



The 2023 Virginia School Safety Survey

DATA BY QUESTION

Background

The Virginia Division Safety Survey is intended to provide school divisions and the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) with information on how best practices for school safety are being implemented across Virginia. The results of this survey provide valuable information on training and resource needs across the state. The survey is updated periodically to incorporate updates to best practices and to gather specific data needed to inform policymakers.

The web-based Virginia Division Safety Survey was developed and administered by the DCJS Virginia Center for School and Campus Safety (VCSCS). In May 2023, all Virginia school division emergency managers received directions for the 2023 School and Division Safety Surveys. Submission of the online survey is one component of the Virginia School Safety Audit requirement (*Code of Virginia § 22.1-279.8*). Once all schools in a division completed their School Safety Survey, a School Response Summary was provided to that division along with the link to complete their Division Safety Survey. Superintendents, or their designees, completed the web-based survey during the months of May through September of 2023, providing information that reflected conditions in their divisions during the 2022–2023 school year.

All 131 school divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia completed the 2023 Division Safety Survey.

Interpreting the Findings

Gray bars indicate survey branching based on respondent answers. If the response did not trigger the follow-up question(s), the question(s) was/were not presented to the respondent.

Many questions requested the reporting of numbers on various topics. These results are reported as such:

Total = Sum of all responses

Schools = Number of schools that reported numbers >1

Mean = Average number reported for schools that reported numbers >1

Range = Spread of numbers reported >1

If you have any questions, please contact the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) Virginia Center for School and Campus Safety (VCSCS):

Nikki Wilcox: 804-786-3923 • nikki.wilcox@dcjs.virginia.gov

Dannie Anderson: 804-624-7754 • dannie.anderson@dcjs.virginia.gov

James Christian: 804-357-0967 • james.christian@dcjs.virginia.gov

I. SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| 1. What is your division and school name? | 1,974 Schools, 131 divisions | |
| 2. If we have any questions about your survey responses, we would like to be able to contact you. Please provide your contact information: <i>individual completing the survey</i> | First Name: | ---- |
| | Last Name: | ---- |
| | Email: | ---- |
| | Phone Number: | ---- |
| 3. What is your role in the school? | N=1,974 ○ Principal/Director, 1263, 64% ○ Associate/Assistant Principal, 649, 33% ○ Dean of Students, 17, 1% ○ SSO, 13, 1% ○ Administrative Intern/Aide, 11, 1% ○ Site/Program Coordinator, 6, 0% ○ Safety Coordinator/Chair/Specialist, 5, 0% ○ School Counselor, 3, 0% ○ Senior Teacher, 1, 0% ○ Other, 6, 0% | |
| 4. Have you received any formal school safety planning/management training? | N=1,974 ○ Yes, 1,602, 81% ○ No, 372, 19% | |
| If you HAVE received formal training | | |
| 4a. What agency facilitated this training? | Responses included: ALICE, County Fire and Rescue, CRASE, Crisis Go, Crisis Prevention Institute, CSB/Fire and Police Departments, DCJS, Department of Homeland Security, Dept. of Juvenile Justice, Evolv technology, MANDT training, FEMA, George Washington University, Handle With Care, I Love U Guys Foundation, ICS, in North Carolina, Liberty University, LifeSpot, local law enforcement agency, NASP Prepare training, Navigate 360, NIMS (National Incident Management System), Office of Youth Risk, Online training for Crisis Management, Raptor technologies, Run, Safe Schools, School Division, School Resource Officer, SURN-William and Mary, table top training, United Way, UVA CSTAG Model, VCART, VDOE, Vector Solutions (Safe Schools), Virginia Commonwealth University, Virginia State Police, Virginia Tech Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. | |
| ALL | | |
| 5. What topics would you be interested in receiving training on? | Responses included: Action plans for incidents, Active Attack Training, Acute medical training (overdose situations students with unique medical needs), Administrative and SRO training, ALICE training, anger management, attendance/truancy, basic school safety readiness, behavior interventions and de-escalation, best practices for SROs in schools, best ways to utilize SSO, bomb threats, building and grounds security, building safety walkthrough, bullying and cyberbullying, bus safety, cell phone usage safety, child abduction/missing student, child exploitation, communicating safety to stakeholders, conducting lockdowns during arrival and dismissal, conducting safety drills in high-traffic areas and busy times and places (ex. cafe), continued training on SRP SRM, COOP plans, CPTED, crisis aftermath, crisis management, crisis plan development, CRT training, cybersecurity, de-escalation tactics for upset visitors, digital safety/social media safety, discipline and behavior response, drills, drug identification, effective use of metal detectors, effects of trauma on children, emergency operations planning, emotional wellbeing of students and | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <i>staff, evacuation to secondary location, family and community engagement in school safety, fentanyl use and prevention, follow-up to threat assessments, gang awareness, gun safety, Handle With Care - School Trauma Communication System, health-related incidents, human trafficking, identifying and supporting students with trauma, infectious diseases and public health, internet safety, Interviewing techniques, Intruder in the building, Investigations, lockdowns, main office personnel response to emergencies, MANDT, metal detectors, mediation/conflict resolution mental health, Narcan, natural disaster safety training, off-site reunification, physical and emotional safety restraint, risk management, Run Hide Fight, school climate, searches, security systems, See Something/Say Something, SEL, safety for students and staff, shelter in place drills, social media, Stop the Bleed, substance abuse, suicide prevention, tabletop scenarios, targeted violence, terrorist/hostage situation in a school, Threat Assessment, Title IX Investigator Training, tornado preparedness, trauma informed care, vaping, vulnerability assessments, weapon detection system, and weapons on campus.</i> | | |
| If you are NOT the acting principal | | | |
| 3a. Please provide the name and email address for your current/acting principal. | First Name: | ---- | |
| | Last Name: | ---- | |
| | Email: | ---- | |
| 6. Is your school/program 100% virtual? | | <i>N=1,974</i> <input type="radio"/> Yes, 14, 0.7% <input type="radio"/> No, 1,960, 99% | |

II. SAFETY-RELATED PERSONNEL AND PARTNERSHIPS

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 7. Which law enforcement agency did you collaborate with on your 2023 School Safety Audit? | | <i>173 different law enforcement agencies selected.</i> | |
| <i>School Resource Officers and Certified School Security Officers</i> School Resource Officer (SRO) is defined in § 9.1-101, Code of Virginia , as “...a certified law enforcement officer hired by the local law enforcement agency to provide law enforcement and security services to Virginia public elementary and secondary schools.” School Security Officer (SSO) is defined in § 9.1-101, Code of Virginia , as “... an individual who is employed by the local school board or a private or religious school for the singular purpose of maintaining order and discipline, preventing crime, investigating violations of the policies of the school board or the private or religious school, and detaining students violating the law or the policies of the school board or the private or religious school on school property, school buses, or at school-sponsored events and who is responsible solely for ensuring the safety, security, and welfare of all students, faculty, staff, and visitors in the assigned school.” | | | |
| 8. What types of safety/security personnel were working in your school during the 2022–2023 school year? | | | |
| | Number dedicated to the school during all school hours | Number present only part of the time students are in the building | Number you share with another school? |
| School resource officers (SROs) (employed as a certified law enforcement officer) | <i>Total 896</i> <i>Schools 847</i> <i>Mean 1.06</i> <i>Range 1-7</i> | <i>Total 363</i> <i>Schools 342</i> <i>Mean 1.06</i> <i>Range 1-3</i> | <i>Total 778</i> <i>Schools 727</i> <i>Mean 1.07</i> <i>Range 1-5</i> |
| Certified School Security Officers (SSOs) (employed by the school division) | <i>Total 1,168</i> <i>Schools 578</i> <i>Mean 2.02</i> | <i>Total 153</i> <i>Schools 117</i> <i>Mean 1.31</i> | <i>Total 227</i> <i>Schools 165</i> <i>Mean 1.38</i> |

| | <i>Range 1-14</i> | <i>Range 1-5</i> | <i>Range 1-6</i> |
|--|---|--|--|
| Certified School Security Officers (SSOs) (employed by a private security company) | <i>Total 57 Schools 26 Mean 2.19 Range 1-19</i> | <i>Total 9 Schools 8 Mean 1.13 Range 1-2</i> | <i>Total 18 Schools 14 Mean 1.29 Range 1-4</i> |
| Contracted private security personnel (not SSOs) | <i>Total 60 Schools 53 Mean 1.13 Range 1-4</i> | <i>Total 7 Schools 5 Mean 1.4 Range 1-3</i> | <i>Total 15 Schools 9 Mean 1.67 Range 1-4</i> |

If you had **School Resource Officers (SROs)**

School Resource Officer (SRO) is defined in [§ 9.1-101, Code of Virginia](#), as “...a certified law enforcement officer hired by the local law enforcement agency to provide law enforcement and security services to Virginia public elementary and secondary schools.”

[§ 22.1-280.2:3](#). School boards; local law-enforcement agencies; memorandums of understanding. The school board in each school division in which the local law-enforcement agency employs school resource officers, as defined in [§ 9.1-101](#), shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with such local law-enforcement agency that sets forth the powers and duties of such school resource officers. The provisions of such memorandum of understanding shall be based on the model memorandum of understanding developed by the Virginia Center for School and Campus Safety pursuant to subdivision A 11 of [§ 9.1-184](#), which may be modified by the parties in accordance with their particular needs.

| | |
|---|---|
| 8a. How familiar are you (the principal) with the roles and expectations set out in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between your school division and the local law enforcement agency for the placement of SROs in your school? | <i>N=1,114</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Extremely familiar, 372, 33%</i> ○ <i>Moderately familiar, 472, 42%</i> ○ <i>Somewhat familiar, 170, 15%</i> ○ <i>Slightly familiar, 75, 7%</i> ○ <i>Not at all familiar, 25, 2%</i> |
| 8b. How useful is the MOU to your daily collaboration with law enforcement? | <i>N=1,114</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Extremely, 342, 31%</i> ○ <i>Moderately, 434, 39%</i> ○ <i>Somewhat, 218, 20%</i> ○ <i>Slightly, 82, 7%</i> ○ <i>Not at all, 38, 3%</i> |
| 8c. Please share any topics not covered in the MOU that you feel would be beneficial or topics you feel need more explanation/direction in the MOU? | <p><i>Responses included:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>A review of roles and responsibilities between Principal and expectations of SRO</i> ○ <i>Access to school security video footage</i> ○ <i>Active Shooter Training</i> ○ <i>Allowable interactions with students</i> ○ <i>Amount of time SRO should be in an elementary school.</i> ○ <i>Assault</i> ○ <i>Attendance roles</i> ○ <i>Best method of communication while on school grounds.</i> ○ <i>Best practices for lockdowns</i> ○ <i>Better Title IX specifics</i> ○ <i>Building relationships with students</i> ○ <i>Cases or scenarios of when SROs can step in and when they cannot.</i> ○ <i>Chain of command to complete Risk Assessments when threats are made.</i> ○ <i>Clarification when SROs communicate with families of students they are addressing.</i> ○ <i>Clearly defined rules and regulations on possession of controlled substances.</i> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Crisis management</i> ○ <i>Dealing with social media issues that occur out of school but then brought to the school building.</i> ○ <i>De-escalation</i> ○ <i>Disaster and Emergency Response</i> ○ <i>School and Personal Liability Issues</i> ○ <i>Expectations of the day-to-day routines for SRO's.</i> ○ <i>Extra-curricular activities occurring after school hours.</i> ○ <i>Future of vaping issues that are affecting schools.</i> ○ <i>How and when the police department "assumes control" over a crisis.</i> ○ <i>Incident reports</i> ○ <i>Interaction with students</i> ○ <i>Limitations to role of Police in requesting access to students.</i> ○ <i>Mental Health for students and social emotional needs</i> ○ <i>Officer's role in discipline especially when behaviors escalate.</i> ○ <i>Operational Procedures</i> ○ <i>Parent contact / SRO interviewing a student.</i> ○ <i>Parental Understanding of MOU</i> ○ <i>Peer Mediation and conflict resolution</i> ○ <i>Physical transport of young students</i> ○ <i>Processes for investigating.</i> ○ <i>Processes regarding drugs and when SROs would get involved.</i> ○ <i>Programs they can provide.</i> ○ <i>Questions surrounding the new vape laws and marijuana.</i> ○ <i>Required training for SRO and school admin together.</i> ○ <i>Role of police when inappropriate pictures are posted/sent on cell phone.</i> ○ <i>Roles of the SRO when reasonable suspicion has been met.</i> ○ <i>Sample Flowchart</i> ○ <i>School Law</i> ○ <i>Search and Seizure</i> ○ <i>Separate Grievance and Disciplinary Appeal</i> ○ <i>Special roles of the SRO in the Middle School.</i> ○ <i>Suicide</i> ○ <i>Supervision responsibilities</i> ○ <i>The role of SROs as part of the school's threat assessment team</i> ○ <i>How does FERPA apply to SROs requesting student information?</i> ○ <i>SRO's role for handling and reporting to off campus/community incidences that involve students.</i> ○ <i>SRO's role in communicating with court services regarding students.</i> ○ <i>The role SROs play when dealing with students with IEPs.</i> ○ <i>Trespassers on school grounds</i> ○ <i>When an officer might seek charges for illegal conduct at school</i> ○ <i>Should school admin report suspected abuse / neglect to police in addition to social services?</i> |
| <p>8d. For the most recently assigned SRO at your school, was the principal or assistant principal consulted in some way as part of the selection process?</p> | <p>N=1,114</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 270, 24% ○ No, 637, 57% ○ Assigned under a previous administration, 207, 19% |

| | |
|---|--|
| 8e. Please rate each of the following areas related to your school/law enforcement partnership. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication from SRO(s) to administrators | <i>N=1,114</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Very Good, 813, 73%</i> <i>Good, 219, 20%</i> <i>Acceptable, 68, 6%</i> <i>Poor, 13, 1%</i> <i>Very Poor, 1, 0%</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication from administrators to SRO(s) | <i>N=1,114</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Very Good, 842, 76%</i> <i>Good, 230, 21%</i> <i>Acceptable, 37, 3%</i> <i>Poor, 4, 0%</i> <i>Very Poor, 1, 0%</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role distinction (mutual understanding of appropriate role and duties of SRO(s)) | <i>N=1,114</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Very Good, 739, 66%</i> <i>Good, 274, 25%</i> <i>Acceptable, 87, 8%</i> <i>Poor, 13, 1%</i> <i>Very Poor, 1, 0%</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distinction between school rules and laws (mutual understanding about which infractions the SRO should and should not handle) | <i>N=1,114</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Very Good, 749, 67%</i> <i>Good, 276, 25%</i> <i>Acceptable, 73, 7%</i> <i>Poor, 12, 1%</i> <i>Very Poor, 4, 0%</i> |
| 8f. What training do you feel your SRO(s) would most benefit from? | <i>select all that apply</i> <i>N=1,114</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Working with students' mental health needs, 416, 37%</i> <i>Social-emotional needs, 400, 36%</i> <i>Working with students with disabilities, 378, 34%</i> <i>Student behavioral dynamics, 367, 33%</i> <i>Mediation, conflict resolution, and de-escalation, 217, 19%</i> <i>Cultural diversity and implicit bias, 172, 15%</i> <i>School and personal liability issues, 147, 13%</i> <i>Relationship building, 143, 13%</i> <i>Disaster, crisis, and emergency response, 138, 12%</i> <i>Interacting with Elementary age students, 137, 12%</i> <i>Mental Health First Aide, 132, 12%</i> <i>Security awareness in the school environment, 129, 12%</i> <i>Mandt, 108, 10%</i> <i>Child Protective Services procedures, 83, 7%</i> <i>DARE, 70, 6%</i> <i>Substance use disorders, 62, 6%</i> <i>MOU, 40, 4%</i> <i>State and federal laws, 28, 3%</i> <i>Other, 18, 2% (Gang awareness, Handle with Care, confidentiality, working with; middle school students, ESL students and students with Autism, time management, social media, and school or division protocols)</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>8g. Have you, the principal, or another administrator from your building, attended a DCJS SRO and Administrator Basic Course?</p> | <p><i>select all that apply</i> <i>N=1,114</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> No, no one from this building has attended an SRO Basic course of any kind, 660, 59% <input type="radio"/> Yes, I have attended, 261, 23% <input type="radio"/> Yes, another administrator has attended, 133, 12% <input type="radio"/> Someone from this building has attended a locally sponsored training not conducted by DCJS, 105, 9% |
| <p>8h. What are the benefits to having a school resource officer (SRO) in your building?</p> | <p><i>Select all that apply</i> <i>N=1,114</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Added sense of security for parents/community, 1,043, 94% <input type="radio"/> Added sense of security for staff/students, 1,036, 93% <input type="radio"/> Building positive relationships with law enforcement officer(s), 945, 85% <input type="radio"/> Positive physical presence of law enforcement, 943, 85% <input type="radio"/> Access to community information that may impact the school day, 929, 83% <input type="radio"/> Visibility/presence as crime deterrent, 917, 82% <input type="radio"/> Provide additional layer of school safety and connection with emergency services, 903, 81% <input type="radio"/> Trained first responder during a crisis, 875, 79% <input type="radio"/> Improved collaboration with law enforcement, emergency responders, parents, and the community, 852, 76% <input type="radio"/> Dedicated person to understand school-related laws and regulations, 715, 64% <input type="radio"/> Resources for legal knowledge, 705, 63% <input type="radio"/> Wellness checks at student homes, 561, 50% <input type="radio"/> Traffic control, 544, 49% <input type="radio"/> Have someone trained to deal with school-aged students as opposed to a patrol officer, 534, 48% <input type="radio"/> Education of students, 525, 47% <input type="radio"/> Conflict de-escalation and mediation, 521, 47% <input type="radio"/> DARE, 231, 21% <input type="radio"/> Attendance/truancy issues, 214, 19% <input type="radio"/> Police Athletic League contact, 54, 5% <input type="radio"/> Only present when needed, 45, 4% <input type="radio"/> Other, 7, 1% (Conduct threat assessments, mentoring-PBIS, cybersecurity and online safety, and afterschool events) |
| <p>8i. To your knowledge, how many incidents of criminal activity occurring at school, or a school-sponsored event resulted in an arrest of a student?</p> | <p><i>Total: 681</i> <i>Schools: 208</i> <i>Mean: 3.27</i> <i>Range: 1-54</i></p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">If you had SSOs</p> <p>School Security Officer (SSO) is defined in § 9.1-101, Code of Virginia, as "... an individual who is employed by the local school board or a private or religious school for the singular purpose of maintaining order and discipline, preventing crime, investigating violations of the policies of the school board or the private or religious school, and detaining students violating the law or the policies of the school board or the private or religious school on school property, school buses, or at school-sponsored events and who is responsible solely for ensuring the safety, security, and welfare of all students, faculty, staff, and visitors in the assigned school.</p> | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8k. What are the benefits to having a school security officer in your building? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Select all that apply</i> ○ <i>N=646</i> ○ <i>Added sense of security for staff and students, 603, 93%</i> ○ <i>Additional security around the building and grounds, 587, 91%</i> ○ <i>Additional adult for positive relationship building with students (student mentoring), 555, 86%</i> ○ <i>Crisis plan management/planning and conducting drills, 485, 75%</i> ○ <i>Assist with enforcement of student code of conduct/safety policies, 484, 75%</i> ○ <i>Escort of students for discipline reasons, 482, 75%</i> ○ <i>Assist with daily routines and procedures, 473, 73%</i> ○ <i>Oversee arrival and dismissal, 462, 72%</i> ○ <i>Additional student supervision, 460, 71%</i> ○ <i>Visitor monitoring and management, 449, 70%</i> ○ <i>Camera system monitoring, 446, 69%</i> ○ <i>Bus lane coverage/traffic/parking assistance, 426, 66%</i> ○ <i>Conflict de-escalation and conflict resolution, 422, 65%</i> ○ <i>Additional staff support, 403, 62%</i> ○ <i>Assist with lunch duty, 374, 58%</i> ○ <i>Positive behavior supports or recognition, 365, 57%</i> ○ <i>Additional security at after school events, 363, 56%</i> ○ <i>Student searches, 363, 56%</i> ○ <i>Physical intervention, 329, 51%</i> ○ <i>Assist with discipline interviews, 232, 36%</i> ○ <i>Community partnerships, 186, 29%</i> ○ <i>Coaching, 109, 17%</i> ○ <i>Other, 8, 1% (Assistance with security checks and metal detectors)</i> |
| If you had contracted private security personnel | |
| 8l. In what capacity are you utilizing private security personnel? | <i>Select all that apply</i> <i>N=41</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>In a School Security Officer capacity, 22, 54%</i> ○ <i>For afterhours security, 4, 10%</i> ○ <i>Other, 15, 37% (Door/visitor management and daily physical security support)</i> |
| 8m. Who hires/funds the private security personnel? | <i>N=41</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Division only, 36, 88%</i> ○ <i>School and division share responsibility, 4, 10%</i> ○ <i>County/City, 1, 2%</i> ○ <i>School only, 0, 0%</i> ○ <i>Other, 0, 0%</i> |

III. EMERGENCY PLANNING, DRILLS, AND RESPONSE

***Schools that identified as being 100% virtual (n=14) did not receive the following questions.**

School Crisis/Emergency Management/Medical Response Plan

The *Code of Virginia* [§ 22.1-279.8](#) states that “each school board shall ensure that every school that it supervises shall develop a written school crisis, emergency management, and medical response plan.”

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| DCJS has adopted the Standard Response Protocol and Standard Reunification Method for divisions, schools, and partners to utilize, free of charge and at their discretion. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Does your school utilize the Standard Response Protocol (SRP)? | <i>N=1,960</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 1,162, 59% ○ No, 178, 9% ○ I am not aware of this protocol, 620, 32% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Does your school utilize the Standard Reunification Method (SRM)? | <i>N=1,960</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 1,160, 59% ○ No, 189, 10% ○ I am not aware of this method, 611, 31% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. What method does your school utilize to train students in crisis response? | <i>select all that apply</i> <i>N=1,457</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teachers train individual classes, 1,270, 87% ○ School assembly, 475, 33% ○ Video, 373, 26% ○ Other, 230, 16% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11a. How often is this training provided? | <i>N=1,457</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As individual drills are scheduled, 992, 68% ○ Once at the beginning of the year, 179, 12% ○ Quarterly throughout the year, 131, 9% ○ Other, 155, 11% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ALL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Does your school's crisis management plan contain written procedures for the following situations? | <i>select all that apply</i> <i>N=1,960</i> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>○ Lockdown, 1,940, 99%</td> <td>○ Building/facility recovery procedures, 1,170, 60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ Active threat, 1,891, 96%</td> <td>○ Death of a student or staff member, 1,140, 58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ Evacuation, 1,877, 96%</td> <td>○ Suicide, 951, 49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ Weather-related incidents, 1,826, 93%</td> <td>○ Loss/kidnapping of a student, 938, 48%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ Shelter-in-place, 1,804, 92%</td> <td>○ Pandemic, 748, 38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ Bomb threat, 1,796, 92%</td> <td>○ Mental health recovery procedures, 745, 38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ Off-site reunification, 1,717, 88%</td> <td>○ Reverse evacuation, 694, 35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ Medical emergencies, 1,684, 86%</td> <td>○ Drug related overdoses, 690, 35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ On-site reunification, 1,548, 79%</td> <td>○ Social media emergency response, 614, 31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ Chemical spill/gas leak (hazmat), 1,483, 76%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>○ Individual emergency/safety plans for individuals with disabilities, 1,311, 67%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | ○ Lockdown, 1,940, 99% | ○ Building/facility recovery procedures, 1,170, 60% | ○ Active threat, 1,891, 96% | ○ Death of a student or staff member, 1,140, 58% | ○ Evacuation, 1,877, 96% | ○ Suicide, 951, 49% | ○ Weather-related incidents, 1,826, 93% | ○ Loss/kidnapping of a student, 938, 48% | ○ Shelter-in-place, 1,804, 92% | ○ Pandemic, 748, 38% | ○ Bomb threat, 1,796, 92% | ○ Mental health recovery procedures, 745, 38% | ○ Off-site reunification, 1,717, 88% | ○ Reverse evacuation, 694, 35% | ○ Medical emergencies, 1,684, 86% | ○ Drug related overdoses, 690, 35% | ○ On-site reunification, 1,548, 79% | ○ Social media emergency response, 614, 31% | ○ Chemical spill/gas leak (hazmat), 1,483, 76% | | ○ Individual emergency/safety plans for individuals with disabilities, 1,311, 67% | |
| ○ Lockdown, 1,940, 99% | ○ Building/facility recovery procedures, 1,170, 60% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ Active threat, 1,891, 96% | ○ Death of a student or staff member, 1,140, 58% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ Evacuation, 1,877, 96% | ○ Suicide, 951, 49% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ Weather-related incidents, 1,826, 93% | ○ Loss/kidnapping of a student, 938, 48% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ Shelter-in-place, 1,804, 92% | ○ Pandemic, 748, 38% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ Bomb threat, 1,796, 92% | ○ Mental health recovery procedures, 745, 38% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ Off-site reunification, 1,717, 88% | ○ Reverse evacuation, 694, 35% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ Medical emergencies, 1,684, 86% | ○ Drug related overdoses, 690, 35% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ On-site reunification, 1,548, 79% | ○ Social media emergency response, 614, 31% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ Chemical spill/gas leak (hazmat), 1,483, 76% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ Individual emergency/safety plans for individuals with disabilities, 1,311, 67% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Did you have to <i>activate</i> any portion of your school's crisis management plan during the 2022–2023 school year due to an <i>actual</i> critical event or emergency? | <i>N=1,960</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 860, 44% ○ No, 1,100, 56% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| If you DID activate your crisis plan | |
|--|--|
| 13a. Please select all events that occurred causing the activation of your school's crisis management plan during the 2022–2023 school year: | |
| Health-related incidents and emergencies: <i>N=34</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medical emergency on school property, 448, 52% Anaphylaxis (severe allergic reaction), 119, 14% Death or serious injury of staff or student, 107, 12% Other health-related incident on or near school property, 92, 11% Drug overdose (identify substance), 42, 5% Exposure to hazardous materials on or near school property, 32, 4% Influenza/pandemic, 20, 2% | Weather or building/power-related incidents and emergencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tornado/hurricane, 175, 20% Smoke or fire/explosion, 92, 11% Other building-related damage or power outage related emergency(ies), 91, 11% Other natural disaster or severe weather, 44, 5% Flood, 4, 0% Earthquake, 1, 0% Roof or building collapse, 1, 0% |
| Man-made incidents and emergencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other man-made incident on or near school property, 162, 19% Weapon on school property, 124, 14% Intruder/trespasser/unauthorized person(s) on school property, 114, 13% Active threat, 85, 10% Loss, disappearance, or kidnapping of a student on school property, 44, 5% Bomb threat, 43, 5% Demonstration/protest on or near school property, 24, 3% | Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unfounded incident/faulty or false alarm, 176, 20% Bus/vehicle crash, 110, 13% Other safety-related incident that affected school and is not listed above, 98, 11% Incident at another school that affected your school, 96, 11% |
| ALL | |
| 14. Did your school conduct any unannounced lockdown drills (no specific date and time of drill announced to the school community)? Lockdown is defined by REMS (Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools) as a course of action to secure school buildings and grounds during incidents that pose an immediate threat of violence in or around the school. The primary objective of a lockdown is to quickly ensure all school staff, students, and visitors are secured in the rooms away from immediate danger. | <i>N=1,960</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, 996, 51% No, 964, 49% |
| If you DID conduct unannounced lockdown drills | |
| 14a. When unannounced lockdown drills were implemented, were they identified as a drill? (e.g., "This is a drill; we are now conducting a lockdown drill.") | <i>996</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, 806, 81% No, 190, 19% |
| ALL | |
| 15. What is your primary method of notifying staff and students of a lockdown? | <i>N=1,960</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PA System, 1,771, 90% Electronic alert to cell phones or computers, 105, 5% Walkie-talkie, 42, 2% Other, 41, 2% (a combination of the above and alert bells) |

| | |
|--|---|
| 16. Did your school provide accommodations for students/staff with disabilities during all drills (lockdown, evacuation, etc.)? | N=1,960 <input type="radio"/> Yes, 1,889, 96% <input type="radio"/> No, 71, 4% |
| If you DID provide accommodations during drills | |
| 16a. What types of accommodations were made? | <i>select all that apply</i> N=1,889 <input type="radio"/> Dedicated staff/personal assistance provided by an assigned individual, 1644, 87% <input type="radio"/> Prior knowledge of drill to allow for preparation, 1636, 87% <input type="radio"/> Sensory supports (headphones, fidgets, etc.), 1260, 67% <input type="radio"/> Specialized location or route, 817, 43% <input type="radio"/> One-on-one training/preparation for students with disabilities/504 accommodations, 751, 40% <input type="radio"/> Social stories/social learning tools, 551, 29% <input type="radio"/> Additional drills/trainings/lessons, 426, 23% <input type="radio"/> Signs or cue cards to assist with communication, 363, 19% <input type="radio"/> Specialized equipment (stair lifts etc.), 277, 15% <input type="radio"/> Other, 3, 0.2% |
| ALL | |
| <p><u>§ 22.1-137.2.</u> Lock-down drills.</p> <p><i>A. In every public school there shall be a lock-down drill at least once during the first 20 school days of each school session, in order that students and teachers may be thoroughly practiced in such drills. Every public school shall hold at least one additional lock-down drill after the first 60 days of the school session. Every public school shall provide the parents of enrolled students with at least 24 hours' notice before the school conducts any lock-down drill, provided, however, that nothing in this section shall be construed to require such notice to include the exact date and time of the lock-down drill.</i></p> <p><i>B. Pre-kindergarten and kindergarten students shall be exempt from mandatory participation in lock-down drills during the first 60 days of the school session. Local school boards shall develop policies to implement such exemption. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, each pre-kindergarten and kindergarten student shall participate in each lock-down drill after the first 60 days of each school session.</i></p> | |
| 17. In addition to the two (2) required lockdown drills, did your school conduct any additional exercises with law enforcement or other first responders in 2022–2023? <i>This question is NOT asking if you conducted the 2 lockdown drills referred to above, but if you conducted any additional drills to what is required by state law.</i> | N=1,960 <input type="radio"/> Yes, 768, 39% <input type="radio"/> No, 1,192, 61% |

| If you DID conduct additional exercises | |
|--|---|
| <p>17a. What types of additional exercises were they?</p> <p><i>This question is not asking about actual events that caused you to activate your CMP but exercises you conducted for training purposes.</i></p> | <p><i>select all that apply</i> N=768</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Fire drill/evacuation, 435, 57% <input type="radio"/> Additional lockdown drills, 433, 56% <input type="radio"/> Weather-related drill (earthquake, tornado, hurricane, etc.), 332, 43% <input type="radio"/> Tabletop simulation, 194, 25% <input type="radio"/> Active shooter/threat training/scenarios, 171, 22% <input type="radio"/> Shelter-in-place, 136, 18% <input type="radio"/> K-9 Sweeps, 112, 15% <input type="radio"/> Intruder drill training, 74, 10% <input type="radio"/> Visitor management training (RAPTOR etc.), 69, 9% <input type="radio"/> Medical emergency, 63, 8% <input type="radio"/> Reverse evacuation, 53, 7% <input type="radio"/> Lecture, 36, 5% <input type="radio"/> Bomb threat, 34, 4% <input type="radio"/> Full-scale drill, 17, 2% <input type="radio"/> Other, 66, 9% |
| ALL | |
| <p>18. Could school administrators communicate directly with law enforcement/first responders via radio when inside the school building during an emergency or critical incident, if necessary?</p> | <p><i>Select all that apply</i> N=1,960</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes, we can directly communicate with outside first responders via radio or an emergency alert system with two-way communication capabilities., 1020, 52% <input type="radio"/> We communicate with the SRO via school radio and the SRO communicates directly with first responders., 784, 40% <input type="radio"/> No, we have no way to communicate directly with first responders via radio., 315, 16% |
| If you were UNABLE to communicate with law enforcement | |
| <p>18a. Why not? What prevents this communication?</p> | <p><i>select all that apply</i> N=315</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Different radio systems/frequencies, not compatible, 222, 70% <input type="radio"/> Do not have radio/do not have working radio, 41, 13% <input type="radio"/> Limitations of radio due to distance or infrastructure, 34, 11% <input type="radio"/> Division policy prohibits it, 6, 2% <input type="radio"/> Other, 31, 10% <input type="radio"/> None of the above, 14, 4% |
| ALL | |
| <p>19. Review the following list of security strategies and select those that were in place at your school during the 2022–2023 school year.</p> | <p><i>select all that apply</i> N=1,960</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> All exterior entrances to the school building or campus were locked during school hours., 1929, 98% <input type="radio"/> Visitors were required to sign in., 1920, 98% |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Main entrance of the school building or campus was secured by a controlled electronic access system (buzzer system) during school hours., 1876, 96% ○ Visitors were required to wear some form of an ID badge while on school grounds., 1801, 92% ○ Classroom windows, including door windows, could be covered to eliminate visibility into classroom., 1675, 85% ○ Staff were required to wear an ID badge while on school grounds., 1660, 85% ○ Visitors were required to participate in an electronic ID check., 1631, 83% ○ All classrooms had designated safe spaces/hard corners and students/staff were made aware of how they are to be used., 1618, 83% ○ School had crisis kits prepared, including medical and emergency plan-specific items., 1573, 80% ○ Classrooms could be locked from outside the classroom., 1554, 79% ○ Classroom doors were kept locked throughout the school day., 1529, 78% ○ Staff received training on how to initiate a lockdown., 1511, 77% ○ School had a checklist available to assist in obtaining pertinent information during a threatening call/communication (e.g., bomb threat), 1386, 71% ○ Classrooms could be locked from inside the classroom., 1144, 58% ○ Staff and students were trained in “run, hide, fight,” “avoid, deny, defend,” or some other recognized response program., 993, 51% ○ Staff were trained how to barricade rooms that cannot be locked from inside., 961, 49% ○ Staff were required to take “go kits” with them wherever they took students., 903, 46% ○ Panic buttons were present in the main office., 816, 42% ○ Door lock safety magnets were utilized., 468, 24% ○ There were panic buttons or silent alarms accessible to all staff., 439, 22% ○ Staff had access to an electronic app connecting them to first responders, 359, 18% ○ Individuals were required to pass through metal detecting equipment upon entry to the building., 175, 9% ○ Students were required to wear an ID badge while on school grounds., 161, 8% ○ Other, 43, 2% ○ None of the above, 0, 0% |
|--|---|

IV. TRAINING AND THREAT ASSESSMENT TEAMS

| | | | | |
|---|---------|------------|------------|----------|
| 20. Please select the training, program(s), or curriculum implemented or provided to each group during the 2022–2023 school year. | | | | |
| | N=1,974 | Staff | Students | Parents |
| Bullying prevention and intervention | | 1,427, 72% | 1,562, 79% | 430, 22% |
| Classroom management | | 1,798, 91% | 517, 26% | 113, 6% |
| Crisis response and mitigation | | 1,777, 90% | 819, 41% | 155, 8% |
| DARE | | 156, 8% | 413, 21% | 48, 2% |
| Discipline (Student Behavior and Administrative Response (SBAR)) | | 1,396, 71% | 454, 23% | 231, 12% |
| Gang awareness and prevention | | 291, 15% | 162, 8% | 64, 3% |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------|----------|
| Handle With Care: Law Enforcement–School Trauma Informed Communication System | 744, 38% | 70, 4% | 31, 2% |
| Mentoring | 1,273, 64% | 850, 43% | 173, 9% |
| Peer-mediation/conflict resolution | 968, 49% | 1,108, 56% | 154, 8% |
| Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) | 1,461, 74% | 1,257, 64% | 612, 31% |
| Restorative justice practices | 928, 47% | 610, 31% | 171, 9% |
| Responsive Classroom | 871, 44% | 429, 22% | 124, 6% |
| Safety Core Restraint Management | 520, 26% | 23, 1% | 4, 0% |
| Safety procedures | 1,769, 90% | 1,493, 76% | 726, 37% |
| Signs of Suicide (SOS) | 767, 39% | 331, 17% | 146, 7% |
| Social and emotional learning (SEL) | 1,630, 83% | 1,408, 71% | 570, 29% |
| Sources of Strength | 137, 7% | 103, 5% | 31, 2% |
| Stop the Bleed/Active Attack Training | 488, 25% | 37, 2% | 5, 0% |
| Substance abuse | 571, 29% | 421, 21% | 186, 9% |
| Trauma-informed care/classroom training | 1,083, 55% | 180, 9% | 43, 2% |
| Violence prevention training | 336, 17% | 97, 5% | 25, 1% |
| Other | 40, 2% | 14, 1% | 13, 1% |
| 21. Does your school participate in the “Handle With Care Law Enforcement–School Trauma Informed Communication System?” | N=1,974 <ul style="list-style-type: none">Yes, 659, 33%No, I am not aware of this program, 798, 40%No, the division does but our school decided not to participate, 7, 0%No, not at this time, 510, 26% | | |
| If you were NOT AWARE of the Handle with Care program | | | |
| 21a. Would you like a member of the DCJS team to contact you with information about the Handle with Care Law Enforcement–School Trauma Informed Communication System? | N=798 <ul style="list-style-type: none">Yes, 298, 37%No, 500, 63% | | |
| ALL | | | |
| 22. Do you feel your school is able to provide sufficient mental health support for students and staff? | N=1,974 <ul style="list-style-type: none">Yes, 1,197, 61%No, 777, 39% | | |
| If you do NOT feel your school is able to provide sufficient mental health supports | | | |
| 22a. Please rank the following issues in terms of how they limit your school’s ability to provide sufficient mental health support to students and staff. | With 1 having the most impact and 7 the least impact- Reported below is the most frequently selected ranking for each. N=777 <ul style="list-style-type: none">Lack of personnel- ranked 1st by 472 schoolsLimited funding- ranked 2nd by 288 schoolsCompeting priorities- ranked 3rd by 244 schoolsLack of accurate knowledge around mental health issues- ranked 4th by 194 schoolsLack of community support- ranked 5th by 280 schoolsWritten or unwritten policies- ranked 6th by 436 schools | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other- ranked 7th by 738 schools |
| ALL | |
| 23. Please select the 5 most needed types of school safety training by your school's administration/faculty/staff? | <p><i>select the 5 most needed.</i> N=1,974</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social/emotional interventions and supports for students, 1,229, 62% De-escalation and mediation, 1,142, 58% Mental health problem awareness and recognition, 860, 44% Trauma-informed classrooms, 783, 40% Crisis planning, prevention, mitigation, and response (to include school safety drills, bomb threat response, crisis response options, crisis intervention and recovery – all hazards), 710, 36% Social/emotional interventions and supports for staff, 609, 31% Social media (Facebook, Snapchat, TikTok, Twitter, YouTube, etc.), 557, 28% Understanding poverty's effect on learning, 511, 26% Peer relations (dating violence, bullying, bystander intervention, conflict mediation, sexual harassment, etc.), 488, 25% Substance abuse/misuse and vaping, 473, 24% Cyber safety, 453, 23% Threat assessment team training, 439, 22% Trauma-informed care, 425, 22% Diversity and inclusion, 416, 21% Effects of screen time on learning, 374, 19% Violence prevention training (including fighting, armed intruder, active shooter, other school violence), 254, 13% Suicide prevention, intervention and postvention, 232, 12% Role of safety and security personnel (SROs and/or SSOs), 116, 6% Human trafficking, 54, 3% None of the above, 6, 0% Other, 6, 0% (Gang awareness and prevention, MTSS strategies, and creating strong classroom communities) |

Since 2013, and in accordance with [§ 22.1-79.4](#), threat assessment teams are legislatively mandated in Virginia for all public schools for grades K-12. Each division superintendent shall establish, for each school, a threat assessment team that shall include persons with expertise in counseling, instruction, school administration, and law enforcement and, in the case of any school in which a school resource officer is employed, at least one such school resource officer. Threat assessment teams may be established to serve one or more schools as determined by the division superintendent. It is also mandated that each team:

- Provide guidance to students, faculty, and staff regarding recognition of threatening or aberrant behavior that may represent a threat to the community, school, or self.
- Identify members of the school community to whom threatening behavior should be reported; and
- Implement school board policies for the assessment of and intervention with individuals whose behavior poses a threat to the safety of school staff or students.

To assist schools in explaining threat assessment and reporting to students, parents, and staff, VCSCS launched **Virginia C.A.R.E.S.** Virginia C.A.R.E.S. is a multi-pronged approach to engagement and awareness in schools that includes videos and resources on threat assessment. The campaign works to build **Caring, Awareness, Recognition, Engagement, and Support** in Virginia schools. The Virginia C.A.R.E.S. framework recognizes that threat assessment and management is

one part of a larger and on-going approach to supporting and enhancing school and campus safety. The health, safety, and well-being of students and staff in schools is sustained and enhanced through a comprehensive approach.

In addition to requiring the establishment of threat assessment teams, the *Code of Virginia* [§ 22.1-79.4](#) also instructs that “Each threat assessment team established pursuant to this section shall report quantitative data on its activities according to guidance developed by the Department of Criminal Justice Services.”

The questions in this section should be answered in consultation with a knowledgeable member of your threat assessment team.

Threat Assessment Team

The *Code of Virginia* [§ 22.1-79.4](#) section C states, “Each division superintendent shall establish, for each school, a threat assessment team that **shall include persons with expertise in counseling, instruction, school administration, and law enforcement** *and, in the case of any school in which a school resource officer is employed, at least one such school resource officer.* Threat assessment teams may be established to serve one or more schools as determined by the division superintendent.”

| | |
|--|--|
| 24. Tell us about your threat assessment team. | <p>N=1,974</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Our school/program has its own threat assessment team (including use of part-time shared individuals), 1885, 95% ○ Threats at our school/program (tech centers, partial day programs, alternative centers, etc.) go to the student’s home/base school team, 43, 2% ○ Threats go to a collaborative school-level threat assessment team serving multiple schools (do not include if your school shares part-time individuals i.e., psychologist), 36, 2% ○ All threats go to a division-wide threat assessment team, 10, 1% |
|--|--|

24a. How did your school/team satisfy each of the required areas of expertise on your threat assessment team?

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Counseling expertise: | <p>N=1,974</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School counselor of student being assessed, 1,350, 68% ○ School Psychologist, 1,077, 55% ○ School Social Worker, 1,019, 52% ○ Any school counselor available, 673, 34% ○ Dedicated school counselor (serves on all assessments), 510, 26% ○ School counselor from another school (student’s homeschool etc.), 48, 2% ○ Community Service Board member, 29, 1% ○ Other mental health professional (Life Counselor, Student Support Counselor etc.), 190, 10% |
| Instructional expertise: | <p>N=1,974</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher of the student being assessed, 1,293, 66% ○ Administrator that was previously a teacher, 834, 42% ○ Dedicated teacher (serves on all assessments), 195, 10% ○ Any teacher available, 170, 9% ○ Someone else with instructional expertise, 91, 5% |
| School administration expertise: | <p>N=1,974</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Principal, 1,277, 65% ○ Assistant principal of student being assessed, 1,132, 57% ○ Any administrator available, 775, 39% ○ Dedicated administrator (serves on all assessments), 209, 11% ○ Someone else with administrative experience, 60, 3% |

| | | | |
|---|--|-----------|-------------------|
| Law enforcement expertise: | <i>N=1,974</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ <i>SRO assigned to your school, 1,481, 75%</i>○ <i>SRO from a neighboring school, 462, 23%</i>○ <i>LE from some other source (describe), 188, 10%</i> | | |
| 25. In 2022–2023, how did your school make the following groups aware of how to recognize and report threatening or aberrant behavior? <i>select all that apply</i> | | | |
| | Students | Staff | Parents/Guardians |
| Back-to-School Night | 462, 23% | 411, 21% | 721, 37% |
| By classroom or small group | 1528, 77% | 834, 42% | 120, 6% |
| Email/text | 348, 18% | 766, 39% | 696, 35% |
| Faculty/staff meeting | 181, 9% | 1740, 88% | 28, 1% |
| Handbook/Code of Conduct | 1438, 73% | 1536, 78% | 1392, 71% |
| In-service/professional development | 131, 7% | 1342, 68% | 21, 1% |
| Instructional video | 274, 14% | 524, 27% | 68, 3% |
| Other written format (brochure/letter) | 225, 11% | 293, 15% | 373, 19% |
| School assembly | 845, 43% | 472, 24% | 43, 2% |
| Via counseling services | 903, 46% | 366, 19% | 274, 14% |
| Website/social media | 483, 24% | 496, 25% | 648, 33% |
| With individuals as needed | 1257, 64% | 1099, 56% | 1001, 51% |
| Other (<i>describe</i>) | 21, 1% | 19, 1% | 1941, 98% |
| Did not inform | 10, 1% | 6, 0% | 29, 1% |

Threat Reporting Procedures

| | |
|---|---|
| 26. Is your threat assessment team, along with your school counselor or school psychologist as part of the team, involved with the assessment and action plans in threats of suicide/self-harm? | <i>N=1,974</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Yes, 1,836, 93%</i> ○ <i>No, 138, 7%</i> |
|---|---|

If threats of suicide/self-harm were **NOT** reported to the threat assessment team

| | |
|--|---|
| 26a. Since your threat assessment team is not typically involved with threats of suicide/self-harm, who handles these threats? | <i>select all that apply</i> <i>N=138</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>School counselor, 123, 89%</i> ○ <i>Administrators, 60, 43%</i> ○ <i>School psychologist/social worker, 49, 36%</i> ○ <i>Other counseling services (i.e., life counselor, student support counselor, etc.), 20, 14%</i> ○ <i>School nurse, 17, 12%</i> ○ <i>SRO, 15, 11%</i> ○ <i>Outside entity (i.e., community service board, law enforcement, etc.), 8, 6%</i> ○ <i>Division representative (i.e., Students Support Specialist, etc.), 5, 4%</i> ○ <i>Other, 11, 8%</i> |
|--|---|

| ALL | |
|---|---|
| 27. To whom has your school provided suicide awareness training? | <i>Select all that apply</i> N=1,974 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff, 1,398, 71% ○ Students, 466, 24% ○ Parents/guardians, 258, 13% ○ None of the above, 523, 26% |
| 28. Does your school utilize a standard suicide prevention screening tool? | N=1,974 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 1,641, 83% ○ No, 333, 17% |
| 29. Are threats of suicide reported to outside health care personnel? | N=1,974 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 1,262, 64% ○ No, 712, 36% |
| 30. Does your school have a method for threatening/aberrant behavior to be anonymously reported? | (Note: In-person reporting is not considered anonymous/confidential.) N=1,974 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 1,410, 71% ○ No, 564, 29% |
| If you HAVE a method for anonymous reporting | |
| 30a. What kind of anonymous reporting methods were available at your school for reporting threats/aberrant behavior? Note: In-person reporting is not considered anonymous. | <i>select all that apply</i> N=1,410 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Web-based tip line or phone app (provided by division), 953, 68% ○ Written (e.g., note, comment box), 548, 39% ○ Phone-based hotline, 514, 36% ○ Web-based tip line or phone app (school-based), 173, 12% ○ None, 19, 1% |
| ALL | |
| 31. How did your school monitor student social media usage (i.e., Facebook, Twitter, TikTok, etc.) to detect and mitigate potential threats and other safety issues? | <i>select all that apply</i> N=1,974 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Did not have a specific monitoring process; we addressed as needed, 1,330, 67% ○ Someone at the division level was responsible for monitoring (i.e., it was assigned as a job-related task), 418, 21% ○ Local law enforcement agency monitored and shared appropriate information as needed, 313, 16% ○ Contracted with a third party that scanned/monitored student social media, 274, 14% ○ Someone at the school level was responsible for monitoring (i.e., it was assigned as a job-related task), 127, 6% |
| If you CONTRACTED WITH A THIRD PARTY to monitor student social media usage | |
| 31a. What is the name of the third party with whom you contracted? | <i>Responses included: BARK For Schools, Beacon Alert, Blocks!, contracted at the division level, Deledao, Fairfax County Police, Gaggle, Go Guardian, I'm not sure, Lightspeed Systems, Media Donar /Flash Point, N/A, Navidgate360 Detect, Our SRO contacted social networks directly when</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <i>there were issues that required an investigation., Raptor, SafeMail, Securely, SpeakUp, Stopit, The Sandy Hook Initiative, and See Something Say Something.</i> |
| 31b. Tell us about your experience with this system. (Was it effective and useful? Did the contract yield good information that was helpful in averting violence and other disruptive situations?) | <i>Responses included: Effective, helpful, did not utilize, useful, responsive, false alarms are better than not knowing, and timely.</i> |
| ALL | |
| 32. Where were the primary threat assessment records (such as <i>Threat Assessment and Response Reports</i>) stored during 2022–2023? | <i>select all that apply</i> <i>N=1,974</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>With school administrator's file/threat assessment team, 1,207, 61%</i> ○ <i>At the division office (central office), 585, 30%</i> ○ <i>With counseling records, 519, 26%</i> ○ <i>Secure digital database, 434, 22%</i> ○ <i>File room/vault separate from student cumulative record, 384, 19%</i> ○ <i>With law enforcement unit records (as allowed by Family Education Rights and Privacy Act), 58, 3%</i> ○ <i>With special education case manager, 45, 2%</i> ○ <i>Health or nurse files, 29, 1%</i> ○ <i>Not applicable (no cases in 2022–2023), 61, 3%</i> ○ <i>Other, 21, 1%</i> |
| 33. Select the top three kinds of training or technical assistance that DCJS could provide to help improve your threat assessment (TA) process? | |
| <i>select the top 3</i> <i>N=1,974</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Training for new staff, 751, 38%</i> ○ <i>Mental health training (recognition and understanding) to include trauma responses for staff, 677, 34%</i> ○ <i>Recognition of threats, threat types, and behavioral red flags, 651, 33%</i> ○ <i>Level of threat training, when to conduct a TA (how to respond to various threat levels, when a low-level threat requires a TA), 552, 28%</i> ○ <i>Case studies, scenario training (social media, harm to self, harm to others), 497, 25%</i> ○ <i>Refresher training and review, 443, 22%</i> ○ <i>Social media monitoring and intervention, 345, 17%</i> ○ <i>Elementary student TAs, 318, 16%</i> ○ <i>Mental health training for students, 316, 16%</i> ○ <i>Suicide prevention, ideation, threat assessment for suicide threat, 297, 15%</i> ○ <i>Social media prevention and supports, 243, 12%</i> ○ <i>Online training in threat assessment, 242, 12%</i> ○ <i>Use of threat assessment findings, 205, 10%</i> ○ <i>Case management and record keeping, 183, 9%</i> ○ <i>Multiple TAs with same student, 171, 9%</i> ○ <i>Specific threat assessment-related topics, 119, 6%</i> ○ <i>Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 97, 5%</i> ○ <i>Violence prevention/reaction and gang awareness, 92, 5%</i> ○ <i>Virtual threat assessments, 47, 2%</i> ○ <i>Regional training with other divisions, 26, 1%</i> ○ <i>Other, 18, 1%</i> ○ <i>None, 33, 2%</i> | |
| 34. What were the three biggest challenges to your threat assessment teams or in conducting threat assessments (TA)? | |
| <i>select the top 3</i> <i>N=1,974</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Competing priorities/time, 787, 40%</i> ○ <i>Managing threat cases over time, 322, 16%</i> | |

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Determining level of threat (when does an act become a threat, how to determine a threat's appropriate level, what constitutes a threat), 588, 30%</i> ○ <i>Length of documentation, 471, 24%</i> ○ <i>Parent follow through, 452, 23%</i> ○ <i>Follow up resources/interventions, 431, 22%</i> ○ <i>Team coordination (managing team member schedules, availability to meet in a timely manner), 400, 20%</i> ○ <i>Conducting thorough TA/review/debrief in a timely manner, 371, 19%</i> ○ <i>Limited staff and staff turnover/retention, 356, 18%</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Understanding the function of threat assessments vs. discipline, 264, 13%</i> ○ <i>Training for new staff and for team members, 261, 13%</i> ○ <i>Conducting reviews and updates, 251, 13%</i> ○ <i>Loss of instructional time, 239, 12%</i> ○ <i>Consistency in division-wide practices, 157, 8%</i> ○ <i>Threat assessment training resources, 135, 7%</i> ○ <i>Transferring students between schools, 84, 4%</i> ○ <i>Privacy issues (FERPA, outside team members maintaining student confidentiality requirements), 53, 3%</i> ○ <i>Other, 33, 2%</i> ○ <i>None, 80, 4%</i> |
|---|---|

V. THREAT ASSESSMENT CASE REPORTING

Threat Assessments Conducted in 2022–2023

For the next series of questions, we want to know about the assessment(s) conducted by your school's threat assessment team, **and not included in any other school/programs threat records.**

Report the number of cases regardless of their risk classification

– Use the following definitions:

- **Threatened others only:** *threatened harm, posed harm to, or was perceived as posing harm to someone other than self BUT DID NOT threaten suicide or self-harm*
- **Threatened other(s) and self:** *threatened harm, posed harm to, or was perceived as posing harm to someone other than self AND threatened suicide or self-harm, or was perceived as suicidal or posing harm to self*
- **Threatened self only:** *threatened suicide or self-harm, or was perceived as suicidal or posing harm to self BUT DID NOT threaten others nor were they perceived as a threat to others*

35. Approximately how many threat assessment meetings were held in 2022–2023 for the following tasks?
Please answer with a number for each type of meeting listed.

| | |
|--|--|
| To assess reports of aberrant or concerning behavior (at least 2 members) | Total: 9,786 Schools: 1,110 Mean: 8.82 Range: 1-110 |
| To assess reports of actual threats made against self or others (at least 2 members) | Total: 23,251 Schools: 1,659 Mean: 14.02 Range: 1-245 |
| For debrief when event occurred without precipitating information (no opportunity to conduct threat assessment prior to event) | Total: 3,533 Schools: 571 Mean: 6.19 Range: 1-69 |
| For administrative reasons: organization, process discussion, training, or practice | Total: 4,892 Schools: 935 Mean: 5.23 Range: 1-182 |

For the meetings held for reports of **ABERRANT OR CONCERNING BEHAVIOR**

35a. Enter the number of assessments conducted based on the individual that exhibited the aberrant or concerning behavior (if there were none, enter 0).

- *If no threat assessment cases involved persons from a listed group or threats of a certain type, enter 0 for number of threat assessment cases conducted.*
- *SUM your responses by type of group (add each row's entries and provide sum) and SUM your responses by type of threat (add each column's entries and provide sum).*

| Type of Group | Exhibited aberrant/concerning behavior towards others only | Exhibited aberrant/concerning behavior towards self only (aka, known as risk-assessment) | Exhibited aberrant/concerning behavior towards both self and other(s) | SUM |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| a. Student from your school exhibited the behavior | Total: 5,693 Schools: 869 Mean: 6.55 Range: 1-73 | Total: 5,153 Schools: 599 Mean: 8.60 Range: 1-245 | Total: 1,059 Schools: 303 Mean: 3.50 Range: 1-43 | Total: 10,222 Schools: 1,061 Mean: 4.55 Range: 1-255 |
| b. Student not from your school exhibited the behavior | Total: 35 Schools: 22 Mean: 1.59 Range: 1-10 | Total: 23 Schools: 7 Mean: 3.29 Range: 1-10 | Total: 24 Schools: 9 Mean: 2.67 Range: 1-10 | Total: 55 Schools: 32 Mean: 1.42 Range: 1-6 |
| c. Student formerly from your school exhibited the behavior | Total: 18 Schools: 15 Mean: 1.2 Range: 1-3 | Total: 1 Schools: 1 Mean: 1 Range: 1 | Total: 7 Schools: 6 Mean: 1.17 Range: 1-2 | Total: 26 Schools: 20 Mean: 1.20 Range: 1-3 |
| d. Faculty/staff currently employed by your school exhibited the behavior | Total: 7 Schools: 7 Mean: 1 Range: 1 | Total: 15 Schools: 10 Mean: 1.5 Range: 1-3 | Total: 3 Schools: 3 Mean: 1 Range: | Total: 25 Schools: 16 Mean: 1.40 Range: 1-3 |
| e. Faculty/staff formerly employed by your school exhibited the behavior | Total: 5 Schools: 5 Mean: 1 Range: 1 | Total: 1 Schools: 1 Mean: 1 Range: 1 | Total: 2 Schools: 2 Mean: 1 Range: 1 | Total: 8 Schools: 7 Mean: 1.10 Range: 1-2 |
| f. Parent/guardian of a student exhibited the behavior | Total: 55 Schools: 37 Mean: 1.49 Range: 1-5 | Total: 10 Schools: 3 Mean: 3.33 Range: 1-5 | Total: 5 Schools: 3 Mean: 1.67 Range: 1-2 | Total: 70 Schools: 42 Mean: 1.42 Range: 1-5 |
| g. Someone else exhibited the behavior (<i>not a student, parent, or faculty</i>) | Total: 25 Schools: 13 Mean: 1.92 Range: 1-5 | Total: 0 Schools: 0 Mean: 0 Range: 0 | Total: 5 Schools: 3 Mean: 1.67 Range: 1-3 | Total: 30 Schools: 14 Mean: 1.60 Range: 1-7 |

| ENTER TOTAL (SUM of items a–g) | <i>Total: 5,838 Schools: 968 Mean: 3.40 Range: 1-73</i> | <i>Total: 5,203 Schools: 621 Mean: 3.70 Range: 1-245</i> | <i>Total: 1,105 Schools: 329 Mean: 2.05 Range: 1-43</i> | <i>Total: 12,146 Schools: 1,072 Mean: 5.54 Range: 1-255</i> |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| For the meetings held for reports of ACTUAL THREATS MADE | | | | |
| <p>35b. Enter the number of assessments conducted based on the individual that made the threat (if there were none, enter 0).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If no threat assessment cases involved persons from a listed group or threats of a certain type, enter 0 for number of threat assessment cases conducted.</i> <p><i>SUM your responses by type of group (add each row's entries and provide sum), and SUM your responses by type of threat (add each column's entries and provide sum).</i></p> | | | | |
| Type of Group | Threatened other(s) only | Threatened self only | Threatened both self and other(s) | SUM |
| a. Student from your school made the threat | <i>Total: 11,508 Schools: 1,361 Mean: 8.46 Range: 1-180</i> | <i>Total: 11,006 Schools: 975 Mean: 11.29 Range: 1-245</i> | <i>Total: 1,263 Schools: 423 Mean: 2.99 Range: 1-37</i> | <i>Total: 23,777 Schools: 1,603 Mean: 7.39 Range: 1-255</i> |
| b. Student not from your school made the threat | <i>Total: 49 Schools: 32 Mean: 1.53 Range: 1-10</i> | <i>Total: 61 Schools: 4 Mean: 15.25 Range: 1-54</i> | <i>Total: 16 Schools: 4 Mean: 4 Range: 1-10</i> | <i>Total: 126 Schools: 39 Mean: 1.52 Range: 1-54</i> |
| c. Student formerly from your school made the threat | <i>Total: 20 Schools: 13 Mean: 1.54 Range: 1-5</i> | <i>Total: 7 Schools: 3 Mean: 2.33 Range: 2-3</i> | <i>Total: 4 Schools: 3 Mean: 1.33 Range: 1-2</i> | <i>Total: 31 Schools: 16 Mean: 1.44 Range: 1-9</i> |
| d. Faculty/staff currently employed by your school made the threat | <i>Total: 17 Schools: 11 Mean: 1.55 Range: 1-5</i> | <i>Total: 14 Schools: 10 Mean: 1.4 Range: 1-2</i> | <i>Total: 4 Schools: 3 Mean: 1.33 Range: 1-2</i> | <i>Total: 35 Schools: 20 Mean: 1.49 Range: 1-5</i> |
| e. Faculty/staff formerly employed by your school made the threat | <i>Total: 4 Schools: 4 Mean: 1 Range: 1</i> | <i>Total: 4 Schools: 3 Mean: 1.33 Range: 1-2</i> | <i>Total: 1 Schools: 1 Mean: 1 Range: 1</i> | <i>Total: 9 Schools: 7 Mean: 1.22 Range: 1-4</i> |
| f. Parent/guardian of a student made the threat | <i>Total: 49 Schools: 37 Mean: 1.32 Range: 1-4</i> | <i>Total: 0 Schools: 0 Mean: 0 Range: 0</i> | <i>Total: 2 Schools: 2 Mean: 1 Range: 1</i> | <i>Total: 51 Schools: 39 Mean: 1.21 Range: 1-4</i> |
| g. Someone else made the threat (<i>not a student, parent, or faculty</i>) | <i>Total: 14 Schools: 14 Mean: 1 Range: 1</i> | <i>Total: 0 Schools: 0 Mean: 0 Range: 0</i> | <i>Total: 1 Schools: 1 Mean: 1 Range: 1</i> | <i>Total: 15 Schools: 15 Mean: 1 Range: 1</i> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ENTER TOTAL (SUM of items a–g) | <i>Total: 11,661 Schools: 1,472 Mean: 4.36 Range: 1-180</i> | <i>Total: 11,092 Schools: 995 Mean: 5.09 Range: 1-245</i> | <i>Total: 1,291 Schools: 437 Mean: 1.95 Range: 1-37</i> | <i>Total: 24,044 Schools: 1,607 Mean: 7.50 Range: 1-255</i> |
| If you had threats made by CURRENT OR FORMER FACULTY | | | | |
| 35c. Please explain the threats made by current or former faculty. | | N=21 <input type="radio"/> Threatened self-harm, 7, 37% <input type="radio"/> Threatened students, 5, 26% <input type="radio"/> Threats to staff members, 5, 26% <input type="radio"/> General threat, 2, 11% | | |
| If you had threats made by PARENTS OR GUARDIANS | | | | |
| 35d. Please explain the threats made by parents or guardians. | | N=37 <input type="radio"/> Threats to staff members, 22, 59% <input type="radio"/> Threatened students, 12, 32% <input type="radio"/> General threat, 3, 8% <input type="radio"/> Threatened self-harm, 1, 3% <input type="radio"/> Threat to family member, 1, 3% | | |
| If you had threats made by “someone else” | | | | |
| 35e. Please describe the relationship of this person or these persons, if any, to your school. | | N=14 <input type="radio"/> Anonymous/unknown, 4, 29% <input type="radio"/> Community Member, 2, 14% <input type="radio"/> Former student, 2, 14% <input type="radio"/> Boyfriend of a student, 1, 7% <input type="radio"/> Estranged boyfriend of current student., 1, 7% <input type="radio"/> Estranged boyfriend of the mother of a current student, 1, 7% <input type="radio"/> Parent, 1, 7% <input type="radio"/> Spouse of employee, 1, 7% <input type="radio"/> Student from another school, 1, 7% | | |
| 35f. Please explain the threats made by these individuals. | | N=27 <input type="radio"/> General threat, 14, 52% <input type="radio"/> Threats to students, 10, 37% <input type="radio"/> Social media threat, 8, 30% <input type="radio"/> Threats of self-harm, 2, 7% <input type="radio"/> Threats to staff, 1, 4% | | |
| If you conducted ANY threat assessments this year (this includes reports of aberrant behavior as well as actual threats) | | | | |
| 35g. Of the threat assessment(s) conducted by your school in 2022–2023, how many initial threat assessments were conducted within the following time intervals of the threat being received by the threat assessment team (TAT)? | | | | |
| Conducted within 1 hour of receipt by TAT | | | | Total: 13,465 |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <i>Schools: 900 Mean: 14.96 Range: 1-230</i> |
| Conducted between 1 and 24 hours of receipt by TAT | <i>Total: 16,211 Schools: 1,199 Mean: 13.52 Range: 1-207</i> |
| Conducted 24 hours or more after receipt by TAT | <i>Total: 1,428 Schools: 277 Mean: 5.16 Range: 1-69</i> |
| Conducted post-incident as there was no (TAT)? knowledge of threat | <i>Total: 504 Schools: 124 Mean: 4.06 Range: 1-97</i> |
| 35h. Of the threat assessment(s) conducted by your school in 2022–2023, how were the reports of aberrant behavior or threats made? | |
| Reported by parent or guardian | <i>Total: 1,537 Schools: 553 Mean: 2.78 Range: 1-48</i> |
| Reported by staff member | <i>Total: 15,940 Schools: 1,423 Mean: 11.20 Range: 1-178</i> |
| Reported by student | <i>Total: 12,528 Schools: 1,222 Mean: 10.25 Range: 1-250</i> |
| Found through social media monitoring | <i>Total: 1,005 Schools: 224 Mean: 4.49 Range: 1-81</i> |
| Reported anonymously | <i>Total: 598 Schools: 116 Mean: 5.16 Range: 1-62</i> |
| 35i. How many individual students were the subject of threat assessment cases? (This may or may not equal the number of threats; if there were two students involved in one threat case this would count as 2 students; if a student was involved in more than one threat they would only count once) Numeric responses only. Include all threat levels. | <i>Total: 27,092 Schools: 1,671 Mean: 16.21 Range: 1-850</i> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>35j. How many of the students that were subjects of threat assessment cases were involved in more than one threat assessment case? <i>Numeric responses only. Include all threat levels.</i></p> | <p><i>Total: 4,391 Schools: 1,009 Mean: 4.35 Range: 1-99</i></p> | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Priority Level/Classification System</p> <p>Priority 1 (Critical/Imminent): Subject poses an imminent threat of serious violence or harm to self or others and has or may reasonably have significant impact on others. Requires immediate law enforcement and school administration notification, subject containment, target protection and safety planning, implementation of crisis response and notification protocols, ongoing assessment and management plan, and active monitoring.</p> <p>Priority 2 (High): Subject poses, or is rapidly developing capability for, a threat of serious violence or harm to self or others, or is in urgent need of hospitalization or treatment. Targets/others are impacted. Typically involves environmental/systemic factors and consideration for precipitating events. Requires immediate notification of school administration and law enforcement, subject containment, target protection and safety plan, activation of crisis response protocols as appropriate, ongoing assessment and management plan, and active monitoring. Referrals as appropriate.</p> <p>Priority 3 (Moderate): Subject does not pose a threat of serious violence or harm, though risk cannot be ruled out. Subject may be developing capability for harm and is engaging in aberrant or concerning behaviors that indicate need for assistance/intervention. Targets/others likely concerned and impacted. Environmental/systemic or precipitating factors may be present. Consider law enforcement/security notification as appropriate. Requires ongoing assessment and management plan, and active monitoring. Referrals as appropriate.</p> <p>Priority 4 (Low): Subject does not indicate a threat of violence or harm to self or others; would or may benefit from intervention or assistance with concerns. Target, environmental/systemic, or precipitating events may be present at low levels. May involve some ongoing assessment management with passive monitoring and/or periodic active monitoring, Referrals as appropriate; close case if no team interventions or monitoring indicated.</p> <p>Priority 5 (Routine/No Known Concerns): Subject does not indicate a threat of violence or harm to self or others, or need for assistance or intervention at this time (or at the time of the assessment). No impact on others, environmental factors, or precipitants that need team intervention. Close case.</p> | | |
| <p>35k. How many of the threat assessment cases conducted at your school in 2022–2023 were classified at the following levels?</p> | | |
| | <p>Number of assessments conducted PRIOR to any event in order to prevent threatened actions/behaviors</p> | <p>Number of assessments conducted AFTER an event as a debrief in order to prevent threatened actions/behaviors</p> |
| <p>Priority 1 (Critical/Imminent): Subject poses an imminent threat of serious violence or harm to self or others</p> | <p><i>Total: 968 Schools: 330 Mean: 2.93 Range: 1-33</i></p> | <p><i>Total: 170 Schools: 78 Mean: 2.18 Range: 1-15</i></p> |
| <p>Priority 2 (High): Subject poses, or is rapidly developing capability for, a threat of serious violence or harm to self or others</p> | <p><i>Total: 1,871 Schools: 587 Mean: 3.19 Range: 1-51</i></p> | <p><i>Total: 373 Schools: 149 Mean: 2.50 Range: 1-16</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Priority 3 (Moderate): Subject does not pose a threat of serious violence or harm, though risk cannot be ruled out | <i>Total: 4,050 Schools: 863 Mean: 4.69 Range: 1-84</i> | <i>Total: 698 Schools: 208 Mean: 3.36 Range: 1-17</i> |
| Priority 4 (Low): Subject does not indicate a threat of violence or harm to self or others; would or may benefit from intervention or assistance | <i>Total: 10,387 Schools: 1,141 Mean: 9.10 Range: 1-106</i> | <i>Total: 2,117 Schools: 259 Mean: 8.17 Range: 1-98</i> |
| Priority 5 (Routine/No Known Concerns): Subject does not indicate a threat of violence or harm to self or others at this time (or at the time of the assessment) | <i>Total: 8,253 Schools: 724 Mean: 11.40 Range: 1-194</i> | <i>Total: 1,342 Schools: 177 Mean: 7.58 Range: 1-50</i> |
| 35l. Does your school use a metric to classify threats other than Priority 1–5 above? | <i>N=1,814</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 328, 18% ○ No, 1,486, 82% | |
| 35m. How many of the threat assessment cases conducted PRIOR to any event, resulted in an act of harm to self or others ultimately occurring at each of the following levels? | | |
| | Number occurring | |
| Priority 1 (Critical/Imminent): Subject poses an imminent threat of serious violence or harm to self or others | <i>Total: 121 Schools: 64 Mean: 1.89 Range: 1-20</i> | |
| Priority 2 (High): Subject poses, or is rapidly developing capability for, a threat of serious violence or harm to self or others | <i>Total: 144 Schools: 72 Mean: 2 Range: 1-18</i> | |
| Priority 3 (Moderate): Subject does not pose a threat of serious violence or harm, though risk cannot be ruled out | <i>Total: 439 Schools: 119 Mean: 3.70 Range: 1-20</i> | |
| Priority 4 (Low): Subject does not indicate a threat of violence or harm to self or others; would or may benefit from intervention or assistance | <i>Total: 1,612 Schools: 174 Mean: 9.26 Range: 1-93</i> | |
| Priority 5 (Routine/No Known Concerns): Subject does not indicate a threat of violence or harm to self or others at this time (or at the time of the assessment) | <i>Total: 1,297 Schools: 109 Mean: 11.90 Range: 1-124</i> | |
| <p>Please provide a brief description of EACH Priority 1 Case where an act of harm to self or others occurred after a threat assessment was conducted and steps were taken to avert the threat.</p> <p>The following questions will be asked for each case reported in question 35l.</p> | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| The type of act(s) that was threatened | <p><i>select all that apply</i> N=96</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suicide/self-harm, 73, 76% ○ General harm to others, 19, 20% ○ Fight/assault, 14, 15% ○ Weapon(s) use, 7, 7% ○ Homicide, 1, 1% ○ Bomb/arson, 0, 0% ○ Other, 0, 0% |
| What steps were taken to try to prevent the act? | <p><i>select all that apply</i> N=96</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parent contact, 91, 95% ○ Mental health service recommendation, 77, 80% ○ Counseling (by school or outside service), 77, 80% ○ School Resource Officer contact, 58, 60% ○ De-escalation, 57, 59% ○ Safety plan, 56, 58% ○ Hospitalized for assessment, 42, 44% ○ Community services board contact, 28, 29% ○ Sent to a residential treatment facility, 25, 26% ○ Transferred to alternative education placement or home-based instruction, 22, 23% ○ Nurse consultation, 20, 21% ○ Monitor social media, 5, 5% ○ Other (describe, 5, 5% |
| The actual act(s) of harm to self or others that took place: | <p><i>select all that apply</i> N=96</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attempted Suicide/self-harm: Cutting, 46, 48% ○ Attempted Suicide/self-harm: Other, 39, 41% ○ Fight/assault, 21, 22% ○ Attempted Suicide/self-harm: Overdose, 13, 14% ○ Use or intimidation with weapon(s), 11, 11% ○ Attempted Suicide/self-harm: Strangulation/suffocation, 6, 6% ○ Completed Suicide/self-harm: Other, 1, 1% ○ Homicide, 0, 0% ○ Other, 2, 2% |
| Did the actual act take place on school grounds or at a school-sponsored event? | <p>N=96</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 48, 50% ○ No, 48, 50% |
| Was a student from your school the primary initiator of the event? | <p>N=96</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 91, 95% ○ Yes; however, there was more than one student considered primary, 0, 0% ○ No, 5, 5% |
| Was this student or students recommended to undergo a clinical assessment conducted by a community-based or private | <p><i>Please answer for each primary student(s) (up to 5)</i> N=91</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, recommended and underwent the assessment, 75, 82% ○ Yes, recommended but did not undergo the assessment, 7, 8% ○ No recommendation was made, 9, 10% |

| | |
|--|---|
| licensed mental health professional? | |
| After what period of time was the student able to continue attending your school? | <p><i>Please answer for each primary student (up to 5)</i></p> <p><i>N=91</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>After hospitalization, 21, 23%</i> ○ <i>11-45 school days, 12, 13%</i> ○ <i>Immediately, 12, 13%</i> ○ <i>After assessment completed and/or plan written, 9, 10%</i> ○ <i>10 school days, 8, 9%</i> ○ <i>Placed on home-based status for the remainder of the year, 7, 8%</i> ○ <i>More than 45 school days, 5, 5%</i> ○ <i>3 school days, 3, 3%</i> ○ <i>After alternative school placement (Please note how long), 3, 3%</i> ○ <i>Student transferred or unenrolled, 3, 3%</i> ○ <i>5 school days, 2, 2%</i> ○ <i>Expelled for 364 days, 2, 2%</i> ○ <i>Unable to return due to death, 1, 1%</i> ○ <i>Other (describe), 3, 3%</i> |
| <p>Please provide a brief description of EACH Priority 2 Case where an act of harm to self or others occurred after a threat assessment was conducted and steps were taken to avert the threat.</p> <p>The following questions will be asked for each case reported in question 35l.</p> | |
| The type of act(s) that was threatened | <p><i>select all that apply</i></p> <p><i>N=107</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Suicide/self-harm, 50, 47%</i> ○ <i>General harm to others, 43, 40%</i> ○ <i>Fight/assault, 30, 28%</i> ○ <i>Weapon(s) use, 8, 7%</i> ○ <i>Bomb/arson, 2, 2%</i> ○ <i>Homicide, 0, 0%</i> ○ <i>Other, 0, 0%</i> |
| What steps were taken to try to prevent the act? | <p><i>select all that apply</i></p> <p><i>N=107</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Parent contact, 101, 94%</i> ○ <i>Counseling (by school or outside service), 78, 73%</i> ○ <i>De-escalation, 68, 64%</i> ○ <i>Safety plan, 64, 60%</i> ○ <i>School Resource Officer contact, 54, 50%</i> ○ <i>Mental health service recommendation, 53, 50%</i> ○ <i>Suicide/self-harm, 50, 47%</i> ○ <i>Hospitalized for assessment, 24, 22%</i> ○ <i>Community services board contact, 20, 19%</i> ○ <i>Nurse consultation, 17, 16%</i> ○ <i>Transferred to alternative education placement or home-based instruction, 10, 9%</i> ○ <i>Sent to a residential treatment facility, 9, 8%</i> ○ <i>Weapon(s) use, 8, 7%</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Monitor social media, 5, 5% ○ Other, 6, 6% |
| The actual act(s) of harm to self or others that took place: | <p><i>select all that apply</i></p> <p><i>N=107</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fight/assault, 49, 46% ○ Attempted Suicide/self-harm: Cutting, 30, 28% ○ Attempted Suicide/self-harm: Other, 24, 22% ○ Use or intimidation with weapon(s), 11, 10% ○ Attempted Suicide/self-harm: Overdose, 3, 3% ○ Attempted Suicide/self-harm: Strangulation/suffocation, 2, 2% ○ Homicide, 0, 0% ○ Other, 1, 1% |
| Did the actual act take place on school grounds or at a school-sponsored event? | <p><i>N=107</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 73, 68% ○ No, 34, 32% |
| Was a student from your school the primary initiator of the event? | <p><i>N=107</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, 96, 90% ○ Yes; however, there was more than one student considered primary, 4, 4% ○ No, 7, 6% |
| Was this student or students recommended to undergo a clinical assessment conducted by a community-based or private licensed mental health professional? | <p><i>Please answer for each primary student (up to 5)</i></p> <p><i>N=96</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, recommended and underwent the assessment, 54, 56% ○ Yes, recommended but did not undergo the assessment, 15, 16% ○ No recommendation was made, 27, 28% |
| After what period of time was the student able to continue attending your school? | <p><i>Please answer for each primary student (up to 5)</i></p> <p><i>N=96</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 school days, 20, 21% ○ Immediately, 13, 14% ○ 10 school days, 12, 13% ○ 5 school days, 9, 9% ○ 11–45 school days, 7, 7% ○ Placed on home-based status for the remainder of the year, 7, 7% ○ After assessment completed and/or plan written, 6, 6% ○ After hospitalization, 6, 6% ○ After alternative school placement (please note how long), 4, 4% ○ Student transferred or unenrolled, 2, 2% ○ More than 45 school days, 1, 1% ○ Not permitted to return, 1, 1% ○ Unable to return due to death, 1, 1% ○ Other (describe), 7, 7% |
| <p>If you had PRIORITY 3–5 cases reported in question 35I where an act of harm to self or others occurred after a threat assessment was conducted and steps were taken to avert the threat.</p> | |
| How often were the following consequences/outcomes/interventions utilized to avert Priority 3–5 threats? | |

| | Number of times (should add up to total priorities 3–5) |
|---|---|
| Community services board contact | <i>Total: 186 Schools: 45 Mean: 4.13 Range: 1-25</i> |
| Counseling (by school or outside service) | <i>Total: 2,550 Schools: 192 Mean: 13.28 Range: 1-143</i> |
| De-escalation | <i>Total: 1,745 Schools: 128 Mean: 13.63 Range: 1-115</i> |
| Discipline consequences given | <i>Total: 1,149 Schools: 155 Mean: 7.41 Range: 1-94</i> |
| Hospitalized for assessment | <i>Total: 144 Schools: 56 Mean: 2.57 Range: 1-31</i> |
| Mental health service recommendation | <i>Total: 967 Schools: 121 Mean: 7.99 Range: 1-63</i> |
| Monitor social media | <i>Total: 79 Schools: 20 Mean: 3.95 Range: 1-23</i> |
| Nurse consultation | <i>Total: 234 Schools: 39 Mean: 6 Range: 1-34</i> |
| Parent contact | <i>Total: 2,550 Schools: 166 Mean: 15.36 Range: 1-143</i> |
| Safety plan | <i>Total: 695 Schools: 122 Mean: 5.70 Range: 1-53</i> |
| School Resource Officer contact | <i>Total: 1,250 Schools: 141 Mean: 8.87</i> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <i>Range: 1-94</i> |
| Sent to a residential treatment facility | <i>Total: 81 Schools: 33 Mean: 2.46 Range: 1-31</i> |
| Transferred to alternative education placement or home-based instruction | <i>Total: 77 Schools: 43 Mean: 1.79 Range: 1-9</i> |
| Other | <i>Total: 38 Schools: 19 Mean: 2 Range: 1-7</i> |

VI. SCHOOL SAFETY AUDIT

School Safety Audit

The *Code of Virginia* [§22.1-279.8](#) requires that all schools in Virginia complete an annual safety audit. The audit is a “**written assessment** of the safety conditions in each public school to (i) **identify** and **if necessary, develop solutions** for **physical safety concerns**, including building security issues and (ii) **identify and evaluate any patterns of student safety concerns** occurring on school property or at school sponsored events. Solutions and responses shall include recommendations for structural adjustments, changes in school safety procedures, and revisions to the school board’s standards for student conduct.”

The [School Safety Audit Program](#) consists of five key components. These components are:

[School Safety Survey](#)

[Division Safety Survey](#)

[Crisis Management Plan Certification](#)

[Virginia School Survey of Climate and Working Conditions](#)

[School Safety Inspection Checklist](#)

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| 36. Date of most recent Crisis Management Plan update and review (mm/dd/yyyy) | 1,974 Schools, 100% |
|---|---------------------|

37. **Safety Audit Review:** The culmination of the School Safety Audit is a review of the data collected for each component. In the following questions, please provide the top two issues or concerns identified from the review of each component.

N=1,974

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Absenteeism/tardiness/skipping, 1,311, 66% ○ Social-emotional learning, 1,089, 55% ○ Mental health for students, 961, 49% ○ Insufficient camera coverage, 821, 42% ○ Need mental health training for staff, 816, 41% ○ Disrespectful behavior, 791, 40% ○ Behavior management/student aggression, 717, 36% ○ Bullying, 695, 35% ○ Mental health, 695, 35% ○ Classroom disruptions, 652, 33% ○ Mental health for staff, 648, 33% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Professional growth opportunities, 189, 10% ○ High-risk area monitoring, 188, 10% ○ Substance abuse, 188, 10% ○ Incomplete building repairs, 184, 9% ○ Cafeteria, 179, 9% ○ Insufficient signage, 177, 9% ○ Out of school suspensions, 174, 9% ○ Work/assignment completion, 169, 9% ○ Fighting, 161, 8% ○ Suicide/self-harm, 153, 8% ○ Bus loading area, 148, 7% |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrooms, 545, 28% Parent involvement, 534, 27% No social media monitoring process, 517, 26% Appropriate social media use, 509, 26% Doors are not able to be locked from inside, 504, 26% Social media, 493, 25% Staff and/or students are not trained in “Avoid, deny defend” or “run, hide, fight”, 467, 24% Student/students relationships, 460, 23% Aggressive behaviors, 428, 22% Traffic design, 421, 21% Cell phones, 396, 20% Doors need repair or upgrades, 383, 19% Insufficient fencing/gates, 368, 19% Student engagement, 367, 19% Students, staff and/or parents are not well informed about the threat assessment process, 355, 18% Crisis plans don’t include all potential events, 341, 17% Bus referrals, 310, 16% Non-compliance, 290, 15% Need to improve unannounced lockdown drill implementation, 282, 14% Not able to communicate directly with first responders, 275, 14% No anonymous reporting system in place for threats, 268, 14% Training/professional development, 266, 13% Student/adult relationships, 249, 13% Perceptions of safety, 248, 13% Entrance lobby, 244, 12% School connectedness, 242, 12% Physical Incidents/fighting, 223, 11% Two-way communications, 210, 11% Acceptable use policy (computers/internet), 198, 10% Crisis preparedness, 198, 10% Cyberbullying, 195, 10% Rigorous instruction, 190, 10% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Windows cannot be covered, 146, 7% Destruction of school property, 143, 7% Staff need more training on role of SRO, 140, 7% Windows need repair or upgrades, 136, 7% Staff collegiality, 130, 7% Insufficient key/access control, 126, 6% Poor or broken lighting, 125, 6% In school suspensions, 123, 6% Landscaping hazards, 122, 6% Hallways/Walkways, 119, 6% Uncleanly building, 114, 6% Physical environment, 107, 5% Threat assessment training is not up to date, 100, 5% Insufficient security alarm, 93, 5% Supportive/consistent leadership, 90, 5% Identification badges, 89, 5% Visitor management system not sufficient, 84, 4% Custodial closets and mechanical rooms, 75, 4% Need to improve communication between admin and SRO, 73, 4% Easy, prohibited roof access, 62, 3% SROs need more training, 52, 3% Doors are not able to be locked from outside, 48, 2% Tolerance, 47, 2% Academic integrity, 40, 2% Threats of self-harm are not handled in a consistent manner, 39, 2% Drill accommodations for staff/students are not sufficient, 38, 2% Exterior entrances are not locked during the day, 28, 1% Main entrance is not controlled by an electronic access system, 19, 1% Weapons, 16, 1% Security of records, 13, 1% Other (describe), 712, 36% |
| <p>38. What resources are needed to resolve the issues identified? N=1,974</p> | |
| <p>Select all that apply N=1,974</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mental health resources, 899, 46% Cameras/camera system upgrades, 671, 34% Additional counseling staff, 606, 31% Training/Professional development, 465, 24% Alternatives to suspension, 424, 21% Funding, 396, 20% Additional security personnel, 355, 18% Additional teaching staff, 298, 15% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signage, 151, 8% Construction/renovations, 147, 7% Security system repairs or upgrades, 139, 7% Improved communications equipment, 127, 6% Clear guidance, 115, 6% Re-keying of doors, 107, 5% |

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Student training, 277, 14%</i> ○ <i>Building repairs/upgrades, 267, 14%</i> ○ <i>Fencing/gates, 258, 13%</i> ○ <i>Community partnerships, 254, 13%</i> ○ <i>Time, 235, 12%</i> ○ <i>No resources needed, will handle in-house, 234, 12%</i> ○ <i>Replacement locks/door repair, 222, 11%</i> ○ <i>VTSS/PBIS, 213, 11%</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Window coverings, 107, 5%</i> ○ <i>Review of jobs, workload, and policies, 100, 5%</i> ○ <i>Lighting, 86, 4%</i> ○ <i>Visitor management equipment, 47, 2%</i> ○ <i>Issue resolved, 32, 2%</i> ○ <i>Other (describe), 118, 6%</i> |
| 39. How has data from the 2022 or 2023 Virginia School Survey of Climate and Working Conditions been utilized in your school? | ---- |
| 40. Have you seen any of the following changes from the 2021–2022 school year to 2022–2023? | <p><i>select all that apply</i> N=1,974</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Decrease in out-of-school suspensions, 479, 24%</i> ○ <i>Increase in out-of-school suspensions, 361, 18%</i> ○ <i>Decrease in criminal activity, 85, 4%</i> ○ <i>Increase in criminal activity, 50, 3%</i> ○ <i>Decrease in bullying behavior, 262, 13%</i> ○ <i>Increase in bullying behavior, 146, 7%</i> ○ <i>Decrease in student attendance, 466, 24%</i> ○ <i>Increase in student attendance, 544, 28%</i> ○ <i>Decrease in student reporting of threatening or aberrant behavior, 106, 5%</i> ○ <i>Increase in student reporting of threatening or aberrant behavior, 484, 25%</i> ○ <i>Other, 154, 8%</i> ○ <i>None, 346, 18%</i> |
| If ANY change has been seen | |
| 40a. What do you feel these changes could be attributed to? | <p><i>Select all that apply</i> N=1,628</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Strong focus on relationships, 542, 33%</i> ○ <i>School climate/culture change, 507, 31%</i> ○ <i>Alternative discipline strategies, 419, 26%</i> ○ <i>Impact of COVID-19 mandates, 395, 24%</i> ○ <i>New/different policies and procedures, 372, 23%</i> ○ <i>Remote learning/pandemic, 368, 23%</i> ○ <i>New administration/staff, 341, 21%</i> ○ <i>VTSS/PBIS/Restorative Justice, 288, 18%</i> ○ <i>Implementation of new program (describe), 101, 6%</i> ○ <i>Small class size, 60, 4%</i> ○ <i>Large class size, 0, 0%</i> ○ <i>SRO/SSO implementation, 0, 0%</i> ○ <i>Other (describe), 249, 15%</i> |
| 41. Any additional safety-related comments or concerns you would like to share? | ---- |

Questions contained in this survey may elicit responses that are exempt from public release pursuant to the *Code of Virginia* [§ 2.2-3705.2](#) and [§ 22.1-279.8](#). Each public body is responsible for exercising its discretion in determining whether such exemptions will be invoked. The DCJS Virginia Center for School and Campus Safety will report aggregate survey data for all schools and divisions and will not share individual school responses unless otherwise required by state law.

Resources

School Safety Audit Program

[Virginia School Safety Audit Infographic](#)

Bullying and School Climate

[School Climate, Student Engagement and Academic Achievement](#)

[Preventing Teen Dating Violence: Interactive Guide on Informing Policy](#)

[US DOE School Climate and Discipline Packet](#)

Crisis and Emergency Planning

[Academic Community Exercise Starter Kit](#)

[Critical Incident Response for School Faculty and Staff](#)

[Critical Incident Response Video](#)

[Digital Mapping Program for Virginia K-12 Schools](#)

[Division Guide for Crisis Management Planning](#)

[Guidance for School Systems in the Event Victims Arise from an Emergency 2018](#)

[Guidance on Emergency Manager Designee](#)

[Guidance on Required Evacuation/Fire and Lockdown Drills 2016 *\(update pending\)*](#)

[School Crisis, Emergency Management and Medical Emergency Response Plan](#)

[School Crisis, Emergency Management and Medical Emergency Response Plan – Quick Guide](#)

[Standard Response Protocol \(Standard Reunification Method\) Guide](#)

[The Virginia Educator's Guide for Planning and Conducting School Emergency Drills](#)

[Virginia Safety Planning Guide for Individuals with Special Needs](#)

[Virginia Schools Bus Driver and Monitor Safety and Security Manual](#)

[Virginia Schools Bus Driver and Monitor Video](#)

Mental Health and Suicide Prevention

[Handle with Care Virginia](#)

[Preventing Youth Suicide – National Association of School Psychologists](#)

[Suicide Prevention PSA – TV](#)

[Suicide Prevention PSA – YouTube](#)

[Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Needs \(U.S. DOE\)](#)

[VDOE Suicide Prevention Guidelines](#)

Threat Assessment

[Threat Assessment in Virginia Public Schools: Model Policies, Procedures and Guidelines – pdf](#)

[K-12 Threat Assessment in Virginia: A Prevention Overview for School Staff, Parents, and Community Members](#)

[K-12 Threat Assessment Video](#)

[K-12 Threat Assessment Form – Fillable pdf](#)

[K-12 Threat Assessment Form – Fillable MSWord](#)

[Technical Assistance for Threat Assessment and Management Teams for Virginia Schools and Institutions of Higher Education](#)

[Threat Management Consultant – Request for Services](#)

Additional K-12 Resources

[U.S. Department of Education Acts on School Safety Report Recommendation to Improve Understanding of Student Privacy Law](#)