

*******CORRECTED*******
ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE
SCHOOL SAFETY PROGRAM OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting
Monday, June 19, 2000
8:30 A.M. – Senate Hearing Room #1

Members Present:

Senator Tom Smith, Cochair	Alberto Gutier
Senator Joe Eddie Lopez	Janet Lander
Fred DePrez	Hellen Carter
Stan Morrow	William Udall

Members Absent:

Representative Dan Schottel, Cochair
Representative Marion Pickens

Staff:

Kimberly Yee, Senate Education Committee Analyst
Kathy Seeglitz, Senate Education Committee Assistant Analyst

Senator Smith called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. Attendance was noted, and a quorum was present. Senator Smith welcomed members and introduced the newest member, Fred DePrez, Principal, Hamilton High School, Chandler School District.

FUTURE SCHOOL SAFETY GRANT EVALUATIONS, Research and Policy Unit, Arizona Department of Education (ADE)

Janet Lander, ADE, explained at the Committee's last meeting ADE's Research and Policy Division presented the findings of the 1999 School Safety Program Survey. A recommendation was made from the Division that the focus of the 2000 evaluation should be on the delivery of Law Related Education (LRE) in the classroom, since it was a major issue that came out of the focus group. The Division also recommended that future safe school program evaluations provide an in-depth analysis of multiple factors impacting safe schools. It would include evaluation of teachers, administrators, parents, students and officers involved in the program to be followed-up by officer interaction with the program over the next several years. Since it is not possible for the Division to conduct an annual evaluation including all the groups mentioned and the information they would want to gather, it is proposed that the evaluation be broken up into parts and each year a different part be evaluated. FY2000 focuses on the officers; FY2001 would include students and teachers, followed by administrators and possibly parents and the public in FY2002. She said after the cycle is completed, it will

start over again. Ms. Lander suggested that the Oversight Committee accept the recommendation from ADE's Research and Policy Division on how future school safety evaluations will be conducted.

Senator Smith indicated that the schedule would provide a more detailed evaluation than had been done in the past. Ms. Lander indicated through S.B.1559 of 2000, ADE was given a position and funds to do a full safe school evaluation from which information could be retrieved for ADE's use.

Senator Smith asked whether the evaluation would be done on a comparison level with schools not in the program versus those in the program. Ms. Lander replied that could be done, but ADE's aim is to conduct the evaluation centered on what the program is doing versus what it is not doing.

Ms. Carter moved that the School Safety Program Oversight Committee accept the recommendation that there be a comprehensive evaluation from ADE that focuses as outlined for FY2001 on students and teachers, FY2002 on administration and parents, due to the fact that in FY2000 the focus was on the POs, SROs and evaluation of officers. The motion CARRIED by voice vote.

Senator Smith clarified that the Legislators assigned to the Committee are in an advisory capacity only and are non-voting members.

LRE TRAINING

Ms. Lander stated that at the last meeting Ms. Carter introduced a proposal to the Committee to fund the development of an LRE Training Academy because of problems encountered over the past few years, which have now become critical. At that time the Committee requested more information, which will be provided today.

Ms. Lander explained that Ms. Carter, Lynda Rando, Director, Arizona Bar Foundation (ABF), and herself have worked on the request, and Ms. Rando would present the revised proposal. Ms. Lander, as daily administrator of the program, gave a brief synopsis of the status. She said LRE is written into the grant as a necessary part of the duties of a school resource officer (SRO) and probation officer (PO). When the program began its first full year in 1994/95, there was a budget of \$2.5 million, which paid for approximately 54 officers. Funds were awarded to each school district for those officers to attend LRE training along with funds to pay for expenses associated with attending the training. ABF has attempted to provide an annual basic training course for the officers in addition to their regular duties. Ms. Lander explained that in the fall of 1999, ABF lost the staff member who was handling the LRE training along with the funding for that position, and was unsuccessful in finding new funding

sources in order to provide the position that was lost. It then became impossible for ABF to continue to provide that service, and the officers were not able to obtain LRE for the past program year. The program has grown to a \$7 million budget, which includes an increase from 54 to 175 officers. Officers who received the basic course were then ready for advanced training. She added that many of the officers currently have not received basic training.

Ms. Lander commented there was no place this past year to send officers for LRE training, and confusion exists with respect to training and how to teach it. She said there is an opportunity to build an infrastructure into this program that will allow all officers to attend yearly basic training through a full-range of advanced courses. It will allow the Oversight Committee to keep tabs on which districts are sending their officers to training, and will provide a mechanism to provide officers with LRE training in the State.

Mr. Gutier wanted to know what would be included in the \$135,000 budget proposal. Ms. Lander replied it would cover every officer in the State, and ABF would handle the training.

Mr. Gutier asked how many of the 175 officers would need basic versus advanced training. Ms. Lander replied that Ms. Rando would elaborate on those issues in her remarks. She said one of the faults of the current training system is that there is no mechanism to track officers' training.

Senator Smith remarked at the last meeting it was indicated the officers participating in LRE had to have 10 to 20 hours per week. Ms. Lander replied currently it is 10 hours per week, but it can include hours both inside and outside of the classroom. Senator Smith said it was his understanding that they were only allowing classroom time, and that often officers handle work that coincides with LRE, but was not being credited towards LRE. Ms. Lander responded that situation will be corrected. She said the evaluation pointed out there was a weakness in reporting those hours, and it needed to be revised this year for clarification.

Senator Smith stated it is important to not get involved in bureaucracy and lose sight of the intent of the program, which is the actual action. He said it is important to have LRE in order for the officers to understand their responsibilities and duties. At the same time, the program needs to be clear, concise and direct so it does not become a bureaucratic nightmare. Ms. Lander indicated the proposal will strengthen the infrastructure, and it will become a better system.

Mr. Gutier asked what happened to the past year's available funds for LRE. Ms. Lander replied the funds were allocated to various types of training, for example, SRO training, or to general prevention training.

Lynda Rando, Director, ABF, presented the proposal in conjunction with ADE (Attachment A). She explained that under the school safety program and guidelines, LRE is defined as “instruction about rules, laws and the legal system, which actively involves students in that instruction to prepare them for responsible citizenship. It is also instruction that teaches about legal rights, responsibilities, and the role of the citizen and requires students to practice application of that teaching to potential real-life situations.” She said when the LRE legislation went into effect and the program was being built, LRE was considered an integral part of the school safety program. Those who have been in the field know that when implemented by individuals properly trained, the effect on children is the following:

- Critical thinking and analysis will lead to better decision making. When student involvement is fostered in the community, there is greater pride in that community in trying to reduce crime and delinquency.
- LRE strengthens academic skills that are important to schools, teachers, students and parents. Promotes positive life skills by teaching conflict resolution to children and young teens.
- Promotes confidence and respect for the law, rules, and persons in authority;
- Increases knowledge and understanding of the importance of law, government, and the legal and justice system.
- Strongly supports academic standards that the State Department has issued including social studies standards.

Ms. Rando explained an LRE Academy is an ideal way to ensure that all officers receive consistent and comprehensive LRE training. It will provide for both basic introductory level and advanced courses. She said there are tremendous benefits of an Academy, particularly to the school districts. The Academy would allow every officer to attend one or both trainings. She urged support for this program, and indicated the program would allow for follow-up and technical assistance to the officers who need help in implementing LRE.

Ms. Rando commented that ABF was created in 1980, and there are two main efforts. One effort promotes teaching of the legal system. She highlighted other aspects of ABF as follows:

- ABF reaches approximately 40,000 school-age children and teens in Arizona, and provides for grants to legal service providers to represent the low-income and poor population.
- ABF has been the sole source of providing LRE since the inception of the Safe School Program, having organized a school safety conference. ABF

has also used its own resources in addition to a registration fee that had been coming through the schools to ABF, which has been helpful. ABF also provides staff and teaching materials, whenever possible.

- ABF is the State Coordinator for the United States Department of Justice, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Youth for Justice Program, and has served in that capacity since 1986.
- For the past 20 years ABF had a public/private partnership with most of the school districts in the State and has trained over 600 teachers a year in how to teach LRE through many of the academic programs.

Ms. Rando stated that under this proposal, there would be benefits to the Oversight Committee in terms of ABF providing accurate financial reporting of how the funds are being used, as well as qualitative and quantitative reporting on the actual training in the classroom. Local experts will be used, plus the full-time position, and national experts to help with training. There are other deliverables that ABF can provide to officers that they are not currently receiving in terms of curriculum, library resources, consulting, and assistance through web sites.

Ms. Rando referred to the “blue print” portion of the exhibit, which highlights an LRE Academy. She explained Level I is a two-day program focusing on responsibility regarding school safety programs and teaching LRE, and Level II consists of advanced training for officers. She indicated all officers’ hours would be tracked, and every officer would receive a Certificate of Completion from the Academy. The exhibit included some comments from school safety officers who have attended classes in the past. The last page of the exhibit outlined a budget proposal that Ms. Rando prepared, and she explained the items on that exhibit. She said ABF is requesting a full-time employee, who will design and administer the Academy under the Safe Schools Program. ABF will supply secretarial support for the new individual through its budget process. ABF is asking for traditional line items and training materials. In addition, under the proposal every officer will be entitled to an amount up to \$250 in teaching materials that would be provided through the Academy. The budget proposal is \$135,000, and ABF will provide an in-kind contribution of \$36,472.

Senator Smith asked if there would be an evaluation component so at the end of one or two years it will be known if the money is well spent, and whether the effects of the program will be positive or negative. Ms. Rando replied there are several items in place, such as a “needs assessments” that will be done to determine the needs of the schools and officers. There are also evaluations that will be performed to provide an indication of the effectiveness. She said it is her understanding from the Research and Policy Unit that there will be a formal evaluation as to the impact on students. ABF will provide quarterly or annual surveys that can be sent to the officers asking about student impact on

knowledge and skills. She pointed out that this proposal does not include money for any type of formal evaluation, which would need to be done by ADE.

Senator Smith mentioned Senator Petersen's program on Character Education, which is included in the Governor's education bill. He said it appears some of the items mentioned regarding LRE are similar to Character Education items. He suggested someone contact Senator Petersen to discuss it, so that the program will not be overlapping.

Mr. Udall referred to the new proposed employee, and asked what the credentials would be for that position. Ms. Rando replied normally most of ABF's employees have a Master's Degree in education or in training and development. She is hopeful of retaining someone who is very experienced in LRE. She said ABF has been very successful in finding appropriate staff in the past. She indicated she has been with ABF for 13 years.

Mr. Udall asked whether the officers would be required to have annual educational training after going through Levels I and II. Ms. Lander replied currently there are not any requirements for annual training of officers. She said Ms. Carter and she proposed a working group to handle certain concerns, such as a requirement that officers attend annual training. She said it should be at least required of new officers.

Mr. Udall commented that as long as the funds are available, it should be an annual requirement because of the changes that need to be addressed. Ms. Lander said the funds will be available, therefore, the districts should take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. Gutier asked about the substance abuse program in the Day One Course and whether it includes alcohol. Ms. Rando replied the items include tobacco, alcohol and prescription and illegal drugs, which are all considered substance abuse. Mr. Gutier remarked that if funds are to be invested for officers' training, he inquired as to the kind of commitment that will be made to retain the same officers. He asked if there is any estimate of how many officers will be lost after the first year of training. Ms. Rando replied the Committee would have to grapple with that issue. As a provider, one of the issues brought to ABF's attention each year is the fact that officers change and the continuity with students makes it difficult when that occurs. She said she understands Mr. Gutier's concerns, and she would recommend to the Committee that officers continue to secure training for professional development to continue to keep updated on research and materials. Senator Smith said Mr. Gutier brought up an excellent point, because in any "people program" the ability and continuity of the SROs and POs in dealing with schools and students is critically important. He said he believes the continuity of the program can be worked out with the police and probation departments along with the working group.

Mr. DePrez said his school had an officer for two years and he felt the training was very helpful because LRE was the most difficult component for the school to understand. He said the program focuses on K-12 and asked if it was possible to have an officer primarily focused on K-6 and K-8, and another focused on secondary schools.

Ms. Rando said that portion of the program is part of Day Two, Basic Training of K-12. She said there would be breakouts for K-5, K-6, through K-12. She said because of the comprehensive approach and because officers come from all different grade levels, ABF will ensure there is appropriate training for all officers from K-12.

Ms. Lander said she would like to assure the Committee that she checked with the Procurement Office to ensure it could be done legally before they entered into this proposal with ABF.

Ms. Carter moved that the Committee accept the proposal that LRE become a part of the safe school package as an Academy, and that funding be allocated for this in the amount of \$135,000 for the sole purpose of the development of the LRE Academy through ABF. The motion CARRIED by voice vote.

WORKING GROUP PROPOSAL

Ms. Lander stated at the last meeting Ms. Carter and she proposed to develop a working group because they were seeing growth in the program, and there were concerns and issues of not having enough input in order to make a decision on the best course of action. She was asked to further explain the purpose of a working group (Attachment B). She said the purpose is to gather input from representatives of all entities in order to address problems and concerns in the program. She commented it is expected that many issues revolving around management of the program can be resolved through recommendations by the working group. However, some issues may be presented to the Oversight Committee for further discussion and vote. A recommendation from officers involved in the FY1999 School Safety Program Evaluation was to conduct meetings between law enforcement agencies, school administrators and officers. Ms. Lander indicated this proactive approach would establish a forum where problems and concerns could be addressed with the intent of options being developed and recommendations accepted to move the program forward through cooperation and collaboration. The working group members may be recruited or may volunteer to participate in the working group, and ADE will facilitate and staff it. Members will determine meeting dates and agenda items and the protocol for the working group. She said she has commitments as follows: one or more Oversight Committee members, a representative of a probation department, who is a supervisor for POs from a rural area and a metropolitan county, a police and sheriff department supervisor for SROs from a rural and urban community, a

school administrator from a rural and urban community, an ABF representative, a school resource officer from a rural and urban community, a juvenile probation officer from a rural and urban community, and representatives the working group deems appropriate. She stated she has commitments from eight people already who wish to share the work of this group and has calls out to others waiting for their acceptance.

Ms. Lander remarked that the issues and concerns for the working group at this time have been identified through site visits, telephone conversations with grantees and with the FY1999 school safety evaluation. It is recommended that the working group will prioritize and begin discussion on the following issues: school involvement in the hiring process; and alternatives to police and sheriff departments for SRO personnel. Ms. Lander commented many counties do not have enough SROs to service the grantees. Also, she said the working group will address the problem of length of service of officers at a site. She said it is known from the evaluation that an officer does not hit his stride until the second or third year, and those that are being rotated out after one year are not nearly as effective.

Ms. Lander pointed out among the issues and concerns for the working group are as follows:

- school involvement in the hiring process;
- alternatives to police and sheriff departments for SRO personnel;
- length of service at a site;
- the number of sites an officer can effectively serve;
- LRE training;
- involving administrators in training;
- improved guidelines for program management;
- development of procedures necessary to eliminate the grant when a district is out of compliance and corrective action is not implemented;
- development of a process that assures all involved in the school safety program understand the purpose of the grant;
- define the role of administrator, officer and law enforcement within the program;
- identify sections for the school safety program web site;
- feasibility of translating LRE materials into Spanish; and
- other issues as identified by the working group.

She stated that an annual report will be presented to the Oversight Committee on the progress of the working group. As far as the time frame, she said it is expected that the working group will convene before the majority of schools begin in August for their first meeting. ADE will propose that the first order of business is to issue a communication to all program managers, officers and school site principals who have received a FY 2001 grant. The memorandum will define the roles of each party, the intent of the grant, how school administrators,

law enforcement and officers can work cooperatively toward the goal of the grant, and any other areas the working group identifies as requiring immediate attention.

Senator Smith asked whether the correct procedure would be for the working group to be in charge and proceed. Kimberly Yee, Senate Education Committee Analyst, responded that staff is recommending the working group meet as a sub-committee and report back to the Oversight Committee. The group can then meet as a whole and decide officially what items should move forward.

Senator Smith asked whether something can be put together, in writing, to Ms. Lander that identifies the working group and how to proceed on it. Ms. Yee replied the working group can elect a chairperson at its first meeting and decide what it wants to do. Senator Smith asked Ms. Yee to get together with Ms. Lander with something in writing so she has the authority and the working group is defined.

Ms. Yee stated that in order to assure the process of an open meeting, she would suggest that ADE work with Senate Staff to provide an agenda for dissemination to the public by making it available on the web site. She indicated the meeting could be held in one of the caucus rooms.

CONSIDERATION OF GRANT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY 2001

Hellen Carter, Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department, stated that she and Ms. Lander met and reviewed all the new applications. She referred to the handout School Safety Program Grant Funding Report for FY2001 (Attachment C). She referred to the pages listing New District Applications, Page 7, and stated that of the districts they reviewed, recommendations will be made to the Oversight Committee that the schools highlighted in bold print be funded through the grant funds available. She outlined those particular requests. She said in reviewing the applications those particular districts had a very high need, but did not have the funding to meet the safety needs of their school. Each was a need of an SRO or PO that did not supplant existing services. It was felt those schools also met the intent of the grant in their request, and had a good understanding based upon the goals and objectives as presented.

Senator Smith inquired as to the number of requests. Ms. Lander replied there were 27 for new applications, and 43 for expansions. Senator Smith asked whether the ones selected were those considered most needy, and if they are new requests. Ms. Carter replied that is correct. She said at the last School Safety Program Committee meeting, there was a vote that they would look at the new district applications versus expansions based on the funds available.

Senator Smith said he believed the Governor's request for education has money included for the Safe Schools Program, depending on what happens with that bill.

Mr. Gutier said on May 31 the budget for new applications was \$7,815,421. Nineteen days later on June 19, it was \$7,667,630. He asked what happened to the \$147,791, and how was that shifted. Ms. Lander explained it shifted because the Oversight Committee did not accept the original proposal on LRE, therefore, they reviewed the renewal applications. The result was that it shifted all the numbers and also shifted the renewal applications below what it was originally. It resulted in a lower budget for LRE, which gave them a little more money to go towards the new grants.

Mr. Gutier asked whether some schools were cut back when the funds were moved around. Ms. Lander replied they took all the money allocated originally for training through the school district out of the proposal and put it in a lump sum for the contract with ABF. She said it reduced the amount from \$175,000 to \$135,000. She explained that they then went back and re-evaluated the money allocated for travel for each of the officers, which resulted in more realistic and exact figures, which also caused some shifting.

Ms. Carter said in the past, schools had all been allocated approximately \$1,000 a year for training each officer. Based on 175 officers, it would have amounted to \$175,000. However, with the proposal that was voted upon, \$40,000 was saved to be allocated to the Safe Schools Program to fund one additional site. She said they were originally looking at four sites, however, two more sites were added.

Senator Smith asked whether there is any funding for LRE for SROs or POs from any other source over and above what the State is currently allocating. Ms. Carter replied not for this particular program.

Senator Smith asked whether the funding is coming directly from the General Fund for this program. Ms. Carter said that is correct. She added ADE recommended not funding some of the applications that were presented. She indicated she did not have the list today, but some were poorly written and did not take the heart or the intent of the Safe Schools Program and those were excluded.

Senator Smith remarked if that occurs, he believes Ms. Carter should let them know their request was not considered because of inadequate presentation and information submitted. He commented if they are turned down because of not meeting the basic qualifications of the request, they should know about it in order to make improvements for any future presentations. They should be notified that if they have any questions, they should call the appropriate individuals who will explain any questions in detail. Ms. Carter indicated she would ensure that they are notified.

Mr. Gutier moved that the Committee consider the recommendation for FY2001 as proposed including expansions, and the ABF budget that was presented today as stated on the agenda and on the proposal. The motion CARRIED by a voice vote.

Senator Smith thanked Ms. Carter for all her work on this project.

In response to a request by Senator Smith at the last meeting, Ms. Lander provided a list of districts participating in the school safety program, so that individuals could visit any of the programs (Attachment D).

Senator Smith said he appreciated receiving that list because if questions are raised, they will have the information to respond. Senator Smith also thanked Ms. Lander for all her work involved in this program. He said this is a people program, and the success depends on hardworking dedicated individuals such as Ms. Lander and Ms. Carter.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:42 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy L. DeMichele
Committee Secretary

(Tapes and attachments on file in the Secretary of the Senate's Office/Resource Center, Room 113.)