9	364	2.5
	Warrensburg R-VI	624	3,264	19.1	773	3,213	24.1	37	3,145	1.2	38	3,122	1.2	36	3,167	1.1
Knox	Knox Co. R-I	39	566	6.9	37	591	6.3	4	582	0.7	2	601	0.3	5	595	0.8
Laclede	Gasconade C-4	8	106	7.5	6	105	5.7	2	120	1.7	4	106	3.8	2	103	1.9
	Laclede Co. C-5	73	493	14.8	116	531	21.8	14	502	2.8	2	513	0.4	5	502	1.0
	Laclede Co. R-I	624	864	72.2	850	849	100.1	6	805	0.7	3	820	0.4	1	861	0.1
	Lebanon R-III	0	4,719	0.0	2,247	4,463	50.3	171	4,408	3.9	142	4,306	3.3	60	4,244	1.4
Lafayette	Concordia R-II	138	534	25.8	0	478	0.0	0	494	0.0	0	477	0.0	0	491	0.0
	Lafayette Co. C-1	135	1,050	12.9	177	1,050	16.9	4	1,037	0.4	3	1,062	0.3	0	1,060	0.0
	Lexington R-V	285	1,031	27.6	465	1,009	46.1	9	1,021	0.9	15	1,042	1.4	6	1,066	0.6
	Odessa R-VII	916	2,199	41.7	870	2,256	38.6	87	2,252	3.9	83	2,322	3.6	91	2,306	3.9
	Santa Fe R-X	80	447	17.9	151	428	35.3	2	422	0.5	3	409	0.7	2	402	0.5
	Wellington-Napoleon R-IX	21	463	4.5	22	463	4.8	3	437	0.7	8	442	1.8	1	458	0.2
Lawrence	Aurora R-VIII	1,591	2,067	77.0	1,956	2,100	93.1	40	2,115	1.9	30	2,127	1.4	18	2,113	0.9
	Marionville R-IX	798	774	103.1	808	762	106.0	17	753	2.3	6	752	0.8	12	735	1.6
	Miller R-II	53	557	9.5	213	593	35.9	4	587	0.7	0	609	0.0	0	655	0.0
	Mt. Vernon R-V	232	1,594	14.6	326	1,563	20.9	7	1,555	0.5	3	1,469	0.2	4	1,404	0.3
	Pierce City R-VI	42	782	5.4	46	766	6.0	0	727	0.0	1	716	0.1	6	764	0.8
	Verona R-VII	122	401	30.4	35	351	10.0	6	404	1.5	11	408	2.7	3	378	0.8
Lewis	Canton R-V	0	547	0.0	273	578	47.2	2	584	0.3	0	587	0.0	2	605	0.3
	Lewis Co. C-1	468	1,022	45.8	482	998	48.3	14	1,031	1.4	113	984	11.5	37	1,012	3.7
Lincoln	Elsberry R-II	620	862	71.9	608	865	70.3	18	870	2.1	23	857	2.7	23	862	2.7
	Silex R-I	10	376	2.7	72	360	20.0	0	342	0.0	2	347	0.6	5	368	1.4
	Troy R-III	2,015	5,771	34.9	1,406	5,543	25.4	45	5,309	0.8	46	5,105	0.9	33	4,914	0.7
	Winfield R-IV	1,779	1,622	109.7	0	1,613	0.0	6	1,587	0.4	31	1,603	1.9	95	1,616	5.9
Linn	Brookfield R-III	259	1,143	22.7	294	1,099	26.8	0	1,116	0.0	1	1,155	0.1	5	1,172	0.4
	Bucklin R-II	29	167	17.4	1	192	0.5	0	186	0.0	0	204	0.0	0	177	0.0
	Linn Co. R-I	39	307	12.7	82	283	29.0	0	274	0.0	0	271	0.0	1	283	0.4
	Marceline R-V	294	694	42.4	354	690	51.3	1	711	0.1	2	693	0.3	0	728	0.0
	Meadville R-IV	0	247	0.0	0	244	0.0	0	250	0.0	0	254	0.0	0	261	0.0
Livingston	Chillicothe R-II	503	1,919	26.2	580	1,874	30.9	20	1,928	1.0	31	1,920	1.6	9	2,013	0.4
	Livingston Co. R-III	1	79	1.3	0	77	0.0	0	71	0.0	0	77	0.0	0	65	0.0
	Southwest Livingston Co. R-I	97	210	46.2	119	223	53.4	1	233	0.4	2	228	0.9	0	222	0.0
Macon	Atlanta C-3	75	223	33.6	38	219	17.4	0	217	0.0	3	221	1.4	0	217	0.0
	Bevier C-4	0	243	0.0	45	277	16.2	0	263	0.0	0	272	0.0	0	270	0.0
	Callao C-8	2	48	4.2	0	45	0.0	0	50	0.0	0	52	0.0	0	51	0.0
	La Plata R-II	57	347	16.4	107	361	29.6	1	378	0.3	0	407	0.0	0	409	0.0
	Macon Co. R-I	431	1,311	32.9	326	1,283	25.4	12	1,303	0.9	10	1,286	0.8	3	1,314	0.2
	Macon Co. R-IV	1	149	0.7	2	144	1.4	0	167	0.0	1	173	0.6	0	180	0.0
Madison	Fredericktown R-I	212	1,922	11.0	179	1,859	9.6	0	1,859	0.0	0	1,925	0.0	0	1,869	0.0
	Marquand-Zion R-VI	12	195	6.2	8	207	3.9	1	214	0.5	4	197	2.0	1	193	0.5
Maries	Maries Co. R-I	107	577	18.5	85	575	14.8	0	563	0.0	2	582	0.3	6	597	1.0
	Maries Co. R-II	6	806	0.7	6	816	0.7	7	789	0.9	8	828	1.0	2	823	0.2
Marion	Hannibal 60	753	3,789	19.9	1,046	3,666	28.5	26	3,632	0.7	79	3,630	2.2	22	3,645	0.6
	Marion Co. R-II	11	241	4.6	18	226	8.0	0	234	0.0	0	245	0.0	0	264	0.0
	Palmyra R-I	177	1,153	15.4	157	1,108	14.2	18	1,141	1.6	12	1,129	1.1	9	1,146	0.8

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Incident Rate														
		Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students
McDonald	McDonald Co. R-I	421	3,728	11.3	593	3,743	15.8	41	3,640	1.1	37	3,554	1.0	44	3,471	1.3
Mercer	North Mercer Co. R-III	7	196	3.6	42	188	22.3	0	185	0.0	0	193	0.0	0	207	0.0
	Princeton R-V	23	418	5.5	0	404	0.0	0	385	0.0	0	391	0.0	1	400	0.3
Miller	Eldon R-I	1,376	1,995	69.0	1,472	1,973	74.6	47	2,016	2.3	17	1,996	0.9	41	2,016	2.0
	Iberia R-V	7	786	0.9	16	752	2.1	10	752	1.3	3	743	0.4	8	753	1.1
	Miller Co. R-III	30	281	10.7	57	290	19.7	1	284	0.4	1	289	0.3	3	294	1.0
Mississippi	School Of The Osage R-II	309	1,865	16.6	297	1,783	16.7	16	1,700	0.9	21	1,675	1.3	13	1,617	0.8
	St. Elizabeth R-IV	9	244	3.7	14	245	5.7	0	248	0.0	0	268	0.0	0	254	0.0
	Charleston R-I	458	1,133	40.4	459	1,162	39.5	2	1,197	0.2	6	1,238	0.5	3	1,294	0.2
Moniteau	East Prairie R-II	183	1,171	15.6	432	1,063	40.6	20	1,051	1.9	13	1,056	1.2	20	1,053	1.9
	Clarksburg C-2	0	111	0.0	3	106	2.8	0	123	0.0	0	121	0.0	0	124	0.0
	High Point R-III	0	80	0.0	1	86	1.2	0	82	0.0	0	89	0.0	0	87	0.0
Monroe	Moniteau Co. C-1	40	228	17.5	8	222	3.6	0	208	0.0	1	207	0.5	1	201	0.5
	Moniteau Co. R-I	675	1,329	50.8	797	1,330	59.9	20	1,326	1.5	16	1,327	1.2	7	1,325	0.5
	Moniteau Co. R-V	1	55	1.8	2	52	3.8	0	59	0.0	0	65	0.0	2	66	3.0
Montgomery	Moniteau Co. R-VI	112	600	18.7	87	622	14.0	7	615	1.1	0	589	0.0	1	585	0.2
	Holliday C-2	28	56	50.0	13	62	21.0	0	64	0.0	3	66	4.5	0	65	0.0
	Madison C-3	54	303	17.8	31	278	11.2	1	296	0.3	4	285	1.4	13	284	4.6
Morgan	Middle Grove C-1	1	40	2.5	0	40	0.0	0	44	0.0	0	32	0.0	0	36	0.0
	Monroe City R-I	501	756	66.3	507	743	68.2	6	789	0.8	6	761	0.8	0	776	0.0
	Paris R-II	6	533	1.1	0	497	0.0	1	520	0.2	1	564	0.2	1	563	0.2
New Madrid	Montgomery Co. R-II	760	1,356	56.0	761	1,338	56.9	40	1,347	3.0	23	1,341	1.7	11	1,330	0.8
	Wellsville Middletown R-I	77	505	15.2	47	468	10.0	11	463	2.4	5	471	1.1	1	480	0.2
New Madrid	Morgan Co. R-I	998	739	135.0	618	765	80.8	10	755	1.3	17	746	2.3	13	706	1.8
	Morgan Co. R-II	1,193	1,495	79.8	1,165	1,501	77.6	18	1,503	1.2	23	1,569	1.5	18	1,611	1.1
Newton	Gideon 37	38	360	10.6	0	340	0.0	1	352	0.3	0	351	0.0	3	376	0.8
	New Madrid Co. R-I	823	1,707	48.2	795	1,719	46.2	29	1,719	1.7	39	1,767	2.2	92	1,846	5.0
	Portageville	317	820	38.7	365	772	47.3	16	801	2.0	31	794	3.9	20	803	2.5
Nodaway	Risco R-II	29	201	14.4	39	190	20.5	1	198	0.5	1	204	0.5	1	220	0.5
	Diamond R-IV	350	968	36.2	575	924	62.2	8	903	0.9	27	848	3.2	31	812	3.8
	East Newton Co. R-VI	252	1,667	15.1	217	1,597	13.6	27	1,579	1.7	19	1,550	1.2	22	1,493	1.5
Oregon	Neosho R-V	2,032	4,480	45.4	1,371	4,349	31.5	48	4,266	1.1	106	4,220	2.5	162	4,212	3.8
	Seneca R-VII	919	1,676	54.8	983	1,612	61.0	11	1,637	0.7	27	1,689	1.6	8	1,683	0.5
	Westview C-6	42	159	26.4	23	164	14.0	0	160	0.0	1	154	0.6	5	154	3.2
Oregon	Jefferson C-123	4	156	2.6	2	150	1.3	0	156	0.0	0	151	0.0	0	157	0.0
	Maryville R-II	192	1,338	14.3	342	1,337	25.6	3	1,299	0.2	3	1,284	0.2	0	1,300	0.0
	Nodaway-Holt R-VII	61	250	24.4	102	264	38.6	0	260	0.0	0	265	0.0	1	275	0.4
Oregon	North Nodaway Co. R-VI	21	265	7.9	14	237	5.9	1	250	0.4	0	256	0.0	0	255	0.0
	Northeast Nodaway Co. R-V	15	223	6.7	23	215	10.7	0	225	0.0	0	231	0.0	1	240	0.4
	South Nodaway Co. R-IV	14	203	6.9	30	200	15.0	0	197	0.0	0	206	0.0	0	205	0.0
Oregon	West Nodaway Co. R-I	193	316	61.1	43	327	13.1	2	342	0.6	1	329	0.3	4	353	1.1
	Alton R-IV	362	774	46.8	328	763	43.0	8	734	1.1	4	761	0.5	4	744	0.5
	Couch R-I	71	269	26.4	41	297	13.8	2	276	0.7	0	270	0.0	0	257	0.0
Osage	Oregon-Howell R-III	16	300	5.3	3	330	0.9	0	329	0.0	0	329	0.0	4	315	1.3
	Thayer R-II	53	667	7.9	74	656	11.3	5	662	0.8	6	640	0.9	0	636	0.0
	Osage Co. R-I	32	217	14.7	109	214	50.9	3	230	1.3	5	230	2.2	1	239	0.4
Osage	Osage Co. R-II	312	663	47.1	442	688	64.2	6	705	0.9	3	708	0.4	4	694	0.6
	Osage Co. R-III	353	776	45.5	201	770	26.1	0	784	0.0	2	810	0.2	1	830	0.1

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students
Ozark	Bakersfield R-IV	299	401	74.6	154	398	38.7	3	380	0.8	0	372	0.0	0	367	0.0
	Dora R-III	12	310	3.9	1	314	0.3	0	306	0.0	3	312	1.0	1	319	0.3
	Gainesville R-V	180	604	29.8	161	633	25.4	3	655	0.5	2	694	0.3	2	699	0.3
	Lutie R-VI	73	212	34.4	18	192	9.4	0	200	0.0	0	218	0.0	2	222	0.9
	Thornfield R-I	0	74	0.0	0	76	0.0	0	86	0.0	0	87	0.0	0	87	0.0
Pemiscot	Caruthersville 18	0	1,503	0.0	1,543	1,505	102.5	82	1,515	5.4	41	1,562	2.6	23	1,639	1.4
	Cooter R-IV	0	337	0.0	0	331	0.0	0	325	0.0	0	303	0.0	0	277	0.0
	Delta C-7	12	216	5.6	13	246	5.3	3	265	1.1	0	277	0.0	2	293	0.7
	Hayti R-II	705	865	81.5	909	868	104.7	18	882	2.0	12	913	1.3	42	913	4.6
	North Pemiscot Co. R-I	170	344	49.4	183	352	52.0	1	351	0.3	2	415	0.5	2	428	0.5
	Pemiscot Co. R-III	12	142	8.5	18	169	10.7	1	173	0.6	5	173	2.9	0	158	0.0
	South Pemiscot Co. R-V	72	782	9.2	56	769	7.3	2	773	0.3	6	787	0.8	9	814	1.1
Perry	Altenburg 48	0	101	0.0	0	157	0.0	0	158	0.0	0	156	0.0	0	156	0.0
	Perry Co. 32	1,518	2,332	65.1	1,301	2,226	58.4	37	2,195	1.7	55	2,232	2.5	42	2,270	1.9
Pettis	Green Ridge R-VIII	50	436	11.5	57	421	13.5	0	397	0.0	0	384	0.0	0	394	0.0
	La Monte R-IV	115	383	30.0	34	382	8.9	4	362	1.1	0	371	0.0	4	356	1.1
	Pettis Co. R-V	72	414	17.4	97	399	24.3	2	416	0.5	2	414	0.5	4	443	0.9
	Pettis Co. R-XII	37	164	22.6	0	173	0.0	0	177	0.0	0	166	0.0	0	165	0.0
	Sedalia 200	2,452	4,536	54.1	2,364	4,335	54.5	131	4,286	3.1	9	4,234	0.2	47	4,191	1.1
	Smithton R-VI	79	608	13.0	271	592	45.8	3	585	0.5	3	596	0.5	1	605	0.2
Phelps	Newburg R-II	112	483	23.2	177	520	34.0	9	503	1.8	6	499	1.2	7	512	1.4
	Phelps Co. R-III	56	194	28.9	39	191	20.4	1	203	0.5	0	206	0.0	0	190	0.0
	Rolla 31	1,413	4,079	34.6	1,684	4,056	41.5	81	4,069	2.0	53	4,084	1.3	49	4,110	1.2
	St. James R-I	996	1,828	54.5	872	1,818	48.0	29	1,820	1.6	34	1,828	1.9	15	1,826	0.8
Pike	Boncl R-X	0	41	0.0	0	43	0.0	0	36	0.0	0	44	0.0	0	46	0.0
	Bowling Green R-I	454	1,392	32.6	471	1,447	32.6	16	1,466	1.1	23	1,498	1.5	19	1,491	1.3
	Louisiana R-II	233	773	30.1	171	792	21.6	19	807	2.4	21	798	2.6	32	804	4.0
	Pike Co. R-III	0	603	0.0	12	560	2.1	1	575	0.2	7	562	1.2	2	561	0.4
Platte	North Platte Co. R-I	7	708	1.0	36	715	5.0	0	705	0.0	0	703	0.0	1	728	0.1
	Park Hill	3,448	10,021	34.4	3,342	9,648	34.6	305	9,498	3.2	99	9,460	1.0	116	9,343	1.2
	Platte Co. R-III	1,045	2,863	36.5	1,390	2,721	51.1	31	2,541	1.2	19	2,406	0.8	6	2,280	0.3
	West Platte Co. R-II	79	655	12.1	109	644	16.9	5	656	0.8	7	690	1.0	7	686	1.0
Polk	Bolivar R-I	828	2,581	32.1	942	2,451	38.4	27	2,375	1.1	31	2,375	1.3	32	2,350	1.4
	Fair Play R-II	131	377	34.7	110	364	30.2	2	381	0.5	5	372	1.3	4	376	1.1
	Halfway R-III	172	305	56.4	188	295	63.7	58	280	20.7	42	284	14.8	64	280	22.9
	Humansville R-IV	131	406	32.3	181	400	45.3	12	431	2.8	4	414	1.0	1	419	0.2
	Marion C. Early R-V	245	807	30.4	80	736	10.9	10	686	1.5	12	667	1.8	9	681	1.3
	Pleasant Hope R-VI	187	951	19.7	231	914	25.3	13	939	1.4	15	945	1.6	22	981	2.2
Pulaski	Crocker R-II	218	577	37.8	229	536	42.7	3	523	0.6	1	529	0.2	0	527	0.0
	Dixon R-I	513	1,136	45.2	828	1,066	77.7	3	1,065	0.3	12	1,096	1.1	5	1,086	0.5
	Laquey R-V	51	779	6.5	20	725	2.8	25	722	3.5	30	678	4.4	15	630	2.4
	Richland R-IV	114	657	17.4	190	634	30.0	25	655	3.8	6	659	0.9	13	664	2.0
	Swedeborg R-III	0	47	0.0	0	45	0.0	0	56	0.0	0	59	0.0	0	53	0.0
	Waynesville R-VI	1,144	5,367	21.3	957	5,237	18.3	83	5,157	1.6	67	5,169	1.3	92	5,147	1.8
Putnam	Putnam Co. R-I	153	797	19.2	123	775	15.9	7	783	0.9	8	801	1.0	2	795	0.3
Ralls	Ralls Co. R-II	138	818	16.9	165	860	19.2	7	814	0.9	4	863	0.5	2	896	0.2
Randolph	Higbee R-VIII	102	241	42.3	100	245	40.8	7	240	2.9	0	209	0.0	3	220	1.4
	Moberly	1,448	2,439	59.4	1,439	2,309	62.3	22	2,250	1.0	32	2,247	1.4	31	2,199	1.4
	Northeast Randolph Co. R-IV	118	465	25.4	126	422	29.9	0	414	0.0	1	434	0.2	1	415	0.2
	Renick R-V	1	173	0.6	1	158	0.6	0	161	0.0	0	148	0.0	2	136	1.5
	Westran R-I	359	676	53.1	141	662	21.3	1	690	0.1	8	721	1.1	1	709	0.1

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Incident Rate Per 100 Students
Ray	Hardin-Central C-2	36	221	16.3	30	220	13.6	0	211	0.0	0	214	0.0	0	222	0.0
	Lawson R-XIV	435	1,347	32.3	650	1,351	48.1	6	1,315	0.5	21	1,344	1.6	7	1,316	0.5
	Orrick R-XI	56	440	12.7	71	444	16.0	0	450	0.0	3	462	0.6	5	456	1.1
	Richmond R-XVI	362	1,699	21.3	257	1,740	14.8	27	1,726	1.6	12	1,734	0.7	37	1,772	2.1
	Stet R-XV	0	115	0.0	0	104	0.0	0	103	0.0	0	98	0.0	0	92	0.0
Reynolds	Bunker R-III	38	242	15.7	0	267	0.0	2	269	0.7	1	269	0.4	0	278	0.0
	Centerville R-I	0	62	0.0	2	66	3.0	0	62	0.0	0	73	0.0	0	74	0.0
	Lesterville R-IV	181	259	69.9	37	257	14.4	3	265	1.1	0	259	0.0	1	264	0.4
	Southern Reynolds Co. R-II	127	604	21.0	128	568	22.5	16	552	2.9	7	547	1.3	2	544	0.4
Ripley	Doniphan R-I	345	1,673	20.6	272	1,673	16.3	44	1,710	2.6	30	1,646	1.8	36	1,619	2.2
	Naylor R-II	61	390	15.6	39	405	9.6	6	404	1.5	0	397	0.0	7	383	1.8
	Ripley Co. R-III	1	129	0.8	1	126	0.8	0	107	0.0	3	104	2.9	5	108	4.6
	Ripley Co. R-IV	8	161	5.0	16	139	11.5	9	137	6.6	4	151	2.6	0	157	0.0
Saline	Gilliam C-4	7	47	14.9	2	47	4.3	0	47	0.0	0	48	0.0	0	43	0.0
	Hardeman R-X	24	53	45.3	12	53	22.6	0	55	0.0	0	58	0.0	0	63	0.0
	Malta Bend R-V	73	137	53.3	4	132	3.0	1	122	0.8	0	117	0.0	0	132	0.0
	Marshall	1,344	2,475	54.3	1,677	2,481	67.6	78	2,456	3.2	60	2,431	2.5	50	2,385	2.1
	Miami R-I	11	62	17.7	1	77	1.3	0	87	0.0	0	91	0.0	0	86	0.0
	Orearville R-IV	1	38	2.6	3	53	5.7	0	54	0.0	0	56	0.0	0	59	0.0
	Slater	162	398	40.7	209	373	56.0	1	406	0.2	8	413	1.9	10	433	2.3
	Sweet Springs R-VII	129	471	27.4	123	438	28.1	0	432	0.0	2	411	0.5	2	430	0.5
Schuyler	Schuyler Co. R-I	269	728	37.0	0	745	0.0	3	731	0.4	1	723	0.1	2	744	0.3
Scotland	Gorin R-III	0	27	0.0	0	37	0.0	0	41	0.0	0	44	0.0	0	52	0.0
	Scotland Co. R-I	41	642	6.4	0	642	0.0	0	654	0.0	5	646	0.8	5	640	0.8
Scott	Chaffee R-II	132	581	22.7	68	577	11.8	16	563	2.8	8	562	1.4	8	591	1.4
	Kelso C-7	0	116	0.0	10	114	8.8	0	121	0.0	2	111	1.8	0	134	0.0
	Oran R-III	35	351	10.0	56	359	15.6	0	371	0.0	0	363	0.0	0	367	0.0
	Scott City R-I	472	1,006	46.9	493	1,007	49.0	30	1,008	3.0	15	1,021	1.5	7	1,025	0.7
	Scott Co. Central	115	361	31.9	184	347	53.0	0	379	0.0	2	391	0.5	0	418	0.0
	Scott Co. R-IV	438	1,001	43.8	150	1,024	14.6	20	1,028	1.9	18	1,041	1.7	4	1,017	0.4
	Sikeston R-6	2,920	3,785	77.1	2,289	3,710	61.7	77	3,792	2.0	129	3,839	3.4	262	3,776	6.9
Shannon	Eminence R-I	74	279	26.5	37	260	14.2	1	274	0.4	1	289	0.3	2	295	0.7
	Winona R-III	0	545	0.0	0	549	0.0	0	565	0.0	0	567	0.0	0	586	0.0
Shelby	North Shelby	28	344	8.1	24	366	6.6	0	372	0.0	0	364	0.0	0	364	0.0
	Shelby Co. R-IV	47	804	5.8	21	769	2.7	2	766	0.3	6	789	0.8	5	776	0.6
St. Charles	Francis Howell R-III	4,633	22,363	20.7	4,921	18,203	27.0	315	18,336	1.7	244	18,360	1.3	290	18,484	1.6
	Ft. Zumwalt R-II	4,496	18,776	23.9	1,727	18,703	9.2	403	18,496	2.2	447	18,156	2.5	416	17,679	2.4
	Orchard Farm R-V	649	1,284	50.5	621	1,294	48.0	64	1,227	5.2	63	1,247	5.1	31	1,287	2.4
	St. Charles R-VI	2,051	5,580	36.8	581	5,733	10.1	134	5,881	2.3	126	5,876	2.1	160	5,879	2.7
	Wentzville R-IV	4,765	10,508	45.3	4,339	9,625	45.1	170	8,720	1.9	187	7,788	2.4	191	6,999	2.7
St. Clair	Appleton City R-II	133	393	33.8	48	387	12.4	2	399	0.5	3	434	0.7	5	419	1.2
	Lakeland R-III	181	497	36.4	244	479	50.9	2	468	0.4	4	478	0.8	11	500	2.2
	Osceola	153	575	26.6	189	552	34.2	10	547	1.8	3	550	0.5	0	496	0.0
	Roscoe C-1	0	55	0.0	0	53	0.0	0	50	0.0	0	63	0.0	0	74	0.0
St. Francois	Bismarck R-V	626	633	98.9	836	644	129.8	44	594	7.4	19	601	3.2	15	616	2.4
	Central R-III	698	1,915	36.4	463	1,818	25.5	21	1,899	1.1	84	1,873	4.5	23	1,792	1.3
	Farmington R-VII	2,209	3,771	58.6	1,902	3,691	51.5	40	3,612	1.1	65	3,629	1.8	89	3,646	2.4
	North St. Francois Co. R-I	1,706	3,236	52.7	2,050	3,108	66.0	44	3,070	1.4	37	3,167	1.2	58	3,134	1.9
	West St. Francois Co. R-IV	525	1,034	50.8	252	1,038	24.3	13	991	1.3	10	1,012	1.0	14	976	1.4
St. Genevieve	St. Genevieve Co. R-II	1,655	2,021	81.9	1,233	2,029	60.8	39	2,083	1.9	43	2,128	2.0	54	2,162	2.5

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Incident Rate														
		Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students
St. Louis City	Missouri School For The Blind	0	71	0.0	0	83	0.0	0	93	0.0	0	100	0.0	0	*	NA
	St. Louis City	14,578	32,872	44.3	25,528	35,042	72.8	2,306	35,692	6.5	517	38,061	1.4	487	39,607	1.2
	St. Louis City Charter Schools	0	5,405	0.0	0	4,514	0.0	0	4,354	0.0	0	3,635	0.0	0	3,046	0.0
St. Louis Co.	Affton 101	2,305	2,500	92.2	1,632	2,507	65.1	56	2,481	2.3	51	2,526	2.0	61	2,571	2.4
	Bayless	162	1,617	10.0	235	1,574	14.9	66	1,596	4.1	26	1,550	1.7	21	1,487	1.4
	Brentwood	77	787	9.8	93	816	11.4	10	812	1.2	5	856	0.6	1	868	0.1
	Clayton	265	2,666	9.9	287	2,460	11.7	14	2,558	0.5	3	2,547	0.1	3	2,478	0.1
	Ferguson-Florissant R-II	14,866	12,848	115.7	13,182	12,319	107.0	812	12,220	6.6	324	12,081	2.7	220	11,949	1.8
	Hancock Place	1,079	1,867	57.8	886	1,779	49.8	19	1,878	1.0	53	1,816	2.9	46	1,802	2.6
	Hazelwood	3,778	19,269	19.6	3,787	19,556	19.4	1,358	19,315	7.0	1,239	19,311	6.4	972	19,266	5.0
	Jennings	2,777	3,352	82.8	2,456	3,264	75.2	127	3,227	3.9	82	3,246	2.5	99	3,131	3.2
	Kirkwood R-VII	2,120	5,266	40.3	1,611	4,995	32.3	126	5,027	2.5	132	5,109	2.6	137	5,101	2.7
	Ladue	147	3,522	4.2	481	3,357	14.3	46	3,293	1.4	26	3,204	0.8	70	3,272	2.1
	Lindbergh R-VIII	1,328	5,597	23.7	1,345	5,501	24.5	120	5,488	2.2	105	5,437	1.9	112	5,289	2.1
	Maplewood-Richmond Heights	0	1,024	0.0	310	971	31.9	67	1,001	6.7	52	1,013	5.1	34	1,062	3.2
	Mehlville R-IX	3,586	11,089	32.3	3,694	11,308	32.7	316	11,649	2.7	417	11,727	3.6	163	11,799	1.4
	Normandy	0	5,417	0.0	5,396	5,526	97.6	432	5,600	7.7	373	5,591	6.7	316	5,860	5.4
	Parkway C-2	3,205	18,432	17.4	3,780	18,787	20.1	574	18,994	3.0	499	19,578	2.5	543	19,928	2.7
	Pattonville R-III	2,093	5,753	36.4	2,924	5,776	50.6	273	5,690	4.8	280	5,946	4.7	255	6,066	4.2
	Ritenour	986	6,247	15.8	0	6,154	0.0	382	6,101	6.3	334	6,174	5.4	335	6,322	5.3
	Riverview Gardens	42	7,870	0.5	8,052	8,032	100.2	888	7,981	11.1	670	7,877	8.5	70	7,778	0.9
	Rockwood R-VI	5,458	22,544	24.2	1,328	22,047	6.0	250	21,871	1.1	115	22,034	0.5	108	21,894	0.5
	Special School District St. Louis Co.	2,734	2,087	131.0	3,222	2,105	153.1	88	2,079	4.2	55	2,047	2.7	82	2,184	3.8
	University City	2,151	3,636	59.2	2,397	3,608	66.4	142	3,784	3.8	42	3,974	1.1	92	4,190	2.2
	Valley Park	597	1,054	56.6	705	963	73.2	27	1,018	2.7	32	1,061	3.0	42	1,048	4.0
	Webster Groves	1,151	4,103	28.1	1,120	4,068	27.5	81	4,105	2.0	70	4,186	1.7	74	4,116	1.8
	Wellston	596	633	94.2	109	577	18.9	26	561	4.6	17	524	3.2	2	747	0.3
Stoddard	Advance R-IV	12	416	2.9	13	438	3.0	4	420	1.0	3	466	0.6	2	476	0.4
	Bell City R-II	49	262	18.7	54	264	20.5	2	304	0.7	4	308	1.3	0	293	0.0
	Bernie R-XIII	71	613	11.6	53	567	9.3	0	599	0.0	5	581	0.9	15	592	2.5
	Bloomfield R-XIV	234	815	28.7	192	763	25.2	2	762	0.3	1	806	0.1	1	823	0.1
	Dexter R-XI	246	2,069	11.9	218	2,044	10.7	12	2,049	0.6	7	2,062	0.3	14	2,064	0.7
	Puxico R-VIII	57	877	6.5	170	882	19.3	1	948	0.1	5	927	0.5	13	937	1.4
	Richland R-I	84	347	24.2	62	387	16.0	3	395	0.8	14	406	3.4	17	418	4.1
Stone	Blue Eye R-V	6	711	0.8	8	695	1.2	6	684	0.9	11	716	1.5	4	740	0.5
	Crane R-III	21	734	2.9	2	716	0.3	9	728	1.2	2	687	0.3	0	680	0.0
	Galena R-II	519	583	89.0	268	566	47.3	4	544	0.7	15	534	2.8	1	537	0.2
	Hurley R-I	56	264	21.2	0	249	0.0	1	248	0.4	1	270	0.4	1	283	0.4
	Reeds Spring R-IV	994	2,166	45.9	1,445	2,116	68.3	60	2,101	2.9	29	2,106	1.4	49	2,093	2.3
Sullivan	Green City R-I	91	329	27.7	98	317	30.9	7	324	2.2	4	322	1.2	3	320	0.9
	Milan C-2	144	706	20.4	109	705	15.5	7	678	1.0	3	692	0.4	20	700	2.9
	Newtown-Harris R-III	30	111	27.0	28	91	30.8	0	103	0.0	0	123	0.0	0	125	0.0
Taney	Bradleyville R-I	41	211	19.4	33	203	16.3	0	177	0.0	6	185	3.2	2	206	1.0
	Branson R-IV	1,641	3,856	42.6	1,289	3,563	36.2	59	3,415	1.7	56	3,336	1.7	55	3,143	1.7
	Forsyth R-III	373	1,187	31.4	487	1,174	41.5	30	1,163	2.6	20	1,132	1.8	20	1,103	1.8
	Hollister R-V	1,011	1,235	81.9	1,338	1,149	116.4	36	1,175	3.1	19	1,152	1.6	19	1,193	1.6
	Kirbyville R-VI	156	343	45.5	256	333	76.9	2	347	0.6	2	344	0.6	7	347	2.0
	Mark Twain R-VIII	11	60	18.3	5	77	6.5	0	76	0.0	0	59	0.0	0	63	0.0
	Taneyville R-II	103	229	45.0	69	212	32.5	1	229	0.4	3	229	1.3	0	230	0.0

Appendix F

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE INCIDENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

		School Year														
		2006-2007			2005-2006			2004-2005			2003-2004			2002-2003		
County	School District	Incident Rate														
		Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students	Total Incidents	Enrollment	Per 100 Students
Texas	Cabool R-IV	24	818	2.9	19	821	2.3	16	860	1.9	25	871	2.9	13	828	1.6
	Houston R-I	773	1,072	72.1	668	1,038	64.4	11	1,016	1.1	5	1,022	0.5	2	1,000	0.2
	Licking R-VIII	383	869	44.1	394	885	44.5	6	838	0.7	6	841	0.7	3	842	0.4
	Plato R-V	430	659	65.3	284	616	46.1	8	565	1.4	11	521	2.1	8	533	1.5
	Raymondville R-VII	55	125	44.0	12	120	10.0	0	125	0.0	0	122	0.0	0	117	0.0
	Success R-VI	7	92	7.6	0	105	0.0	0	107	0.0	0	112	0.0	0	112	0.0
	Summersville R-II	0	432	0.0	0	444	0.0	0	463	0.0	0	486	0.0	0	517	0.0
Vernon	Bronaugh R-VII	46	243	18.9	32	230	13.9	2	216	0.9	0	226	0.0	1	231	0.4
	Nevada R-V	0	2,664	0.0	0	2,598	0.0	36	2,563	1.4	38	2,522	1.5	19	2,552	0.7
	Northeast Vernon Co. R-I	16	249	6.4	249	211	118.0	0	212	0.0	2	230	0.9	0	220	0.0
	Sheldon R-VIII	46	195	23.6	99	180	55.0	7	175	4.0	1	185	0.5	2	187	1.1
Warren	Warren Co. R-III	2,249	2,977	75.5	2,036	2,837	71.8	47	2,772	1.7	52	2,693	1.9	42	2,668	1.6
	Wright City R-II	1,296	1,460	88.8	1,386	1,438	96.4	61	1,415	4.3	11	1,350	0.8	21	1,340	1.6
Washington	Kingston K-14	589	806	73.1	602	807	74.6	60	827	7.3	89	874	10.2	12	872	1.4
	Potosi R-III	936	2,452	38.2	758	2,419	31.3	88	2,403	3.7	70	2,355	3.0	53	2,337	2.3
	Richwoods R-VII	2	188	1.1	80	184	43.5	2	187	1.1	1	178	0.6	0	172	0.0
	Valley R-VI	455	468	97.2	77	485	15.9	5	486	1.0	2	490	0.4	1	475	0.2
Wayne	Clearwater R-I	798	1,144	69.8	764	1,090	70.1	25	1,096	2.3	35	1,173	3.0	9	1,161	0.8
	Greenville R-II	301	796	37.8	569	801	71.0	30	844	3.6	28	814	3.4	26	800	3.3
Webster	Fordland R-III	185	615	30.1	253	628	40.3	8	636	1.3	7	603	1.2	0	612	0.0
	Marshfield R-I	1,018	3,086	33.0	694	3,008	23.1	35	2,994	1.2	45	2,984	1.5	48	2,853	1.7
	Niangua R-V	255	227	112.3	307	232	132.3	4	237	1.7	1	251	0.4	3	307	1.0
	Seymour R-II	884	916	96.5	756	889	85.0	16	905	1.8	27	921	2.9	19	903	2.1
Worth	Worth Co. R-III	63	379	16.6	46	379	12.1	2	378	0.5	0	389	0.0	1	380	0.3
Wright	Hartville R-II	340	757	44.9	45	740	6.1	14	736	1.9	18	734	2.5	8	790	1.0
	Manes R-V	0	65	0.0	0	69	0.0	0	62	0.0	0	63	0.0	0	70	0.0
	Mansfield R-IV	583	733	79.5	314	698	45.0	3	668	0.4	2	692	0.3	1	689	0.1
	Mountain Grove R-III	1,074	1,486	72.3	857	1,496	57.3	4	1,490	0.3	8	1,536	0.5	4	1,564	0.3
	Norwood R-I	78	449	17.4	67	445	15.1	9	462	1.9	8	443	1.8	4	450	0.9
NA	Division Of Youth Services	0	851	0.0	0	841	0.0	0	827	0.0	0	952	0.0	0	900	0.0
NA	State School For Severely Handicapped	0	988	0.0	0	1,022	0.0	0	982	0.0	0	975	0.0	0	*	NA
		349,560	920,454	38.0	364,400	899,997	40.5	27,182	894,855	3.0	27,317	896,186	3.0	16,815	894,469	1.9

* No enrollment data recorded for the 2002-2003 school year.

Note: Data represents incidents reported on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Core Data system as of August 15, 2007. As noted in this report, the data is not always complete and accurate. In addition, in the 2006-2007 and 2005-2006 school years, school districts were instructed to report incidents resulting in suspensions of one-half day or more and expulsions. In previous years, school districts were instructed to report incidents resulting in suspensions of 10 or more days and expulsions.

Appendix G

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES SCHEDULE OF STATE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Personnel of various state agencies identified the following programs as safety related programs provided to school districts from fiscal year 2003 to the present:

Program	Description/Objectives of the Program
Department of Agriculture (DOA)	
Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in Missouri Schools	This program is implementing a IPM model for adoption by schools in Missouri. The program has been funded through two federal Environmental Protections Agency grants which totaled over \$90,000. The first grant was awarded in 2004 through 2006 while the second grant was awarded in 2007 and will be funded through 2009. Adopting IPM in Missouri schools can reduce pesticide exposure to school staff and students.
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)	
CHARACTERplus	The mission of CHARACTERplus is to "develop positive character traits in young people by providing a high quality character education process and resources to schools, homes, and communities." From fiscal years 2002 to 2007, the DESE paid approximately \$2.4 million in state funds to a contractor to administer the CHARACTERplus program to participating school districts, primarily in the St. Louis area. The fiscal year 2008 program funding totaled approximately \$835,000.
Internet Safety	The DESE partners with MOREnet to provide school districts an "Internet Safety Night", a video-conference geared toward practices and tools parents can use to help educate their children about the risks/dangers of Internet communications.
Missouri Center for Safe Schools (MCSS)	The MCSS is a statewide resource for school safety information. The center provides various services to school districts including safety reviews; safety coordinator training; and training on the issues of violence prevention, bullying prevention, Internet safety, emergency response, fight intervention, conflict resolution, and other aspects of school safety. The DESE has granted over \$200,000 in state funds annually to the center in the last several years.
Missouri Student Survey	See Department of Mental Health below.
Pupil Transportation	The DESE provides guidance to school districts regarding pupil transportation and transportation payments to school districts, totaling over \$162 million in state funds since fiscal year 2004. School districts may be reimbursed approximately 50 percent of school bus safety equipment (i.e. video cameras, two-way communication systems etc.). In addition, the DESE facilitates the School Bus Task Force committee which meets semiannually to discuss school transportation issues, including safety.
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program	School districts must have a plan for keeping schools safe and drug-free that includes appropriate and effective discipline policies, security procedures, prevention activities, a student code of conduct, and a crisis management plan for responding to violent or traumatic incidents on school grounds. Since 2003, the DESE has provided federal funding totaling approximately \$5.3 million to \$6.6 million to school districts each year for these activities.

Appendix G

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES SCHEDULE OF STATE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Program	Description/Objectives of the Program
Safe Schools Grant Program	Through this program, the DESE has awarded grants to school districts for prevention services, intervention services/alternative schools, security equipment, and school resource officers. Beginning in fiscal year 2007, grants are only awarded for intervention services. Grant payments totaling approximately \$20.1 million in state funds were made to over 150 school districts during the five years ended June 30, 2007.
School Renovation Grants	The DESE awarded grants to school districts on a competitive basis for school repairs and technological activities related to school renovation. The program was federally funded and expenditures totaled approximately \$16.9 million during the three years ended June 30, 2004.
School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS)	The purpose of SW-PBS is to improve school climate and safety through increasing the likelihood of appropriate student behaviors and social skills, as well as reducing the likelihood of inappropriate behaviors. The program was federally funded and the DESE provided grants totaling over \$375,000 to school districts for SW-PBS trainers during the five years ended June 30, 2007.
Teacher Certification/Background Checks	The DESE is responsible for ensuring background checks are conducted on applicants for educator certificates and for reviewing background check results.
<u>Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)</u>	
Adolescent Health Program	This program provides consultation, education, training, and resources to assist health professionals, school personnel, parents, adolescents, state agencies, community and state organizations to address various adolescent health concerns. The program is funded with federal monies.
Chemical Risk Mapping Project	This project gathers data on fixed chemical sites within each Missouri county and the sensitive populations, including schools, that are at risk from these sites. The DHSS plans to provide a list of schools at risk to the DESE. School officials will be encouraged to work with local health and emergency management officials to ensure plans are in place to respond to a chemical release that may affect a school.
Child Care Health Consultation	The DHSS contracts with Local Public Health Agencies to offer health and safety consultation, adult training, and children's health programs to all child care providers. Preschool and before/after school programs in schools are included in these services. Funding for the program is a federal block grant and a small amount of state funding.
Family Care Safety Registry (FCSR)	State law requires certain care givers, including child care workers, to register with the FCSR, and allows others to voluntarily register. Individuals and entities may request FCSR background checks. These background checks access several state agency databases including the Missouri State Highway Patrol's (MSHP) criminal records and sexual offender registry, the Department of Social Services' abuse/neglect records, and the Department of Mental Health's employee disqualification list. The FCSR operating costs totaled over \$3.2 million (excluding fringe benefits) in state funds for the five years ended June 30, 2007.

Appendix G

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES SCHEDULE OF STATE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Program	Description/Objectives of the Program
Child Care Regulation	The DHSS is responsible for the licensing of child care centers in Missouri, including some centers associated with school districts. Centers administered by school districts are license-exempt, although some voluntarily become licensed. Other centers are located in buildings owned by school districts but are operated by outside agencies and therefore require licensure. In total, these two groups represent 350 licensed child care centers and have a combined licensed capacity of approximately 20,000 children. All licensed child care centers are required to conduct background screenings for all employees and volunteers, counted in child/staff ratios. Most providers use the FCSR to perform these background screenings for employees and volunteers.
Food Protection Program	The DHSS contracts with local health agencies to inspect various food service facilities, including school cafeterias. According to DHSS personnel, school facilities are inspected at least once a year.
Immunization Program	This program includes a survey and data collection process to address immunization rates for school children. In addition, the DHSS provides immunization-related information to school districts.
Indoor Air Program	This program seeks to improve indoor air quality in schools and other public buildings. The DHSS handles inquiries and complaints from building officials, parents, employees, or other citizens.
Maternal and Child Health (MCH) Program	The DHSS distributes certain federal funds to local public health agencies. These agencies may use the funds to provide programs related to safety in schools.
Public Health Event Detection and Assessment (PHEDA)	This program monitors health trends in Missouri in order to detect acts of bioterrorism, chemical terrorism, and similar events. Data is collected from various sources, including schools.
Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program (REP)	This program ensures the health and safety of the public from a release of radioactive material from the Callaway or Cooper Nuclear plants. Protective action recommendations are made to the individuals and entities within ten miles of the plants including the general public, schools, daycares, nursing homes, correctional facilities, hospitals, and transients. The State Emergency Management Agency and DHSS manage the program.
Ready in 3	This program's purpose is to increase awareness and encourage individuals to prepare in advance for emergency situations in three easy steps – create a plan; prepare a kit; and listen for information. The program includes materials and tools for many targeted groups such as schools, faith-based organizations, workplaces, adult care facilities, child care providers, seniors, special needs populations, children, and the general population. According to DHSS personnel, almost \$200,000 in federal funds has been spent on outreach about the program to Missouri schools during the four years ended June 30, 2007.

Appendix G

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES SCHEDULE OF STATE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Program	Description/Objectives of the Program
Safe Kids	The DHSS contracts for services for preventing unintentional injuries and death in children aged 14 and under. Services include safety prevention and reinforcement programs and events and activities such as car seat installation and inspection, bike rodeos, helmet distribution, walk to school safety, fire drill and safety education, smoke detector distribution, and water safety education. The program is federally funded and expenditures totaled almost \$600,000 during the five years ended June 30, 2007.
School Age Child Care Orientation Training (SACOT)	Licensed child care center employees are required to receive 12 hours of training each year. SACOT is a six-hour training course specifically designed for school age child care providers, and is offered statewide at least once a year. During fiscal years 2002 through 2007, the DHSS paid contractors \$13,800 in state funds to provide this training.
School District Policies	The DHSS, in collaboration with the Safe Schools Working Group, is currently developing policies for school districts to follow in the event of an influenza pandemic. School districts will be encouraged to incorporate the policies into their emergency plans.
School Health Services	This program assures that school children have access to school nursing services by providing contracts to public school districts and local public health agencies to establish or expand health services for school-age children. The school safety services provided include suicide prevention and child abuse and neglect prevention education for staff; safety and interpersonal violence prevention education for students; and emergency action plan development. The program is a collaborative effort of the DHSS, DESE, and Department of Social Services. Contracts totaling approximately \$25 million were paid from state and federal funds during the five years ended June 30, 2007.
Schools' Preparedness Planning Project	Through a contract with the Missouri School Boards' Association, (MSBA), the DHSS developed a web-based program for public, private, and parochial schools to plan for biological and chemical events. The MSBA was paid over \$400,000 from federal funds during the two years ended June 30, 2007 to develop the program. Later, the program was expanded to include all hazards and other entities. See the Department of Public Safety.
Sexual Assault Prevention and Education Program	The DHSS, through contractors, provides sexual assault prevention education for children, teens and adults, as well as providing professional training to prevent sexual assault and dating violence. Services and education are provided to students and school personnel as well as law enforcement personnel, medical professionals, and the community. The program is funded with federal monies.
State Indoor Radon Program	This program, which receives both federal and state funding, focuses on educating citizens about radon and encouraging radon testing and mitigation in homes and schools. The DHSS plans to test all of the public schools in the state once every ten years. Private schools are also eligible for free radon testing upon request.

Appendix G

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES SCHEDULE OF STATE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Program	Description/Objectives of the Program
Teen Outreach Program (TOP)	This program is a comprehensive youth development and service-learning program offered in after school hours settings (school and community) for middle school and high school students in three areas of the state. The program addresses a wide range of topics that can foster safe environments for young people. Youth participation in this program has steadily grown, from 55 youth during the pilot year of 2005 to 130 in 2007. The DHSS has spent approximately \$145,000 in federal funds to administer the program during the three years ended June 30, 2007.
ThinkFirst Missouri	This program is a trauma prevention program through the University of Missouri – Columbia School of Medicine, and provides education to prevent traumatic head and spinal cord injury to students in middle, junior high and senior high schools, at no costs to the schools. The program serves over 50 schools and 15,000 students each year. The DHSS provides the university \$42,000 in federal funds each year for the program.
Department of Mental Health (DMH)	
Disaster Mental Health	The DMH facilitates the Education Mental Health Disaster Readiness committee, which meets periodically to discuss issues surrounding disaster mental health in schools. In addition, through a partnership with the St. Louis University Heartland Centers, the DMH conducts periodic training for school personnel and others regarding the unique aspects of disaster mental health in a school setting. This training is funded with federal monies.
Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) Training	The DMH contracts with the Missouri Police Chief's Charitable Foundation (MSHP prior to fiscal year 2006) to provide training to police officers to present the DARE program. This program teaches students how to recognize and to resist the pressure to be involved in drugs, gangs, and violent activities. The training is paid from federal funds and totaled over \$700,000 during the five years ended June 30, 2007.
Missouri Student Survey	The DMH and DESE conduct a joint Missouri Student Survey every two years showing trends in health-related behaviors of students in the state. The University of Missouri- Columbia School of Medicine evaluates and reports on the survey results. The survey is funded with federal monies.
School-Based Mental Health	In fiscal year 2008, the DMH provided one-time federal and state funding, totaling almost \$2.4 million, to the Springfield R-XII school district to continue a program for school based clinicians (SBC). The school district had received federal funds directly for the SBC program; however, the federal grant expired. The department provided funding to continue the program until the school district could find alternative funding. The SBC program provides mental health care professionals at 17 Springfield R-XII School District alternative, middle, and high schools who work directly with students, teachers, and their families to help foster a safe and healthy learning environment.

Appendix G

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES SCHEDULE OF STATE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Program	Description/Objectives of the Program
School-based Prevention Intervention and Resources Initiative (SPIRIT)	This program offers a variety of evidence-based prevention programs to five school districts. The program objectives are to delay onset of substance use and decrease substance use, improve overall school performance, and reduce incidents of violence. During fiscal year 2007, over 5,000 children/youth participated in the program. The program expenditures, primarily funded with federal monies, totaled almost \$4.7 million during the five years ended June 30, 2007.
Youth Suicide Prevention Project	This project funds seven regional suicide prevention resource centers which provide educational programs and training to students and staff of schools in their area; suicide prevention programs that are coordinated through the University of Missouri – Columbia; staff and evaluation services; and awards to various entities, including schools, to create and carry out their own suicide prevention programs. Current project funding from two federal programs increased to \$550,000 from \$150,000 in fiscal year 2006.
Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	
Chemical Disposal	The DNR serves as a resource for school districts regarding the handling and disposal of hazardous chemicals.
Department of Public Safety (DPS)	
Active Shooter Training	The State Emergency Management Agency formed a partnership with the Missouri Sheriff's and Police Chief Associations for the development and conduct of a course designed to enhance the preparedness of Missouri schools for addressing the possibility of an active shooter event. Implementation of the course is pending receipt of U.S. Department of Homeland Security funding.
ChalleNGe Youth Program	This program administered by the Missouri National Guard served drop-out students at risk of drug use during fiscal years 1998 through 2003. The program was designed primarily for unemployed high school dropouts between the ages of 16 and 18 and targeted youth at risk of drug use. Participants received training directed at citizenship, life coping skills, job training and placement, personal development, group skills, and work/personal values. The program was funded with state and federal monies and the fiscal year 2003 expenditures totaled approximately \$1.4 million.
Conference on Coordinated School Safety and Security	In 2007, the DPS, Office of Homeland Security and DHSS supported MSBA's first annual conference on Coordinated School Safety and Security. The conference was to assist teachers, administrators, school board members, law enforcement, the health community, fire fighters, and others in keeping the schools safe.
Emergency Response Information Plan (ERIP)	The ERIP is an emergency school planning tool that is free to public and non-public K-12 schools, higher education institutions, and licensed child care centers to assist in planning and training for all types of emergency events. The tool allows law enforcement, fire and other emergency responders to access participating school's floor plans and other critical information via a web portal when responding to school emergencies. The tool expanded the DHSS's bioterrorism planning tool to include all hazards and is funded with federal monies. Fiscal year 2007 costs, covering planning tool and maintenance services through 2010, totaled approximately \$1.4 million.

Appendix G

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES SCHEDULE OF STATE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Program	Description/Objectives of the Program
Missouri Alert Network	The Missouri Alert Network is a rapid notification system for K-12 schools and higher education institutions. The network was implemented in fall 2007 through a partnership with the DPS and the MSBA. In the event of a statewide emergency or other situation that might have an impact on school security, the DPS can simultaneously deliver a message to officials at participating schools and higher education institutions. Messages would be delivered by telephone (landline or cellular), text, and/or email. School districts (public and non-public) and higher education institutions are provided this service for one contact person, and may purchase the service from the MSBA for \$100 per year for each additional contact. According to DPS officials, as of March 2008, 91 percent of Missouri public school districts and 17 higher education institutions were registered with the Missouri Alert Network.
Safe Schools Working Group	In April 2006, the Governor's Homeland Security Advisory Council established the Safe Schools Working Group. The group consists of representatives from school districts, law enforcement agencies, emergency responders, state agencies, and other related entities across the state and meets every other month. The group's projects have included the ERIP, hazardous chemicals in schools, bullying in the classroom, and pandemic influenza planning.
School Bus Inspection Program	The MSHP administers the school bus inspection program. School buses receive two safety inspections annually, one performed at public or private inspection stations prior to the start of the school year and another performed by patrol personnel beginning after February 1. The patrol also performs spot inspections of at least 10 percent of the statewide school bus fleet during the fall each year. In 2007, over 12,000 school buses were inspected by the patrol, which resulted in an 87 percent approval rate.
Department of Revenue (DOR)	
School Bus Driver Licensing	The DOR is responsible for issuing and renewing School Bus Endorsements for drivers transporting school students.
Department of Social Services (DSS)	
Division of Youth Services (DYS)	The DYS provides alternative education and training and employment services to youth placed with the DYS when the youth is prohibited from returning to school due to a Safe Schools Act violation. At June 30, 2007, approximately 80 youth were in the DYS's custody due to a Safe School Act violation.
Missouri School Violence Hotline	The hotline has been maintained since 2001 for people to report school violence or threats of such violence. Hotline personnel forward information to appropriate officials, including school districts, the DESE, and law enforcement. The hotline operates predominately through a grant from the DPS. Expenditures for the hotline totaled approximately \$1.2 million in federal and state funds during the five years ended June 30, 2007.

Appendix G

SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES
SCHEDULE OF STATE SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Program	Description/Objectives of the Program
Department of Transportation (MoDOT)	
Safe Routes to School (SRTS)	This program, implemented in January 2006, provides grants to public and non-public schools to provide safer biking and walking accommodations for children in kindergarten to eighth grade and is designed to provide public awareness and outreach efforts and improve biking and walking conditions around schools. The program is federally funded and for the two years ended June 30, 2007, program expenditures totaled almost \$126,000.