

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

College of Doctoral Studies

IMPROVING SAFETY IN ARIZONA'S SCHOOLS

EDUCATION POLICY PAPER 2: GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY

Gerald N. Tirozzi, Visiting Professor

Riann Balch, Doctoral Student

Jaqulyne Hardiesty, Doctoral Student

September 18, 2013

INTRODUCTION

The recent tragic school shootings in Newton, Connecticut – only the latest in a sad succession of other school shootings across the country – further awakened the consciousness of our nation regarding the need to improve school safety.

In response, Congress, federal agencies, state legislators, city governments, school boards, and other concerned stakeholders have expanded their debate over efforts and strategies to better insure the safety, well-being, and protection of students, faculty, and staff in all of our nation's schools.

This commitment to advancing school safety has also resulted in a highly visible national debate – a debate that has not fallen on deaf ears in Arizona. Consider that the governor, attorney general, legislators, and other groups and organizations have each put forth various new initiatives and strategies to insure the safety of the state's schools, students, educators, and staff.

Yet, however well-intentioned national and state efforts have been, the reality is that most of the positive actions taken to improve school safety have been at the local school level. Regrettably, while school-based personnel have displayed the insight and resolve to provide programs of school safety, their “voices” have been largely silent in the state and national discourse on this subject.

Consider the reality that as national, state, and local leaders debate how to make schools safer, they have largely ignored input and consultation from those who are most closely aligned with the school settings – teachers and administrators.

It is highly recommended that as Arizona legislators and policy makers continue their deliberations to enhance school safety, such discussions not take place in a vacuum, but rather incorporate the “voices” of those who toil daily in the state's schools and classrooms. These professionals represent a major resource to the state's leaders, emanating from their extensive experience in school settings, and their valued input can further support Arizona's efforts to insure safe school environments.

FORMAT

The paper will address a number of critical findings, gleaned from national reports. These findings represent key variables and considerations essential to an elevated understanding of the “warning signs” of potential school violence. In addition, the findings provide a framework for proactive school safety planning and implementation.

While each finding has its own level of significance, it is essential to grasp the importance of the findings in their entirety. Convergence of all of the findings must be considered in planning strategies and policies to enhance school safety.

Additionally, the paper will present selected best practices in school safety planning, as identified in reports issued by national education associations. Specific recommendations for enhancing school safety will be presented -- elicited from the many and varied findings and “best practices” -- as identified in the referenced national reports. The recommendations will provide a coherent framework to improve school safety planning in Arizona schools.

It is important to acknowledge that certain recommendations presented in the paper may already have been implemented in some of the state’s schools. Nevertheless, it is incumbent that such strategies, where implemented, be revisited in juxtaposition with other recommendations provided in the paper to enhance the potential for more comprehensive school safety planning.

The paper will also place a special emphasis on the growing national, state, and local discourse as to whether or not teachers and principals should be armed on school campuses. The intent to focus a high profile on this issue is not to take a position on it, but rather to emphasize that the nature of this discourse merits careful consideration and singular attention as the debate continues and intensifies in some localities.

SELECTED FINDINGS:

“The Final Report of the Safe School Initiative” (Vossesuil, 2002):

- Incidents of targeted violence at school are rarely sudden, impulsive acts. Students who engaged in school-based attacks did not “just snap.” Instead the attacks examined appeared to be the end result of a comprehensive process of thinking and behavior.
- Prior to most incidents, others knew about the attacker’s idea and/or plan to attack.
- There is no accurate or useful “profile” of students who engaged in school violence.
- Most attackers engaged in some behavior prior to the incident that caused other concerns, or indicated a need for help.
- Most attackers had difficulty coping with significant losses or personal failures. Moreover, many had considered or attempted suicide.
- Many attackers felt bullied, persecuted, or injured by others prior to the attack.
- Prior to most incidents, other people knew about the attacker’s idea and /or plan.
- In over half of the incidents, the attacker had selected at least one school administrator, faculty member, or staff member as a target.
- Most attackers (73%) had a grievance against at least one of their targets prior to the attacks.
- State standards related to school safety vary from non-existent to stringent.

SELECTED FINDINGS:

Report Of The National School Shield Task Force (National School Shield, 2013):

- School administrators are, generally, not trained in security assessments, or the development of comprehensive safety and security plans.

- Many states do not have a critical element in their standards that requires all schools to participate in a school safety assessment and develop a security plan based on the unique needs of the school.
- There is a lack of developing and implementing threat assessment strategies at the school level, which is a limitation to creating a positive school climate that encourages sharing information on early warning signs of bullying and other anti-social behavior.
- Insufficient attention has been paid to school security issues in medium- to smaller-sized schools, representing schools, which do not have the level of resources available to larger schools.
- Older schools, constructed more than 10 years ago, have greater security challenges than newer school facilities.
- A properly trained armed school resource officer (SRO) has proven to be an important layer of security for prevention, and responding to an active threat on a school campus.

SELECTED BEST PRACTICES:

“A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools (Cowan, Vaillancourt, Rossen, and Pollitt, (2013):

- Balance physical and psychological safety to avoid overly restrictive measures” (i.e., avoid overreliance on armed guards and metal detectors) that can undermine a school’s learning environment.
- If a school determines the need for armed security, properly trained school resource officers (SROs) are the only school personnel who should be armed.
- Decisions regarding appropriate security measures, including the use of SROs, should be determined by each school’s leadership team and should not be determined via universal mandate.
- Discipline should be employed that: functions in concert with efforts to address school safety and climate; is not simply punitive (e.g., zero tolerance); is clear, consistent, and equitable, and reinforces positive behavior.

- Integrate learning supports (e.g., behavioral, mental health, and social services) instruction and school management within a comprehensive, cohesive approach that facilitates multidisciplinary collaboration.
- Principals need to maintain a constant presence in the school and in classrooms listening to and observing what is taking place, assessing needs, and getting to know students and teachers.
- There are no one-size fits all approaches to creating safe and successful schools. To be effective, schools should assess the structures and resources already in place and determine what additional resources are needed.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING SCHOOL SAFETY

SAFE SCHOOLS TEAM PLANNING:

- Every school should be required to develop and implement a school safety assessment and a requisite school security plan. Once a school safety plan is in place, it is imperative that regular school safety drills be conducted. Such drills should be elevated to the same level of importance afforded to conducting regular fire drill exercises. The importance of such safety drills cannot be overstated. Consider that reports indicate that it is likely that the death toll at Sandy Hook would have been even greater without such planning and practice by the staff and students at the school.
- While it is essential that the state or school district provide some level of training for school personnel in developing school safety plans, it is important to understand and respect that each school is unique. Hence, while there may be common elements included in all school plans, it is imperative that school security planning be locally tailored to be effective and reliable, and acceptable to the faculty and staff in the school. It is also necessary to involve parents and community leaders in the development of the plan --insuring their “buy-in” and support of the plan’s implementation.

- Every school, in its planning, should maintain a close relationship with its local law enforcement agency and “first responder” groups, to gain greater insight as to proactive deterrents to school violence, and reactive procedures and protocols in the event that such violence occurs on the school’s campus.
- Efforts should be made to utilize consultants with extensive experience in school safety planning to provide support and assistance to school in developing and implementing their plans.

SCHOOL-BASED THREAT ANALYSIS:

- Schools need to identify and eliminate barriers in the school environment that may discourage students from coming forward to report “suspicious” student behavior and/or “rumors” that may be forerunner to future disruptive or violent behavior.
- Schools need to make every effort to insure the confidentiality of those students who come forth to express their concerns in such matters.
- School administrators should respond to all students who make threats to adults or students in the school. Regardless of how insignificant the threat may appear, it necessitates that school administrators have an in-depth discussion with the student responsible for making the threat.
- It may also be necessary to reach out to the parents of the student who is making a threat, and who may have a more in-depth understanding of the root causes of the threat.
- It is also essential to ascertain if other individuals in the school have knowledge of the threat. Succinctly stated, threat analysis is important and necessary.
- Schools should consider developing threat assessment teams. Such teams, in addition to administrators and faculty, should place a high priority on including mental health professionals, guidance counselors, and school social workers. Additionally, consideration should be given to providing threat assessment consultants to work with the school teams to elevate their understanding of “early warning signs,” which are often precursors to potential incidents of school disruptions.

ADDRESSING “BULLYING BEHAVIOR”

- School personnel must be continually vigilant in their classrooms and schools in identifying any aberrant behavior on the part of students. They also need to display greater sensitivity to those students who have recently experienced personal losses or failures, and provide these students with counseling and mental health services.
- Administrators, faculty, and staff must be vigilant in identifying bullying behavior on the part of students, and take appropriate disciplinary measures and/or counseling interventions as deterrents of such behavior.
- Local school boards should have policies in place that make it emphatically clear that bullying and persecution of other students will not be tolerated, and that offenders will be appropriately disciplined.
- Local school boards should have funding in place that supports each school’s efforts to provide on-going anti-bullying prevention programs for students.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR INCREASED STATE-LEVEL SUPPORT:*Rural schools:*

- The state department of education should give careful consideration and attention to the needs of suburban and rural schools, respecting the reality that such schools generally have minimal resources and staffing to insure adequate safety and security measures. This need is further validated by the reality that the majority of the nation’s school violence incidents have taken place in these types of smaller communities.
- The state department of education, in cooperation with these smaller schools districts, should conduct a “safe school assessment” of the ability of these schools to determine the safety and security needs of these school settings. The state legislature, based on the “safe school assessments” should consider providing fiscal resources to address the identified school safety needs in these smaller school districts.

School Facility “Safety Audits”:

The state department of education, in cooperation with local school districts, should consider conducting facility studies of all schools in the state to determine the extent to which each school can pass a “school safety audit.” In this effort, special consideration should be given to the state’s “older schools” (in the range of 10-15-years old). These types of studies should consider the following:

- Retrofitting door locks and windows to insure maximum security. Consideration should be given to covering windows and other entrances with heavy-duty plastic glass or heavy-duty screens to further limit access to school buildings.
- Considering the availability or expansion of the use of hallway cameras, to monitor corridor passageways.
- Addressing school perimeter conditions that impair outside views (e.g., removal of shrubs, trees that may impair vision).
- Assessing the availability and adequacy of potential “safe rooms“ in the school to accommodate large groups of students in emergency situations.
- Utilizing the services of a school facilities consultant with experience in assessing safety readiness in a school setting.
- Considering the various ingress points to the school building as related to the potential to reducing entry doors.
- Requiring all visitors, including parents, to check in at designated centralized locations --in close proximity to the location of the school’s main office.
- Considering the location of the school’s main office in relation to the main building ingress for visitors, recognizing the importance of the office’s proximity and “sight line” to the visitor’s entrance. Where necessary and feasible, consider relocating the location of the main office.
- Assessing the availability of adequate communication links between classrooms and the main office (e.g., intercom connections, mobile phones, buzzer alerts).

Dedicated Safe School Funding:

The state legislature should consider establishing a dedicated school safety fund to provide additional financial resources to further support school safety initiatives at the school district and school campus levels. Such funding should place a high priority on addressing the needs of the state's suburban and rural school districts, which generally have major school safety resource and staffing needs, and which necessitate facility improvement to deter the potential for school violence. These latter considerations are elevated in light of the reality that the majority of violence on school campuses have been predominant in the nation's smaller and more rural school settings.

UTILIZING THE SERVICES OF SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS (SROS) ON SCHOOL CAMPUSES

Some consider the use of trained armed SRO's in all schools -- authorized and trained by local law enforcement -- as a significant deterrent to school violence in the state's schools. This, of course, is a very costly proposition, and will necessitate a major financial commitment of both state and local school district funding. It is recommended that a committee of state legislators, school board members, school superintendents, and law enforcement officials be tasked with developing a cost analysis for dramatically increasing the number of SROs in the state's schools. Consideration, in such an analysis, should address the potential for a phase-in plan of 3-5 years for adding additional SROs, which would serve to lessen the financial burden.

CONSIDERATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Considering the implementation of school safety courses for school principals and staff by the state's universities, colleges, and community colleges, these courses should place a strong emphasis on developing and implementing school-based: safety plans, threat analysis teams, and facility safety reviews. It is also essential that such courses provide principals with the requisite leadership skills to provide guidance and direction to faculty and staff in improving school safety. The cited areas and skill sets are largely conspicuous by their absence in administrator preparation programs.

It is further recommend that adjunct faculty -- with extensive background and experience in school safety and/or law enforcement be recruited as visiting professors for these courses.

ARMING SCHOOL STAFF WAS THE ANSWER, BUT WHAT WAS THE QUESTION?

The focus on “arming” in this paper is not to take a particular position on this issue, but rather to bring into focus the questions and issues related to having guns in a school. These questions merit serious consideration before there is a “rush to judgment” on a very complex issue. It is also important to note that the discourse that follows is not intended to take issue with Second Amendment rights, but rather is specifically rooted in placing a focus on ensuring school safety.

In tense and stressful situations and debates, decision makers may rush to provide “answers” to complex and multi-faceted problems without first considering the “questions” that merit serious deliberation. Careful examination of whether or not to arm school personnel is required to reduce the likelihood of this type of “knee jerk” reaction.

As well intentioned as the proponents of having armed teachers and principals may be, it is imperative to consider a number of critical questions, and the related, clarifications that plea for their attention.

Initially it must be pointed out that a recent U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Study reported that that “only one percent of childhood homicides, a majority of which involve guns, occur in schools.” (Russo, 2012) It has also been noted that “fifty million children went to school on the day that 20 were killed at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, therefore the chances of a child dying in a school shooting are remote.” (Harris, 2013) A cogent warning is added: “Our perception of danger is easily distorted by rare events.” (Harris, 2013)

While the death of only one child resulting from a gunshot is tragic and catastrophic, it must be considered that putting guns in the hands of school personnel may be an overreaction, and may only serve to exacerbate tense school situations when they occur.

Additionally, it should be considered that as traumatic as school shootings are, the weapons used are

but a symptom of much deeper and complex mental health problems, and the propensity for violence in our society.

In effect, efforts and resolutions to enhance school safety might be better served in implementing a more holistic approach – building on the recommendations cited in this paper.

Charles Russo, who holds an endowed chair in education and is an adjunct professor of law at Dayton University, has written an excellent article on the issues inherent with arming teachers and principals. The following questions and observations are reflections of his commentary on this issue. Consider the following:

What message does arming teachers and principals send to children in the schoolhouse?

Arming teachers sends a message that the role of teachers as caregivers is changed to being that of defenders. It also places children in an entirely new and different school and classroom environment; one in which the presence of guns could conjure fear and anxiety in their minds, and may very well have the unintended consequence of their constantly being on guard for their personal safety. Creating such a climate, negatively affects teaching and learning, and may very well be the unintended consequence of arming teachers and principals.

To reinforce this point, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) issued a joint statement: “Any impression that obstructs a trusting relationship in school compromises school safety instead of enhancing it.” (NASSP, 2012)

Are teachers and principals qualified and prepared to be armed?

Recommendations abound as to providing teachers and principals with training programs that include target practice, shooting lessons, and general gun safety. Consider that while some may learn to fire safely and accurately in controlled situations, there is a significant difference when faced with the anxiety and emotion produced by a real “life and death” situation. It has been reported, “even highly

trained police officers, most of whom never fire their weapons in the line of duty, do not always shoot accurately when they must do so.” (Russo, 2012)

The imperative of accuracy, when confronting an attacker in a school setting, cannot be overstated, especially when considering that children and staff may very well be in the field of the fire. The “accuracy reality” exists even for police officers, who undergo extensive and continuous training. A report on the nation’s largest police force, New York City, provides greater insight into this reality; “While officers hit their targets about a third of the time over all, far fewer bullets generally found their mark.” (Baker, 2008) The essential factor to consider is that if police officers, expertly trained and experienced, only hit their targets one-third of the time, there should be an immediate concern regarding the accuracy of teachers and principals, who generally have received little, if any training. Inaccuracy in firing a gun in a chaotic school setting, by staff that are not adequately trained can very well lead to greater tragedies resulting in “friendly fire” casualties.

Who will pay for the cost of providing guns, ammunition, and training for arming teachers and principals?

These cost centers will necessitate a significant and continued stream of financial support from the state and/or school districts. This potential new financial stream represents a funding conundrum for state and local leaders, coming at a time when many school districts and schools in the state are in need of additional funding for instructional materials, textbooks, additional support services, technology advances, professional development, staff salary increases, and building renovations.

Where will teachers keep their weapons in the classroom?

Consider that a gun carried by a teacher on his/her person dramatically changes the classroom climate and environment for students -- reducing the classroom setting to “a secure compound.” In addition, the role of the teacher is dramatically compromised and transformed in the eyes of students.

If teachers secure their guns in locked desks, several concerns surface that merit consideration. How difficult will it be for a teacher to find the key to his/her desk, to access a weapon, when an attacker enters

the classroom? Also, how much time will be lost as a teacher searches for and aims the weapon, rather than using the time getting students to safety during a crisis situation?

What are the positions of teachers and principals as to their having guns in school settings?

The NEA and the AFT – representing approximately 4.5 million of our nation’s teachers – have issued a joint statement, reacting to governors, legislators, and policy makers, who are proposing arming teachers as a way to prevent school violence. Their direct response makes it explicitly clear the position of these national teacher organizations: “Guns have no place in schools. Period. Everything must be done to reduce the possibility of any gunfire in schools, and concentrate to keep all guns off school property and ensure the safety of children and school employees.” (Van Roekel & Weingarten, 2012) The statement concludes: “Lawmakers at every level of government should dismiss this dangerous idea and instead focus on measures that will create the safe and supportive learning environments our children deserve.” (Van Roekel & Weingarten, 2012)

The joint statement continues with an explicit recommendation that “school safety is better served if there is a greater access to mental health services, bullying prevention and a greater commitment to funding guidance counselors, social workers and school psychologists.” (Van Roekel & Weingarten, 2012)

In the aftermath of the school shootings in Newtown, Connecticut, the NASSP and the NAESP also issued a firm joint statement regarding arming teachers and principals: “Our organizations believe that arming educators would cause more harm than good, and we advise decisions makers to approach these policies with extreme caution.” (NASSP, 2012) They also point out that “to be effective, schools must be perceived as safe havens where students want to be. The presence of armed school officials on campus conveys the opposite message to students and the local community.” (NASSP, 2012) An editorial headline in *Education Week* (2012) reflects the position of school principals: “Nation’s Principals: Don’t give us Guns!”

In summary, it is important to reflect on the reality that there is no documented evidence to support

the belief that armed teachers and principals will improve school safety. It must also be considered that putting guns in the hands of school personnel may only serve to exacerbate tense situations involving distraught staff in highly emotional settings.

Hopefully, as legislators and policy contemplate promoting the carrying of weapons by school personnel, they will give special attention to the questions, and related commentary, that have been provided in the paper.

It is also incumbent upon these decision makers to take into consideration that the teachers and administrators whom they envision as carrying guns on school campuses, are overwhelmingly opposed to this practice.

State and local leaders, especially as pressure may build to arm school personnel, must always consider that carrying weapons is not in the “job description” of any individual on a school staff, and promoting the “arming” of school personnel is a potential recipe for greater endangerment for individuals working in a school setting and the students they serve.

SUMMARY

This policy paper has made an effort to bring into focus the major findings of national organizations and education associations relating to violence on school campuses, and school safety measures that merit serious considerations. These findings, in turn, have served to elicit a number of recommendations, which are presented in the paper.

Special attention in the paper is directed to the on-going national, state, and local debate regarding consideration to arming teachers and principals on school campuses. This special consideration is not intended to take a position on this issue, but rather to enlighten the discourse as to the myriad and complex questions and issues that merit serious consideration prior to implementing legislation and/or policies to arm teachers and principals.

A report issued by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) offers a cogent and timely reminder as to the propensity for violence in our nation's schools:

“Violence can happen anywhere, and schools must be prepared to respond and protect students and staff in our free and open society.” (AASA, n.d.)

The report also provides further insight and clarity, and a timely context, regarding school safety – offering three guiding elements as the scaffolding that should be the framework for school safety planning; *awareness, balance, and control.*

AWARENESS is directed at the need for schools to be constantly aware of the threats of violence on campuses, and the persistent vigilance to protecting the safety of students. Comprehensive and integrated school safety and school emergency response plans to minimize the threat of school-based shootings are core conditions of this element.

BALANCE is a recognition that a combination of strategies, rather than one or two extreme solutions, can be most effective in keeping students safe.

CONTROL is a focus on the need to control access to the school's learning environment including such considerations as hiring school safety officers, maintaining a strong visitor policy, limiting school entry points, and conducting periodic emergency response drills.

A careful review of the *awareness*, *balance*, and *control* construct will reveal a close alignment with the findings and recommendations imbedded in this policy paper. Of particular note, the policy paper places an emphasis on an understanding "that one size fits all" is not a recipe for successful school safety planning and implementation. Rather the key observation is that each school campus must engage in a thoughtful and considered exercise to determine their respective resources, capabilities, and needs to insure a greater potential for school safety.

Ronald Stevens, executive director of The National School Safety Center (NSSC), reinforces this imperative. "Such school planning is all about the 'art of the possible.' It should not be limited to special constraints or set of guidelines. Each school community has the opportunity to shape the climate it wishes to create. A safe school plan, more than anything else, is a function of community wills, priorities, and interests." (Stephens, n.d.)

It is also imperative to consider that school safety planning not be constricted to one or two "silver bullets" as the formula for success. Rather, it is vital to consider a broad array of school safety strategies – many of which are presented in this paper -- in a coherent framework to insure a comprehensive approach to enhanced school safety.

The issues of school safety and violence in our society are lamentably conditions that are real and cannot be ignored. In this societal context, Arizona must never let its guard down regarding school safety. It is important to consider that, prior to the school shootings in Connecticut, most states, school districts, and schools had a false sense of security often expressed by the statement "it probably can't happen here." This "false sense" of security was forever shattered by the heartbreaking occurrence at Sandy Hook Elementary School, taking place in a small, quiet, and pristine New England town – serving as a constant reminder that all of our nation's schools are at risk of school violence.

Ronald Stevens offers a lucid reminder of the significant challenges ahead in addressing the realities of school violence, and the ever pressing need to remain vigilant in this pursuit:

“In an ideal world, one would like to prevent all school crime and ensure the safety of each staff member and student. The reality is that so many things are outside of the control of the school administrator that such a task is virtually impossible. To attempt to predict the disruptive behavior of a student, a staff member, an intruder or a terrorist is unrealistic. However, armed with the knowledge that this could happen the astute administrator and school community leaders can take actions to prepare for a crisis, avoid a crisis, and preclude successive crises, and now, equally important, to lead the healing process following a crisis.” (Stephens, n.d.)

The challenges ahead for insuring safe schools and preventing school violence are daunting, and necessitate the continuing attention and responsiveness of Arizona’s educators, state and local leaders and policy makers, community leaders, and parents

This policy paper seeks to offer an additional resource for Arizona, in its continuing resolve and commitment to insure the safety of its students and school personnel.

Author Biography

Dr. Gerald N. Tirozzi served as an Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) until July 1, 2011. Dr. Tirozzi has an extensive background in the educational field and is a nationally recognized leader in education reform. Prior to joining NASSP in March 1999, Dr. Tirozzi held a variety of positions in the field of education. These included: Assistant Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education at the U.S. Department of Education...from 1996 to 1999; Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Connecticut from 1993 to 1995; President of Wheelock College from 1991 to 1993; Commissioner of Education in Connecticut from 1983 to 1991; Superintendent of New Haven (CT) Public Schools from 1977 to 1983. Early in his career, Tirozzi also served as science teacher, assistant principal, and principal. Dr. Tirozzi serves on a number of national educational advisory boards, task forces, and professional organizations. Some of these include: the Educational Research Service, the League, the Learning First Alliance, Pearson Education National Policy Board, the USA Today Education Advisory Panel, and the U.S. Department of State's Overseas Schools Advisory Council. Dr. Tirozzi is the author of numerous articles on educational topics that have been published in educational and scholarly journals. Some of these writings have been collected in the publication, *Reflections on School Leadership*. Dr. Tirozzi's public service and leadership have been recognized by a number of state and national organizations. Some of these include: the Ellis Island Medal of Honor, the Horace Mann League, the U.S. Department of Education, Michigan State University, and the Connecticut Legislature. Dr. Tirozzi holds a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Educational Administration and Higher Education from Michigan State University. He has a Sixth Year Certificate in Education Administration from Fairfield University in Connecticut. He received a Master of Arts Degree in Guidance and Counseling and a Bachelor of Science Degree in Elementary Education from Southern Connecticut State University.

References

- American Association of School Administrators. (n.d.). ABC's of school safety. Retrieved from www.aasa.org.
- Baker, A. (2008, May 8) 11 years of police gunfire in painstaking detail. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com.
- Cowan, K. C., Vaillancourt, K., Rossen, E., & Pollitt, K. (2013). A framework for safe and successful schools. [Brief]. Bethesda, MD. National Association of School Psychologists.
- Harris, S. (2013, January 2). The riddle of the gun. Retrieved from <http://www.samharris.org>. National Association of Secondary School Principals (2012, December 19). National principals groups oppose proposal to arm officials. Retrieved from www.nassp.org.
- Russo, C.J. (2013). Armed teachers and guards won't make schools safe. *Education Week* editorial. 32(19)
- Stephens, R.D. (n.d.) Safe School Planning: The Art of the Possible. Retrieved from www.schoolsafety.com
- The National School Shield. (n.d.). The report of the National School Shield Task Force. Retrieved from www.nraschoolshield.com.
- Van Roekel, D, & Weingarten, R. (2012, December 12). Arming teachers won't keep schools safe. Retrieved from www.nea.org.
- Vossekuil, B. F. (2002). The final report and findings of the safe school initiative. Washington, D.C.: United States Secret Service.
- Zubrzycki, J. (2012, December 19). Nation's principals: Don't give us guns!" *Education Week* 32(12).
- Stephens, R. (n.d.). Director's message. National School Safety Center. Retrieved from www.schoolsafety.us.

GRAND CANYON
UNIVERSITY™

College of Doctoral Studies

3300 West Camelback Road, Phoenix, AZ 85017-3030