



Public Advocate for the City of New York

Between Policy and Reality: **School Administrators Critical of** **Department of Education School Safety Policy**

A REPORT BY PUBLIC ADVOCATE BETSY GOTBAUM
FEBRUARY 2007

Visit us on the web at www.pubadvocate.nyc.gov or call us at 212-669-7200.

Office of the New York City Public Advocate

Betsy Gotbaum
Public Advocate for the City of New York

PREPARED BY:

Laurel Tumarkin
Director of Policy and Research

Daniel Browne
Deputy Director of Policy and Research

Tomas Hunt
Senior Policy Analyst

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF:

Matthew Silverman
Policy Intern

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The reality of conditions in New York City public schools is often at odds with the rhetoric articulated by the city's Department of Education (DOE). For example, on January 11, 2007, Chancellor Klein's response to the news that 12 additional New York City schools had been added to the state's failing schools list¹—a list that now includes more than 330 city schools—was, “[t]oday’s announcement shows that we have made lasting improvements in our schools.”² Another example of this gap between rhetoric and reality is the way the DOE reports school safety incidents.

The DOE is required by the state to report “only those school safety incidents that constitute violations of the Penal Law or the criminal provisions of the New York City Administrative Code, e.g., a crime against property such as an incident of grand larceny.”³ As a result, many discipline infractions go unreported and the public is denied a true picture of conditions in city schools.

It is not the intention of this report to draw conclusions about the overall safety of city schools from the under-reporting of school safety incidents. It is the case, however, that the DOE is under-reporting. According to the DOE's website, only 8 schools out of more than 1,400 experience more than 180 school safety incidents per year. In response to the survey used to create this report, however, 18 of 158 school administrators indicated that their schools experience more than 180 incidents a year.

The under-reporting of school safety incidents is symptomatic of flawed or unrealized school safety and discipline policies. The findings of this report suggest that the DOE is largely out of touch with the needs of administrators engaged in the effort to create a safe school environment conducive to teaching and learning.

The issue of school safety involves many competing interests. Teachers want greater authority to deal with disruptive students; parents want their children to be safe and fairly treated; students want teachers and administrators to treat them with respect; elected officials want results that can be readily measured. It is the responsibility of the principal to negotiate among these competing interests. Principals determine the punishment for safety violations, deal with the parents of students who are disciplined or victimized, work with teachers on the protocols for handling safety violations, and advocate for more resources and support from the New York City Department of Education. This report presents the concerns and needs of administrators regarding DOE school safety policy.

¹ New York State Education Department, “School Accountability Status for the 2006-07 School Year,” www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/school-accountability/2007/Schools-NotInGoodStanding.pdf.

² Gootman, E., “46 New York City Schools Join List of Those Failing in Student Performance Under U.S. Law,” *New York Times*, January 11, 2007.

³ Included in a November 2, 2006 letter to Public Advocate Betsy Gotbaum from a Senior Counselor in the New York City Department of Education (DOE) Office of School Intervention and Development, Rose Albanese-Depinto. (“Only” was underlined in the letter).

Methodology

A survey of 18 questions⁴ created by the Office of the Public Advocate was disseminated by e-mail with the help of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators (CSA) to the CSA members. The questions were designed to glean administrators' perspective on DOE school safety policies, including the degree to which those policies cultivate an atmosphere conducive to teaching and learning. The survey also asked administrators for the rates of incidents and superintendent suspensions in their schools during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years. Finally, the survey asked administrators about the number of teachers in their schools who had received conflict resolution training and the degree to which conflict resolution training and programming is a part of day-to-day life in their schools.

One hundred and fifty-eight administrators from all 10 regions, districts 75 and 79, and several regional offices responded to the survey. Eighty-eight of the 158 were principals, 66 were assistant principals, and 4 were from regional offices. Administrators were allowed to respond anonymously.

Findings

- *Administrators at 18 schools in 8 different regions reported that “181 or more”⁵ school safety incidents occurred during the 2005-2006 school year.*
- *Administrators at 16 schools reported “181 or more” school safety incidents during the 2004-2005 school year.*

This information calls into question the DOE's own reporting of school safety incidents. According to the DOE, only eight schools out of nearly 1,400 experienced more than 180 school incidents during the 2004-2005 school year.⁶

- *More than 35 percent of respondents reported more than 120 school safety incidents during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.*
- *4 schools reported that “81 or more” students received superintendent suspensions during the 2005-2006 school year.*
- *17 administrators surveyed reported increases in superintendent suspensions from the 2004-2005 to the 2005-2006 school year.*
- *23 percent of school administrators believe that they receive the necessary resources to effectively handle school safety incidents.⁷*

⁴ See Appendix for a copy of the survey.

⁵ “181 or more” was the highest interval category offered as a response in the survey.

⁶ DOE, <http://schools.nyc.gov/doefacts/factfinder/ServiceDetails.aspx?id=74.html>.

- *34 percent of all respondents believe that DOE school safety policy creates an atmosphere that is conducive to teaching and learning. Only 28 percent of high school administrator respondents believe this.*
- *9 percent of all respondents believe that students who return from superintendent suspensions are academically prepared to return.*
- *8 percent of all respondents believe that students who return from superintendent suspensions are well-behaved.*
- *98 percent of high school administrators report that “a few” teachers, or no teachers at all, in their schools have received any conflict education and/or resolution training.*
- *82 percent of administrators at all levels report that “a few” teachers, or no teachers at all, have received conflict education and/or resolution training.*

Recommendations

The DOE must solicit the input of teachers, students, principals, parents, community-based organizations (CBOs), and other stakeholders in the development of school safety policies that are conducive to teaching and learning.

The DOE, in conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget, should list all school safety allocations, including Safe Schools Against Violence in Education Act (SAVE)⁸ provisions, as line items in the city budget, making it possible to track specific budget allocations for school safety.

The DOE must ensure that all schools have “time-out” or SAVE rooms on-site for disruptive students, as required by state law.

The DOE must substantially enhance the role of conflict education and resolution programming in schools and make training for teachers and administrators mandatory.

⁷ School safety incidents, as reported in the “online occurrence reporting system” on the DOE website and included in the Mayor’s Management Report, are separated into three categories: “major crime,” “other crime,” and “non-criminal” incidents.

⁸ In 2000, the New York State Legislature passed the Safe Schools Against Violence in Education Act (SAVE), Article 55, Regulations By Boards of Education of Conduct on School District Property, §2801, 2801-a, 2802, 2814, which strengthened the ability of teachers and administrators to remove disruptive students from the classroom and called for a mandatory SAVE room for such students, as well as extensive new incident reporting requirements.

Background

In November 2002, Mayor Bloomberg, Chancellor Klein, Police Commissioner Kelly, and Criminal Justice Coordinator Feinblatt introduced Operation Safe Schools (a.k.a. *SchoolSafe*).⁹ This school safety plan featured an increased emphasis on the involvement of the New York City Police Department (NYPD) in schools, increased reliance on surveillance technology—including approximately \$120 million for closed circuit cameras and metal detectors—and a package of DOE initiatives called “Sanction and Support,” which entailed student “contracts with consequences,” community service assignments and extended removal from school for offenders. In the four years since the introduction of *SchoolSafe*, the DOE has routinely adjusted the organization of its school safety services, most recently shifting intervention and student discipline services from Regional Student Enrollment Offices to the Regional Offices of Youth Development. The DOE has also added several new safety initiatives to *SchoolSafe*, most notably the “Impact Schools,”¹⁰ which have become the centerpiece of DOE school safety policy.

In its 2006 report published by the Center for Court Innovation, the Youth Justice Board concludes that, “the School Safety Initiatives [SSI] have clearly helped reduce crime at some of the most troubled schools [Impact Schools]. However, more work needs to be done to improve the safety of all schools... In addition, some of the solutions themselves have created some negative consequences that must be addressed.”¹¹ The report raises several concerns that are not adequately addressed by DOE school safety policy, among them problems related to overcrowding,¹² poor relationships between school security agents and students, lack of respect between students and teachers, and low student morale.¹³

Signs that school safety policy is having a negative effect on student morale are increasingly evident. Last August, more than 100 students rallied on the steps of DOE headquarters to protest the “criminalizing” atmosphere in their schools and to deliver a

⁹ DOE, http://schools.nyc.gov/press/02-03/n_48_03.html.

¹⁰ The Impact Schools policy is modeled after the New York Police Department’s “Operation Impact,” which employs crime data from the COMPSTAT computer system to identify high crime areas in the city and target them for increased police presence. Impact Schools are selected on the basis of higher-than-average numbers of criminal incidents, suspensions, and what the DOE terms “early warning problems,” such as low school attendance and disruptive behavior. In its third year, the Impact Schools policy has included 22 middle and high schools from all five boroughs.

The Impact Schools initiative employs three police department strategies for reducing crime in the public schools: dispatching large numbers of uniformed police officers to targeted areas, cracking down on minor incidents or disruptive behavior, and “spotlighting” and quickly suspending those who repeatedly violate even minor rules. The Impact Schools policy uses a “broken windows” approach to school discipline in that police are instructed to crack down on minor offenses, such as cursing.

¹¹ Cabrera, E., et al. (Youth Justice Board), “One Step at a Time: Recommendations for the School Community to Improve Safety,” *Center for Court Innovation*, Summer 2006.

¹² A report prepared by the New York University Wagner School of Public Service, and in conjunction with the Prison Moratorium Project titled, “The Impact Schools Initiative: A Critical Assessment and Recommendation for Future Implementation,” establishes a strong link between overcrowding, student misbehavior, violence, and poor academic performance. This report cites additional studies that conclude overcrowding is a significant factor contributing to tension in schools.

¹³ *Ibid.*

report card on school safety to the Chancellor.¹⁴ The students told the DOE that it failed to respect students, provide a safe learning environment free from harassment, and listen to student voices.¹⁵

On November 18, 2006, approximately 800 students from the Urban Youth Collaborative announced a “students’ bill of rights” that includes the right “to attend school in a safe, secure, non-threatening and respectful learning environment in which [students] are free from verbal and physical harassment, as well as from intrusions into their bodily space and belongings by school safety agents, police officers, administrators, and teachers.”¹⁶



Though they may not fully share the views of students, school officials are also concerned that DOE policy does not create an atmosphere conducive to teaching and learning. On March 2, 2005, Public Advocate Betsy Gotbaum joined Jamaica High School Assistant Principal for Security Bret Rosenthal to discuss the failings of the DOE’s school safety policy.¹⁷ Mr. Rosenthal told the *Daily News* that he was “coming forward out of moral reasons.”¹⁸ In a prepared statement, Mr. Rosenthal said, “Are our schools safe? The answer is no...[A]s a dean, when I go through a day without seeing an arrest or having to do a suspension, it’s a pleasant surprise. According to the numbers, crime in schools is down. However, nothing could be further from the truth. Deans and security personnel across New York City schools are doing their best, but things must change to ensure the safety of our students.”¹⁹

In March 2006, former Senior Superintendent of the Alternative Schools District, Bernard Gassaway, wrote that, “...the Department of Education’s way of dealing with children who are described as disruptive is to treat them like criminals.”²⁰

Conflict Resolution Training and Services

New York University Professor of Education Pedro Noguera warns that, “[s]chools that rely on security guards and metal detectors to create safety may end up creating an environment that is so repressive that it is no longer conducive to learning.”²¹ Referring to the success of community policing initiatives, Prof. Noguera asserts that safety is

¹⁴ Hassan, I., “Demanding an Academic Ethos: Students Critique Cop Presence,” *City Limits*, August 7, 2006.

¹⁵ Urban Youth Collaborative, “Bill of Rights,” www.urbanyouthcollaborative.org/rights.html.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Yaniv, O., “School Crime-Stat Scrap,” *New York Daily News*, March 3, 2005.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Statement of Bret Rosenthal, Jamaica High School Assistant Principal for Security, at a press conference outside Jamaica High School, March 2, 2005.

²⁰ Gassaway, B., “Out of ‘Site’ Education,” *Education Next*, March 2, 2006.

²¹ Noguera, P., “Re-Thinking School Safety,” *In Motion Magazine*, June 2, 2004.

“ultimately a by-product of social relationships and from the willingness of the members of a community to look out for each other and hold one another accountable.”²²

One way of strengthening social relationships and establishing a sense of communal accountability in schools is through the use of comprehensive conflict resolution and peace education programming. Studies demonstrate that conflict resolution programs successfully teach children to act cooperatively and express themselves non-violently, which, in turn, leads to safer schools.²³

The New York City Department of Education’s Citywide Standards of Discipline and Intervention Measures state that “[a]dministrators, teachers, counselors, and other school staff are expected to engage with students, including students with disabilities, in intervention and prevention strategies that address the student’s behavioral issues...and family circumstances: social/emotional learning, such as conflict resolution/mediation/negotiation...”.²⁴ To this end, the DOE offers voluntary conflict resolution professional development training for teachers and administrators. Additionally, the state provides various funding streams for complementary programming, such as the Violence Prevention and Extended Day grant. However, the findings of this report suggest that the DOE is not doing enough to ensure that conflict resolution training and services are supported in city schools.

Funding and Implementation

It is nearly impossible to track funding for school safety initiatives and compliance with the state Safe Schools Against Violence in Education Act (SAVE),²⁵ which requires all schools to maintain a “timeout” or “SAVE” room on-site for disruptive students. According to administrators who responded to the Public Advocate’s survey, the DOE claims that adequate funding is allocated to the schools to implement this mandate.²⁶ Many principals said, however, that they lack the funding to provide the personnel and/or space to comply with the state’s SAVE room mandate.

While many DOE allocations are listed as line items with a specific dollar amount assigned to a specific service or program, school safety allocations are not. The state issues a few categorical school safety grants, such as Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention (AIDP) and Violence Prevention and Extended Day funding, but

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Metis Associates, “Anchorage Public Schools Evaluation Report,” New York: 2001;

Metis Associates, “New York City Public School RCCP Evaluation Report,” New York: 1990;

Metis Associates, “New York City Public Schools Evaluation Report,” New York: 1991;

Metis Associates, “Atlanta RCCP Evaluation of Five Schools,” New York: 1997;

Metis Associates, “Evaluation of RCCP in Newark, NJ Public Schools,” New York: 1999.

²⁴ DOE Citywide Standards of Discipline and Intervention Measurements, pg. 2.

²⁵ Article 55, Regulations By Boards of Education of Conduct on School District Property, §2801, 2801-a, 2802, 2814.

²⁶ The Public Advocate’s Office has learned from administrators, teachers, and officials at the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), who have raised the issue of under-funding and noncompliance with SAVE Act provisions, that the DOE claims SAVE is adequately factored into school-based budgets. The UFT is currently gathering data on SAVE rooms and SAVE Act compliance.

they amount to a small fraction of the total budget for school safety services. Without line-item designations in the DOE budget for school safety initiatives it is difficult to determine which school safety programs are simply under-funded and which are poorly implemented.

Incident Reporting

Last spring, the New York State Comptroller's Office released the results of an audit of 15 upstate school districts.²⁷ The audit revealed that upstate schools are underreporting safety incidents by 80 percent on average and by as much as 95 percent in some schools. Additionally, the audit determined that upstate schools experience an average of 115.1 incidents per 1,000 students each year.²⁸ The DOE, in conjunction with the NYPD, have reported that city schools experience an average of 40.3 incidents per 1,000 students, approximately one-third the upstate average.²⁹ The disparity between the upstate incident rates and what the city reports calls into question the accuracy of the city's reported data. The city's teachers' union, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), points out that there is "troubling incongruity between the DOE statistics that suggest incidents are dropping and reports from UFT members who say they are rising."³⁰

The New York State Education Department (NYSED) has begun its own audit of safety reporting in 100 New York City schools.³¹ The investigation has already uncovered high levels of safety incidents previously undetected in 24 schools—schools not included in the Impact Schools initiative. NYSED Commissioner Mills has stated that the number of schools with high incident rates identified by the NYSED would likely increase.³² The DOE responded by stating it does not believe that the new list "appropriately represents safety in our schools."³³

In November 2006, in response to a letter from the Public Advocate, Rose Albanese-DePinto, Senior Counsel for School Intervention and Development at DOE, stated that "[e]ach principal knows that all infractions, from the most minor to the most serious, must be reported and that not reporting will not be tolerated." Despite this assertion, however, the results of the Public Advocate's survey suggest that the actual number of safety incidents is higher than reported by the DOE. A lack of clarity concerning categories of infraction on the part of the DOE and the fact that the DOE only reports incidents that involve the NYPD may contribute to the problem.

²⁷ Office of the New York State Comptroller, Division of State Services (State Education Department), "Reporting of Violent and Disruptive Incidents by Public Schools," Report 2005-S-38.

²⁸ Herszenhorn, D., "Data on Violence in Schools is Questioned," *New York Times*, June 13, 2006.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Callaghan, J., "Safety Resolution Passes Unanimously," *NY Teacher*, August 17, 2006.

³¹ Gootman, E., "State, In Response to Critics, Adds to List of Unsafe Schools," *New York Times*, August 23, 2006.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*

Methodology

A survey of 18 questions (see Appendix) created by the Office of the Public Advocate was disseminated by e-mail with the help of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators (CSA) to school administrators. The questions were designed to glean the administrators' perspective on DOE school safety policies, including the degree to which those policies cultivate an atmosphere that is conducive to teaching and learning. The survey also asked administrators for the rates of incidents and superintendent suspensions in their schools during the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years. Finally, the survey asked administrators about the degree to which they use or wish to use conflict resolution training and the degree to which conflict resolution training and programming are part of day-to-day life in schools.

Administrators have been instructed not to communicate with elected officials unless authorized to do so. In November 2006, a DOE official acknowledged this policy: "We just want to have some concept of where people [administrators] are and what they're saying."³⁴ Despite this restriction, 158 administrators from all 10 regions, Districts 75 and 79, and several regional offices responded to the survey. Eighty-eight of the 158 were principals, 66 were assistant principals, and 4 were from regional offices. Administrators were allowed to respond anonymously.

Findings

- ***Administrators at 18 schools in 8 different regions reported "181 or more" school safety incidents during the 2005-2006 school year.***
- ***Administrators at 16 schools reported "181 or more" school safety incidents during the 2004-2005 school year.***

This information calls into question the DOE's own reporting of school safety incidents. According to the DOE, only eight schools out of nearly 1,400 experienced more than 180 school incidents during the 2004-2005 school year.³⁵

- ***More than 35 percent of respondents reported more than 120 school safety incidents during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.***
- ***4 schools reported that "81 or more" students received superintendent suspensions during the 2005-2006 school year.***
- ***17 administrators reported increases in superintendent suspensions from the 2004-2005 to the 2005-2006 school years.***

³⁴ Einhorn, E., "Ed. Dept. Tells School Bigs: Clear All Talks First," *New York Daily News*, November 13, 2006.

³⁵ DOE, "Online Occurrence Reporting System," <http://schools.nyc.gov/doefacts/factfinder/ServiceDetails.aspx?id=74.html>.

- ***Only 23 percent of school administrators believe that they receive the necessary resources to effectively handle school safety incidents.***³⁶

Although it is reasonable to assume that all administrators would prefer to have more resources at their disposal, survey respondents consistently mentioned the same specific concerns in regard to resources. Many principals said that they do not have enough school security agents and other personnel and that they lack the funding to provide the personnel and/or space to comply with the state’s SAVE room mandate. The following comments come from administrators who responded to the survey and from one teacher who discussed the issue separately with a representative of the Office of the Public Advocate.

“We have a SAVE room. It’s called the teachers lounge. Nobody wants to send students there because the teacher “on duty” in the room is actually on break. Plus, we’re not allowed to put a student in the hall, so we don’t have a lot of options when it comes to disruptive students.” **Elementary School Teacher in Brooklyn**³⁷

“The biggest problem we face is that the SAVE legislation for student removal and principal’s suspensions is unfunded. Each school should have funding for a suspension teacher to monitor the SAVE room.” **Middle School Principal in Brooklyn**

“Our region requires each school to have a SAVE room. Schools receive no funding for this requirement.” **Elementary School Principal in Queens**

“We need funds for resources such as full-time SAVE room teachers and/or deans.” **Elementary School Assistant Principal in Brooklyn**

“The high schools are packed to the gills and the school safety staff in schools is woefully undermanned and lacks professionalism. Schools are not even required to guard their exits nor are resources present to do this.” **High School Assistant Principal in Brooklyn**

“NYPD/Division of School Safety needs to be more responsive to the needs of the school and community. A pro-active approach and additional staff are needed. They are on a different page than the DOE.” **High School Assistant Principal in Queens**

- ***Only 34 percent of respondents believe that DOE school safety policy creates an atmosphere that is conducive to teaching and learning. Only 28 percent of high school administrators believe this.***

Administrators indicated that programs intended to help improve teaching and learning have suffered from implementation problems and, in some cases, have actually made the learning environment worse.

³⁶ School safety incidents, as reported in the “online occurrence reporting system” on the DOE website and included in the Mayor’s Management Report, are separated into three incident categories: “major crime,” “other crime,” and “non-criminal” incidents.

³⁷ This quote was recorded in a fall 2006 visit to a school and not taken from the survey.

“I was told [by the DOE] I could send 40 students to the New Beginnings program, so I met with the students that I thought would benefit from the program and I met with their parents and everyone signed contracts... Well, the New Beginnings people decided they didn’t want 17 of the students so they sent them back, but on top of that they sent, with the department’s consent, 40 additional students that didn’t come from this school.” **High School Principal in Brooklyn**³⁸

- ***9 percent of all respondents believe that students who return from superintendent suspensions are academically prepared to return.***
- ***8 percent of all respondents believe that students who return from superintendent suspensions are well-behaved.***

The vast majority of survey respondents believe that the approximately 320 “alternative” sites designated to provide instruction to suspended students fail to prepare them academically or behaviorally to return to their home schools.

- ***98 percent of high school administrators report that “a few” or no teachers in their schools have received any conflict education and/or resolution training.***
- ***82 percent of administrators at all levels report that “a few” or no teachers have received conflict education and/or resolution training.***

Social/emotional services help address the root causes of violence and help support a sustainable school safety policy.³⁹ This type of training is purported to be a central component of the DOE school safety and discipline initiatives,⁴⁰ but according to administrators, such training is minimal.

Recommendations

The DOE must solicit the input of teachers, students, principals, parents, community-based organizations (CBOs), and other stakeholders in the development of school safety policies that are conducive to teaching and learning.

Research has demonstrated that preventative programs that are integrated into the curriculum are effective when administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders have a direct role in the identification of programs that best suit their schools.⁴¹ The Public

³⁸ This quote was recorded in a fall 2006 visit to a school and not taken from the survey.

³⁹ Burstyn, J. N. & Stevens, R., “Involving the Whole School in Violence Prevention,” Chapter 8 in Burstyn, J.N., et al., (2001) *Preventing Violence in Schools*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

⁴⁰ DOE’s Citywide Standards of Discipline and Intervention Measures states, “[a]dministrators, teachers, counselors, and other school staff are expected to engage with students, including students with disabilities, in intervention and prevention strategies that address the student’s behavioral issues...and family circumstances: social/emotional learning, such as conflict resolution/mediation/negotiation...,” pg. 2.

⁴¹ See 39.

Advocate, among others, has repeatedly called on the DOE to make a greater effort to solicit the input of stakeholders in the development of its policies.⁴²

The DOE, in conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget, should list SAVE⁴³ provisions and other school safety allocations as line items in the city budget, making it possible to track specifically the funds spent on school safety.

To improve the New York City Council's ability to provide budgetary oversight, the DOE should specifically delineate how it spends money on school safety initiatives, including all expenses shared with other agencies (e.g. NYPD, Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Department of Probation, etc.).

The DOE must ensure that all schools have SAVE rooms, as required by state law.

According to administrators, the DOE claims that adequate funding is allocated to the schools to implement this mandate, but survey respondents say either that their schools do not have SAVE rooms or that there is no funding to ensure that they are supervised. The DOE must address this discrepancy.

The DOE must substantially enhance the role of conflict education and resolution programming in schools and make training for teachers and administrators mandatory.

The DOE has acknowledged the importance of training teachers to provide social/emotional services. The DOE, however, must provide this training more extensively and consistently.

⁴² Office of the New York City Public Advocate, "Testimony at Department of Education Hearing on Standards for Discipline for City Schools," August 9, 2006, <http://pubadvocate.nyc.gov/news/DOEschoolsafety.html>.

⁴³ See 8.

Appendix A
School Safety Survey

School Safety Survey

1. School Safety Survey

Please take a brief moment of your time to fill out the following survey on school safety. Your responses will be kept completely anonymous and will only be used to address system-wide school safety concerns.

*** 1. What is your title?**

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Supervisor
- Education Administrator
- Other

*** 2. What Region do you work in?**

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | D75 | D79 |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

*** 3. In what setting do you work?**

- Elementary School
- Middle School/Junior High School
- High School
- Region

*** 4. My school (or region) has the necessary resources to effectively handle all school safety incidents.**

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

*** 5. The current DOE school safety policies are successful in creating a safe environment that is conducive to teaching and learning.**

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

*** 6. My school (or region) is able to effectively deal with violent and disruptive students.**

- strongly agree
- agree
- neutral
- disagree
- strongly disagree

*** 7. School safety incidents (criminal and non-criminal) occurred in my school (or region) during the 2004-2005 school year.**

- | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 0-30 | 31-60 | 61-90 | 91-120 | 121-150 | 151-180 | 181 or more |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

*** 8. School safety incidents (criminal and non-criminal) occurred in my school (or region) during the 2005-2006 school year.**

- | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 0-30 | 31-60 | 61-90 | 91-120 | 121-150 | 151-180 | 181 or more |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Next >>

School Safety Survey

2. In-School Administrators

The following four questions (9-12) are for in-school administrators only.

- * **9. Superintendent suspensions were issued to students in my school during 2004-2005.**

0-15 16-30 31-45 46-60 61-80 81 or more

- * **10. Superintendent suspensions were issued to students in my school over 2005-2006 school year.**

0-15 16-30 31-45 46-60 61-80 81 or more

- * **11. Students who return to my school from Superintendent Suspensions are, in general, prepared academically.**

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Neutral
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

- * **12. Students who return to my school from Superintendent Suspensions are, in general, well behaved.**

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Neutral
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

- * **13. Conflict education/resolution programming is an important part of the day-to-day life at my school.**

Strongly Agree
 Agree
 Neutral
 Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

- * **14. As of today the amount of teachers at my school (or in the region) that have**

received conflict education/resolution training is:

- None
- A Few
- Approximately half
- Most
- All

*** 15. Conflict education/resolution programming is in my school (or region) is used primarily: (check all)**

- For ALL students that commit disciplinary code infractions
- For SOME students that commit disciplinary code infractions
- For ALL students regardless of any disciplinary code infraction
- For SOME students regardless of any disciplinary code infraction
- Not at all

*** 16. My school would benefit from additional in-school conflict education/resolution programming.**

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

*** 17. In general, conflict education/resolution programming helps in creating a safe school atmosphere.**

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

18. Use the space below to add any additional information or concerns you wish.

--