Agenda

October 7, 2019

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
100 Community Place, Crownsville, MD 21032 – Side A

- Welcome of the Advisory Board – Chair, Dr. George Arlotto
  o Declaration of Quorum
  o Additions to the Agenda (if needed)

- Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes
  o May 6, 2019 - Meeting Minutes
  o July 1, 2019 - No quorum present at the July 1, 2019 meeting

- Maryland Center for School Safety Updates – Kate Hession

- Work Plan Topic #1: Data Collection – MCSS
  o Topic: Data Collection
  o Outcome: Develop a list of possible data sources and needs to help identify gaps in school safety.

- Work Plan Topic #2: Training Needs – MCSS
  o Topic: Training Needs
  o Outcome: Develop recommendations for MCSS 2020 training plan.

- Closing – Dr. Arlotto
  o Next Meeting – December 2nd at 10:00 a.m. Anne Arundel Board of Education
  o Adjournment

Please be advised that the Advisory Board may move into a closed session, if needed, pursuant to Maryland Code, § 3-305 of the General Provisions Article.
Meeting Minutes - October 7, 2019

The meeting of the Maryland School Safety Advisory Board was held on October 7, 2019 at 100 Community Place, Crownsville, MD 21032

Dr. George Arlotto, the Advisory Board Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m., and provided opening comments, noting that a quorum was present.

The following Advisory Board members were in attendance:

- Chair - Dr. George Arlotto, Superintendent, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
- Sheriff Scott Adams, Cecil County Sheriff’s Office (Maryland Sheriff’s Association)
- Thomas E. Alban, Director of Risk Management for the Archdiocese of Baltimore
- Chief Tim Altomare, Anne Arundel County Police Department
- Dr. Kellie Anderson, Coordinator of Psychological Services, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
- Karin Bailey, Chair, St. Mary’s County Board of Education (Maryland Association of Boards of Education)
- James T. Bell, Head Football Coach at Great Mills High School (Parent of a Public School Student)
- Megan Berger, Attorney
- Dr. Chanta’ M. Booker, Principal, New Era Academy (School Principal)
- Jon Carrier, SRO Anne Arundel County Public Schools (President, Maryland Association of School Resource Officers)
- Eric Ebersole, Delegate, District 12
- Rachael Faulkner, Policy Consultant
- Tina Dover, Designee for Pamela Gaddy (Maryland State Education Association / TABCCO)
- Captain Patrick D. Herring, Parent of a Child with Disabilities
- Sam Deschenaux, Designee for Katherine Klausmeier, Senator
- Laurel Moody, MS (Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems)
- Lourdes Padilla, Secretary Department of Human Services (MDHS)
- Manfred Reek, Representative School Bus Drivers
- Nicholas Shockney, Special Education Administrator, Carroll County Public Schools
- Jayshree Srinivasan, Student, Mount Hebron High School

The following Maryland Center for School Safety (MCSS) members were in attendance:

- Kate Hession, Executive Director
- Joseph Dino Pignataro, Deputy Director
- Dawn P. O'Croinin, Assistant Attorney General
- Michael Rudinski, Regional Training & Certification Specialist
- Christian Cymek, Special Assistant
- Emily Allen Lucht, Communication Specialist
Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes:

A motion was made by Dr. Arlott to approve the minutes. The motion to approve the May 6, 2019 minutes. Mr. Alban moved in favor to approve the minutes with no changes and was seconded by Secretary Padilla. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Dr. Arlott to approve the minutes. The motion to approve the July 1, 2019 minutes. Mr. Alban moved in favor to approve the minutes with no changes and was seconded by Secretary Padilla. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Arlott asked if there were any changes or deletions to the Agenda. There were none and the motion unanimously passed to approve the Agenda.

Prior to the Center’s update, Ms. O’Croinin (Counsel) reminded attendees about the rules surrounding public meetings. Only identified board members were allowed to vote on any matters and comments from non-member attendees would be at the discretion of the Chair. Only the Director of the Maryland Coordination and Analysis Center (MCAC) has been permitted, in statute, to have a designee on the Board.

Maryland Center for School Safety (MCSS) Updates:

Ms. Hession informed the Advisory Board that the Center finalized the SRO trainings for the summer; however, there were a few SROs that still needed to be trained and that later in the meeting they would be hearing from Mr. Rudinski in regards to additional training.

Ms. Hession went on to update the Board on the status of the Center’s grants, informing them that all grant application periods had closed and that the Center offered four grants in FY2020 including: Hate Bias Crimes Grant, Safe Schools Fund Grant, SRO Adequate Coverage Grant and School Traffic Safety Enforcement Grant. Ms. Hession further stated that in regards to the SRO Adequate Coverage grant that most school systems had applied but that the Center was circling back to those that had not applied for available funds.

Work Plan 1: Data Collection – Jeyan Jabaraj

(MCSS Data and Policy Analyst)

Mr. Jabaraj defined why data collection is important when making decisions: eliminates guesswork; provides information; and leads to action. Mr. Jabaraj went on to say that data collection must be: summarized; analyzed; and synthesized. Mr. Jabaraj stated that school safety is quickly evolving and that data should be used for reporting. Examples of data that the Center collects includes training, tip line,
and grants. Mr. Jabaraj outlined how secondary data sources include partnering organizations, public datasets, focus groups, reports, and other entities outside of state organizations.

Mr. Jabaraj asked the Board what data they felt was important to be tracked as it relates to training. This was an open discussion, where the following opinions were presented:

- Input Data – Number of SROs and SSEs
- Base Year – it is important to have a start year so that you can see results over time
- School climate surveys – is there a way to include additional questions to that survey
- Survey SROs o Ask the SROs what their experience is and how they feel about the trainings  
  o Do they feel that they need a booster training 6 or 12 months after the initial training  
  o What has the impact been – has the number of arrests increased or decreased  
  o Did they feel the training was effective  
  o What’s the turnover rate for SROs and why did they leave
- Survey Students o Ask the students if they knew the SRO existed?  
  o Do the students know the role of the SRO?

Mr. Jabaraj went on to inform the Board that the Center offered four grants totaling $22.6 million and posed the question to the group of what other grants the state of Maryland may have available or other Federal grants that may be available to help with school safety.
Suggestions included:

- A grant for after school programs to help keep kids off the street or provide meals to help keep them at the schools and to see educators in a different light.
- A community grant that helps deal with the child’s basic needs and mental health issues that could lead to security related issues
- Law enforcement grants from casino money.
- A grant dealing with more parental engagement to assist with issues happening in the homes that carry over to the schools.
- A grant for family support centers to assist students.
- Money from MSDE for School Based Health centers.

Mr. Jabaraj asked the Board how we would identify measurable data on how the grants are being used and what effect these funds are having on the community. Mr. Jabaraj made suggestions such as looking at each grant and creating categories to see where the trends are, as well as looking at the school systems to see where they are using the money and if it’s adequately plugging the holes.

Mr. Jabaraj talked about the Centers School Bus Safety initiative and specifically the School Traffic Enforcement Safety Grant. Mr. Jabaraj informed the Board that currently there is only a one day survey to get data in this area to which all agreed was not efficient. Mr. Jabaraj asked if there was a way to get other data about school bus stop arm violations.

Sheriff Adams stated that the Center could get violation data from law enforcement.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that Montgomery County has cameras on their buses and that the Center could possibly get that data from the county.

Ms. Hession asked the Board if there were other data sets in the school system outside of the one-day survey.

General discussion ensued and the consensus was that it’s a better initiative to try and prevent these type of violations from happening vs. citing them and asked if the Center’s tip line is tracking any of this type of information. It was confirmed by MCSS that the tip line does allow for tips related to violations.

Mr. Jabaraj stated that data standardization and normalization is key and a problem throughout the state. Mr. Jabaraj stated that this is important to keep standards and to measure trends. The Board suggested that the Center look at DHS and first responders to see what they use for data standardization being that they are larger organizations that are collecting information.

Mr. Jabaraj introduced Mr. Michael Rudinski who would discuss the Center’s training and training needs that have been identified.
Work Plan 2: Training Needs – Mike Rudinski

(MCSS School Safety Emergency Preparedness Specialist -

Training and Certification)

Mr. Rudinski informed the Board of the differences between a School Resource Officer (SRO) and a School Security Employee (SSE). A SRO is a sworn law enforcement officer with a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the school while a SSE is an employee of the school system, located in the school.

Mr. Rudinski stated that there are approximately 360 SRO’s in Maryland schools and that when conducting the trainings this summer they found out a few important things such as:

- When legislation was written and timing for training identified it appeared like they did not take into account 10-month employees.
- There’s a strained relationship between police, schools and the SRO in some school systems.
- SRO’s may be doing more than what is listed in their MOU with the schools.
- In some school systems, the role of the SRO are not understood within the local law enforcement agency and schools.
- SROs work for the police department not the school system.
- After school activities need attention.

Mr. Rudinski informed the Board that the Center had been working on a 5-year training plan and the plan included things such as:

- People: Communication skills
- Legal: FERPA updates, legislation, regulation, process development
- Technology: Web Based training options
Mr. Rudinski went on to state that he thought it was important to update the role of the SRO and that SROs and SSE’s need to know the duties of each other and that training topics would include:

- STLA
- MOUs
- Quad Concept
- SRO Attrition/Selection
- Criminality vs. Discipline
- How to Build Relationships
- Who’s in Charge
- Supporting your SRO
- SRO Chain of Command
- Administrator Wants and Needs

Mr. Rudinski stated that the latter would be very important as the Center is finding that some are confusing what school policy vs. what is the law is.

Mr. Rudinski further stated that the Center staff would be undergoing training as well to maintain their law enforcement instructor certifications, stop-the-bleed training, and mental health first aid training.

Mr. Rudinski noted that there is a training wish list from partners that includes: bus safety, prom safety, and mandated training for new SROs and SSEs.

Mr. Rudinski opened the floor for questions:

Question: Can private schools obtain trainings through the Center?
Answer: Yes.

Question: Who will be conducting the Mental Health training?
Answer: The Center regional staff is being trained to conduct the trainings and bring in other resources.

Question: Who is looking at the MOUs?
Answer: We are not sure if there is an oversight on the MOU’s; however, the regional team members are the center are reviewing them and suggesting that the school system and police departments review them at least annually.

Ms. Hession also informed the Board that the MOUs were included as part of the grant application when they applied for grant money from the Center.

Mr. Rudinski, asked the Board their biggest frustrations.

Mr. Bell stated that parents not understanding the security protocols, so how do you get that type of information out to them?

Mr. Rudinski stated that the best way would be to have base line training for the parents.
Mr. Alban stated that his frustration was communication and how to get information out to private schools when something occurs in the community, including child care centers, and how to get that message out geographically because sometimes the community knows but the school doesn’t.

Ms. Srinivasan stated that from the student perspective, actions are taken by the administrator but the students don’t know about it. How do the students receive this information?

Mr. Rudinski stated that students do need to know what’s happening and SROs are encouraged to talk with the students and communicate with them.

Ms. Srinivasan asked, how would that be measured?

Mr. Rudinski suggested asking the students where they do and do not feel safe and take pictures of those things.

Mr. Rudinski asked the Board where they felt there were gaps in school safety and security and if they had any suggested trainings. The group feedback was as follows:

- Many of the school drills are where the students feel safe, in the classrooms. More attention needs to be on safety in areas like the cafeteria and gymnasium.
- Handle with Care exits but there is nothing after that, what is step two with that student and who is responsible for this.
- Secretary Padilla questions what’s happening inside of the schools and how do we get help to troubled children and work around the “confidentiality” of the law?

Mr. Rudinski stated that in many instances the school system policies are still outdated and that FERPA updates need to be included.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that as people get trained that dots need to be connected and that the different initiatives that are coming out need to connected and it takes time for these policies to be implemented.

Mr. Rudinski thanked everyone for their time and told the Board to feel free to contact him with any questions or suggestions.
Closing:

Dr. Arlotto thanked everyone for the conversation and reminded the Board that the next meeting would be on December 2nd at Anne Arundel County Board of Education.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Mr. Alban, which was seconded by Sheriff Adams. The motion was unanimously approved. The meeting concluded at 11:53 a.m.