

## ***4. Community College Risk/facility Managers Survey Instrument and Related Analysis***

### **The Survey Instrument Format**

The survey instrument consisted of twenty-five (25) closed and open-ended questions and required approximately thirty (30) minutes to complete. The survey instrument began with a general introductory statement that provided informed consent to the respondents. The survey instrument was then divided into three (3) sections.<sup>1</sup>

The first section, *Part 1: Background and Context* (Questions 1-12), collected basic demographic information on respondents. *Part 1* began by focusing on respondent familiarity with Safe School Design principles. Further, *Part 1* sought to uncover the extent to which Safe School Design principles (as contained in the *Guidelines*) have been incorporated into the design of community colleges as well as the perceived effectiveness of the design principles contained the *Guidelines*. *Part 1* also categorized and described criminal activities catalogued by occurrence throughout the public school system in Florida's School Environmental Safety Incident Reporting System (SESIR) for the years 1999-2000. This provides comparative criminal activity data even though we know that community colleges are considerably different in many aspects from K-12 public schools.

*Part 2: Criminal Activity and School Design* (Questions 13-21), assessed the specific places and locations, as well as the specific period of the day, when incidents of crime are believed to occur most frequently. The final section, *Part 3: Design and Policy Suggestions* (Questions 22-25), addressed school design and policy concerns of the survey respondents.

Throughout the survey instrument, the questions also aimed to evaluate management trends and the effectiveness of management policy, as proper management is a fundamental component of Safe School Design.

### **Part 1: Background and Context**

**Questions 1-5, "Date," "County," "Person Completing Survey," "Title/Position," and "Contact Information"** provided demographic data which enabled the research team to identify, organize, and catalogue respondent information and the geographic origin of the completed surveys.

Fifty (50) survey instruments were mailed to community college administrators across Florida in May and June 2002. In addition, thirty (30) survey instruments were personally distributed at a meeting of community college facility managers and administrators on May 23, 2002. By August 14, 2002,

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that because of rounding, response totals to some questions may not equal 100%

twenty (20) of the survey instruments were returned, for a completion rate of twenty-five percent (25%). Eleven (11) -- fifty-five percent (55%) -- of the respondents were from Facilities/Physical Plant. Six (6) -- thirty percent (30%) -- of the respondents were from Police/Safety and Security. And two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents were from Administration. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents did not provide background information. The returned Community Colleges Survey Instruments accounted for 18 (eighteen), or sixty four percent (64%) of the twenty- eight (28) community college regions throughout Florida (See Map 4, page 181).

**Question 6: How would you rate your familiarity with the design principles listed in Table-A above?**

- A. Very Familiar**
- B. Somewhat Familiar**
- C. Not Very Familiar**
- D. Not At All Familiar**

Question 6 measured respondent familiarity with the Safe School Design principles codified in the 2001 Florida Building Code, Section 423, 7(h). The majority, twelve (12) -- sixty percent (60%) -- of the respondents reported being *Somewhat Familiar* with the Safe School Design principles. Five (5) -- twenty- five percent (25%) -- of the respondents reported being *Very Familiar*. Two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents reported being *Not Very Familiar*, and one (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents reported being *Not At All Familiar*.

**Question 7: The 1993 Florida's Safe School Design Guidelines illustrate how the above design principles can be implemented. How familiar are you with these principles?**

- A. Very Familiar**
- B. Somewhat Familiar**
- C. Not Very Familiar**
- D. Not At All Familiar**

Question 7 measured respondent familiarity with the *1993 Florida Safe School Design Guidelines*. Twelve (12) -- sixty percent (60%) -- of the respondents reported being *Somewhat Familiar* with the *Guidelines*. Four (4) -- twenty percent (20%) -- of the respondents reported being *Not Very Familiar*. Two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents reported being *Very Familiar*. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents reported being *Not At All Familiar*. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

**Question 8: Whether you are familiar or not with the design principles above or the guidelines, how would you characterize the incorporation of the Safe School Design principles listed in Table-A into the design and construction (including retrofit) of your community college?**

- A. Extensively Incorporated
- B. Incorporated Somewhat
- C. Not Incorporated Much At All
- D. Not Incorporated At All
- E. Cannot Judge

Question 8 measured the extent to which the respondent perceived the Safe School Design principles of the *1993 Florida Safe School Design Guidelines* to have been incorporated into the design and construction of community colleges. The majority, sixteen (16) -- eighty-percent (80%) -- of the respondents reported that the Safe School Design principles and guidelines have been *Incorporated Somewhat*. Three (3) – fifteen percent (15%) – of the respondents reported that the principles and guidelines have been *Extensively Incorporated*. One (1) -- five percent (5%) – of the respondents did not provide a response.

**Question 9: If incorporated “*extensively or somewhat*” (A and B above) in your judgement what have been some of their most important features relative to safety and security?**

Question 9 elicited a variety of open-ended responses related to effective safe school design features applicable to community colleges. Fifteen (15) -- seventy-five percent (75%) – of the respondents provided additional data for Question 9. Five (5) -- twenty-five percent (25%) – of the respondents did not provide a response.

Among the responses provided, fourteen (14) -- ninety-three percent (93%) – of the data related to *Surveillance* (e.g., “adequate lighting, low density landscaping, security cameras in high cost equipment rooms,” “Landscaping for maximum view of campus for security,” “Opening the view to buildings, removing archs and barriers, and the site lighting have been very effective tools for design,” “Site lighting and the elimination of hiding places”).

Seven (7) -- forty-six percent (46%) -- of the responses related to *Access Control* (e.g., “Natural access and control of buildings and campuses,” “Locked roof access,” “Intrusion alarm systems to detect unauthorized entry when buildings are closed,” “Separation of spaces during partial use periods”). One (1) -- six percent (6%) -- of the respondents provided a response that included *Territoriality* (i.e., “Natural Access Control, Natural Surveillance, and Territorial Reinforcement”), indicating that this individual understood the connection among these concepts.

**Question 10: In your estimation, has the incorporation of the Safe School Design principles helped make your community college safer?**

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. Cannot Judge

Question 10 estimated respondents' perspectives related to the effectiveness of Safe School Design principles in promoting a safe and secure community college environment. A significant majority of the respondents, thirteen (13) -- sixty-five percent (65%) -- reported, "Yes," Safe School Design principles help make community colleges safer. Five (5) -- twenty-five percent (25%) -- of the respondents reported that they *Cannot Judge*. Two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

### **Question 11: Comments?**

Question 11 sought to elicit additional responses pertaining to certain areas and specific principles that have been most effective in promoting a safe and secure community college environment. In addition to Question 9, the responses allowed the research team to assess the perceived effectiveness and ineffectiveness of specific Safe School Design principles, and provided a variety of examples with which to better understand the perceived advantages and disadvantages of Safe School Design principles.

Seven (7) -- thirty-five percent (35%) -- of the respondents provided additional comments. Thirteen (13) -- sixty-five percent (65%) -- of the respondents did not provide additional comments. Of the responses provided, three (3) -- forty-two percent (42%) -- of the responses referred the research team back to additional comments provided in Question 9. One (1) -- fourteen percent (14%) -- of the responses suggested that the Safe School Design principles "are common sense -- many of our architects have done K-12 work." Another respondent suggested that "the most helpful principles have been provided by the eighty (80) hour class 'Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design' (CPTED)," that this person had taken.

**Question 12: Of the 11 crimes listed below (which are derived from SESIR categories), please rank those which are *the most serious concerns* on your campus relative to occurrence (number of incidents) where 1=most serious and 11=least serious.**

- A. Robbery**
- B. Battery**
- C. Sexual Battery**
- D. Possession of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs**
- E. Breaking and Entering**
- F. Larceny/Theft**
- G. Vandalism**
- H. Trespassing**
- I. Fighting**
- J. Disorderly Conduct**
- K. Weapons Possession**

Reviewing responses to Question 12, twenty (20) -- one hundred percent (100%) -- of the respondents provided data. Seventeen (17) -- eighty-five percent (85%) -- of the respondents rank ordered all of the criminal activities listed in Question 12. Three (3) -- fifteen percent (15%) -- of the respondents provided only partial data.

Based on responses to Question 12, respondent data was regrouped into three categories: Most Serious (Rankings 1-3), Moderately Serious (Rankings 4-6), and Least Serious (Rankings 7-11). Reviewing the grouped data, respondents perceive *Larceny/Theft* to be the most serious criminal activity and *Vandalism* to be the second most serious criminal activity. *Breaking and Entering* was perceived to be the third most serious criminal activity.

**MOST SERIOUS CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES (Regrouped Data)**

(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

<u>Criminal Activity</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent*</u>
• Larceny/Theft	17	85%
• Vandalism	12	60%
• Breaking and Entering	8	40%
• Trespassing	6	30%
• Disorderly Conduct	6	30%

\*Does not total 100% due to recoded, or grouped, data.

The resulting data from Question 12 contrasts with the criminal activities recorded in the SESIR data, in which the violent crimes of *Fighting* and *Battery* are reported to occur more frequently than property crimes of *Breaking and Entering*, *Larceny/Theft*, or *Vandalism*. The significance of a relatively higher frequency of property crimes when prescribing appropriate recommendations for Safe School Design in community colleges should not be overlooked. However, one would expect to find less violent crimes at community colleges due to the differences in ages and maturity levels of these students than compared with those attending K-12 public schools.

## **SESIR DATA: FLORIDA SCHOOL CRIMES IN RANK ORDER AND PERCENT<sup>2</sup>**

(Based on the Number of Reported Incidents)

<u>Criminal Activity</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Fighting	67, 412	37%
Disorderly Conduct	36, 091	20%
Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs	18, 753	10%
Harassment	16, 921	9%
Property Crimes	15, 491	8%
Violent Acts	13, 980	7.75%
Other Non-Violent Acts	7, 971	4%
Weapons Possession	3, 732	2%

### **Part 2: Criminal Activity and School Design**

**Question 13: Of the various types of school designs listed below, which one would you prefer in terms of providing the best community college safety and security?**

- **A single 2-story (or more) building**
- **Multiple 2-story (or more) buildings**
- **1-story centrally organized grouping of buildings**
- **1-story campus plan (spread out) grouping of buildings**

Question 13, repeats a question from the *1993 Florida Safe School Design Guidelines*, “State of Florida Questionnaire,” which sought to assess the preferred type of school design among respondents in terms of providing the best community college safety and security.

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that just released SESIR data show that “Disorderly Conduct” has dropped from 78,948 incidents in 1998-1999 and from 36,091 incidents in 1999-2000 to 7,817 incidents in 2000-2001. This extraordinary decrease is the result of a redefinition of the term to exclude minor threats of disorderly conduct in favor of major campus disturbances, such as bomb threats. (See [http://www.firn.edu/doe/besss/sesir/sesir\\_home.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/besss/sesir/sesir_home.htm)) The survey data categories reported here are based on 1999-2000 statistics, which are part of the trend line consistently showing disorderly conduct among the top three crimes reported by school authorities.

Nine (9) -- forty-five percent (45%) -- of the respondents prefer a “1-Story Centrally Organized Grouping of Buildings.” Six (6) -- thirty percent (30%) -- of the respondents prefer “Multiple 2-Story (or more) Buildings.” Three (3) -- fifteen percent (15%) -- of the respondents prefer “A Single 2-Story (or more) Building.” And two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents prefer a “1-Story Campus Plan (Spread Out) Grouping of Buildings.”

**Question 14: Crime Location.** Using your best judgement based on past experience, place an “X” in the box or boxes that you believe best represent a significant location (according to the number of incidents) for the occurrence of each particular crime. For example, if you believe that school parking lots represent a significant location where robberies take place put an “X” in the corresponding box.

Question 14 measured various crimes in relation to the corresponding locations in which crimes are perceived to occur most frequently. When we review the results of Question 14 with the results of Question 12, which indicate that *Larceny/Theft*, *Vandalism*, and *Breaking and Entering* are the most serious crimes, Matrix A indicates that the most serious crimes, relative to the number of incidents, are believed to occur most frequently in the following locations: (See MATRIX A: CRIME BY LOCATION)

**CRIME BY LOCATION**

(Based on Perceived Frequency of Occurrence)

<u>Criminal Activity</u>	<u>Location (Reported Frequency)</u>
• Larceny/Theft	Parking Lots (14), Classrooms (9)
• Vandalism	Parking Lots (11), Restrooms (8)
• Breaking and Entering	Parking Lots (12), Accessory Buildings (5)

Of all the reported criminal activities, responses to Question 14 indicate that respondents believe criminal activities occur most frequently in the following locations:

**FREQUENTLY REPORTED CRIME LOCATIONS**

(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

<u>Location</u>	<u>Reported Frequency</u>
• Parking Lots	88
• Off Grounds/Adjacent Buildings	35
• Classrooms	21
• Cafeterias/Food Courts	19
• Restrooms	19

- Recreation Areas 18
- Accessory Buildings 16

**MATRIX A: CRIME BY LOCATION**

	Robbery	Battery	Sexual Battery	Alcohol, Tobacco, Other Drugs	Breaking & Entering	Larceny/Theft	Vandalism	Trespassing	Fighting	Disorderly conduct	Weapons Possession	Total
Off Grounds/Adjacent Building	4	4	4	6	2	3	3	2	1	2	4	35
Parking Lots	4	7	4	9	12	14	11	8	9	6	4	88
Recreation Areas/Playgrounds	0	1	1	2	0	0	5	1	2	0	0	12
Exterior Walkways	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	6
Exterior Courtyards/Patios	0	0	1	2	0	1	5	2	1	0	0	12
Vehicle Drop Pff/Pick-Up	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bike Racks	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Portables	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	9
Accessory Buildings	1	1	1	0	5	3	1	2	1	1	0	16
Main Entrance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Secondary Entry	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Lobby/Reception Area	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	5
Interior Courtyards	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4
Interior Corridors	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	7
Stairs and Stairwells	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
Administration Offices	1	0	0	0	3	4	0	1	0	2	0	11
Classrooms	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	1	1	5	0	21
Labs/Shops/Art/Music Rooms	0	0	0	1	4	6	1	0	0	2	1	15
Recreation Rooms	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	3	4	3	1	18
Locker Rooms	0	0	1	0	2	7	2	1	1	0	0	14
Auditorium/Assembly Rooms	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4
Media Centers/Computer Resource Rooms	0	0	0	0	4	7	1	0	0	1	0	13
Cafeteria/Food Court	0	2	1	0	1	6	2	0	2	5	0	19
Within/Adjacent Vending Areas	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	1	0	1	0	11
Restrooms	0	2	3	0	0	2	8	2	2	0	0	19
Rooftops of Covered Walkways	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Building Rooftops	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Total	10	19	19	23	43	85	59	33	25	33	10	359

**Question 15: Time of crime occurrence.** Using your best judgement based on past experience, place an “X” in the box or boxes that you believe best represents the most significant time period during which each particular crime occurs. For example, if you believe batteries are more likely to take place during regular daytime school hours, place an “X” in the corresponding box.

Question 15 measured various crimes in relation to the corresponding times during which the crimes are perceived to occur most frequently. Matrix B below depicts respondents’ thinking in this regard.

**MATRIX B: CRIME BY TIME**

	Robbery	Battery	Sexual Battery	Alcohol, Tobacco, Other Drugs	Breaking & Entering	Larceny/Theft	Vandalism	Trespassing	Fighting	Disorderly conduct	Weapons Possession	Total
Before School	0	1	0	2	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	10
During School Hours	4	4	1	5	4	13	6	7	5	9	2	60
Between Classes	0	5	0	3	0	2	2	0	4	6	0	22
After School	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	2	10
Evening Hours	6	4	10	6	12	8	10	8	1	5	3	73
Weekends	1	1	3	4	6	5	8	7	1	1	2	39
Total	11	17	14	21	23	33	27	22	14	22	10	214

When we review the results of Question 15 with the results from Question 12, which indicate that *Larceny/Theft*, *Vandalism*, and *Breaking and Entering* are the most serious crimes relative to the perceived number of incidents, we see the following pattern:

**CRIME BY TIME**

(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

Criminal Activity

Time (Reported Frequency)

Larceny/Theft

During Normal Daytime School (13), Evening (8)

Vandalism

Evening Hours (10), Weekends (8)

Breaking and Entering

Evening Hours (10), Weekends (6)

Of all the reported criminal activities, responses to Question 15 indicate that respondents believe criminal activities occur most frequently during the following time periods:

FREQUENTLY REPORTED CRIME TIMES  
(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

<u>Time</u>	<u>Reported Frequency</u>
• Evening Hours	73
• During Normal Daytime School Hours	60
• Weekends	39

In Matrix B, the crimes reported most frequently in the *Evening Hours* are *Breaking and Entering* (12), *Vandalism* (10), and *Sexual Battery* (10). Crimes reported most frequently *During Normal Daytime School Hours* are *Larceny Theft* (13), *Disorderly Conduct* (9), *Trespassing* (7), and *Vandalism* (6). Crimes reported most frequently on the *Weekend* include *Vandalism*, *Trespassing*, and *Breaking and Entering*.

**Question 16: If there are other connections or relationships between specific crimes and their location and time of occurrence in your district not covered by the above matrices, please tell us about them.**

Question 16 elicited additional responses to Question 14 and Question 15, and further attempts to connect and relate specific crimes with spatial and temporal features. Of the twenty (20) respondents, one (1) – five percent (5%) – of the respondents provided additional information noting problems with “sporadic students not involving college students – non-students on campus – transients, etc.” Nineteen (19) – ninety-five percent (95%) – of the respondents did not provide a response.

**Question 17: Using your best judgement based on past experience, do you believe that allowing public access to recreational (or other) facilities after normal daytime class hours to schools in your district makes them more prone to criminal activities than if schools were closed to such activities?**

- **Yes**
- **No**
- **Cannot Judge**

Question 17 asked respondents whether or not they believe public access to school facilities after normal daytime class hours makes schools more prone to criminal activities than if school facilities were closed to such activities. Community college respondents were almost equally divided on this issues with ten (10) -- fifty percent (50%) -- of the respondents reporting, “Yes,” access to school

facilities after normal daytime class hours makes schools more prone to criminal activity, while nine (9) -- forty-five percent (45%) -- of them said “No.” One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

**Question 18: Please provide any comments relative to Question 17 above.**

Question 18 elicited a wide variety of open-ended comments detailing the perceived advantages and disadvantages of access to public schools after normal daytime class hours. Of the twenty (20) respondents to the Community Colleges Survey Instrument, eleven (11) -- fifty-five percent (55%) -- of the respondents provided additional comments. Nine (9) -- forty-five percent (45%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

Of those providing data, ten (10) -- ninety percent (90%) -- of the respondents stated that after-hour access increases the potential for crime, with most offering reasons why they thought this was so (e.g., “Yes, lack of appropriate security staffing,” “Lack of funding to provide adequate security coverage,” “Allowing the public access to the campus after-hours when police/security/staff is minimal makes it difficult to keep the campus safe,” “Extremely difficult for security to maintain access and conduct control if the gym and recreation facilities are open to community use after hours,” “Bathroom use and a lack of a bathroom cause problems”). One (1) -- nine percent (9%) -- of the respondents stated that “we have no data to support a correlation” between crime and after-hour access.

**Question 19: Does your community college post signs advising visitors about school entry procedures for access control? (check all that apply)**

- **During School Hours**
- **After School Hours**
- **Don’t Know**

Question 19 elicited responses concerning access control management. Four (4) -- twenty percent (20%) -- of the respondents reported that policies exist for posting signs detailing entry procedures “After School Hours.” Three (3) -- fifteen percent (15%) -- of the respondents reported that they “Don’t Know.” Two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents reported policies for posting signs detailing entry procedures “During School Hours.” In addition, six (6) -- thirty percent (30%) -- of the respondents provided additional, open-ended information indicating that “No Policies” exist.

**Question 20: Please tell us whether the following are serious concerns relative to their *actual occurrence* within your community college.**

- |    |         |        |                                                 |
|----|---------|--------|-------------------------------------------------|
| A. | Yes ___ | No ___ | <b>Gang Related Activities</b>                  |
| B. | Yes ___ | No ___ | <b>Hate Crimes Related Activities/Incidents</b> |
| C. | Yes ___ | No ___ | <b>Bomb Threats</b>                             |
| D. | Yes ___ | No ___ | <b>Terrorism</b>                                |
| E. | Yes ___ | No ___ | <b>Violence in the Workplace</b>                |

Seventeen (17) -- eighty-five percent (85%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Gang Violence Activities* are not serious concerns relative to the number of incidents, whereas two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Gang Violence Activities* are serious concerns relative to the number of incidents.

Seventeen (17) -- eighty-five percent (85%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Hate Crimes Related Activities/Incidents* are not serious concerns relative to the number of incidents. Two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Hate Crimes Related Activities/Incidents* are serious concerns relative to the number of incidents.

Eleven (11) -- fifty-five percent (55%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Bomb Threats* are not serious concerns, relative to the number of incidents. Eight (8) -- forty percent (40%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Bomb Threats* are serious concerns relative to the number of incidents.

Sixteen (16) -- eighty percent (80%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Terrorism* is not a serious concern relative to the number of incidents. Three (3) -- fifteen percent (15%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Terrorism* is a serious concern relative to the number of incidents.

Fourteen (14) -- seventy percent (70%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Violence in the Workplace* is not a serious concern relative to the number of incidents. And, five (5) -- twenty-five percent (25%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Violence in the Workplace* is a serious concern relative to the number of incidents.

One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response to Question 20.

**Question 21: If you answered yes to any of the answers above, does your community college have specific plans and policies in place to deal with that situation? Please describe them briefly.**

Question 21 further measured community college policies and district management practices relative to the five issues noted above. Four (4) -- twenty percent (20%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Gang Violence Activities*. Two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies do exist to deal with *Gang Violence Activities*.

Four (4) -- twenty percent (20%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies do exist to deal with *Hate Crimes Related Activities/Incidents*. Two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Hate Crimes Related Activities/Incidents*.

Nine (9) -- forty-five percent (45%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies exist to deal with *Bomb Threat*. Zero (0) respondents indicated that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Gang Violence Activities*.

Six (6) -- thirty percent (30%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies exist to deal with *Terrorism*. Two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Terrorism*.

And eight (8) -- forty percent (40%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies exist to deal with *Violence in the Workplace*. And one (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Violence in the Workplace*.

**Part 3: Design and Policy Suggestions**

**Question 22: What do you see as the most critical areas of school design with respect to safety and security from crime relative to your community college? Please rank the areas noted below such that 1=the most critical area and 14=the least critical area.**

- A. Maintaining visual surveillance from the street**
- B. Maintaining visual surveillance in corridors (interior and exterior)**
- C. Minimizing niches, alcoves, and other residual spaces that provide places for hiding**
- D. Window design**
- E. Exterior door design**
- F. Enclosure of school property perimeter (fencing, walls)**
- G. Landscaping**
- H. Location of key cabinets**
- I. Alarm systems**
- J. Miscellaneous openings and outbuildings**
- K. Electronic Surveillance systems (for example CCTV)**
- L. Other (please specify)**

The responses to Question 22 were grouped into three categories: Most Critical (Rankings 1-5), Moderately Critical (Rankings 6-10), and Least Critical (Rankings 11-14), to assess the most frequently recorded areas of concern. When grouped in this way, *Exterior Lighting* (17) was reported to be the most critical area of school design. *Alarm Systems* (12) and *Interior Lighting* (11), respectively, were the second and third most critical areas of school design.

**FREQUENTLY REPORTED AREAS CRITICAL TO SCHOOL DESIGN**

<u>Area of School Design</u>	<u>Reported Frequency</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exterior Lighting</li> </ul>	17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alarm Systems</li> </ul>	12

- Interior Lighting 11
- Minimal Niches 9

**Question 23: If funding were available, what *design changes* would you implement in your community college to make it safer from crime?**

Question 23 elicited a variety of open-ended responses. Of the twenty (20) respondents to this question, sixteen (16) -- eighty percent (80%) -- of the respondents provided additional comments and recommended design changes. Four (4) -- twenty percent (20%) -- of the respondents did not provide additional comments nor recommend design changes.

Among the respondents providing additional comments, nine (9) -- fifty-six (56%) -- of the respondents recommended design changes involving issues of *Surveillance* (e.g., “Install security camera systems,” “Surveillance cameras throughout the college,” “Electronic surveillance systems in our parking lots,” “Expand electronic surveillance systems (CCTV) to cover all buildings, parking lots, and walkways”).

Seven (7) -- forty-three percent (43%) -- of the respondents suggested design changes involving issues of *Access Control* (e.g., “Access control systems management,” “Key access to certain areas,” “Control and limit the number of entrances to parking lots,” “Restrict vehicle traffic access when closed -- using gate controls,” “Closure of campus to public after hours”).

**Question 24: If funding were available, what *single policy or procedure* would you implement within your community college to increase safety and security?**

Question 24 elicited thirteen (13) -- sixty-five percent (65%) -- responses from the respondents to the Community Colleges Survey Instrument. Seven (7) -- thirty-five percent (35%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

Six (6) -- thirty percent (30%) -- of the respondents provided policy recommendations concerning *Management and Guardianship* (e.g., “24 hour security presence on campus,” “Policy of providing adequate security 24/7,” “Provide additional security staff,” “Improve the professional training of the security staff”).

Four (4) -- thirty percent (30%) -- of the respondents provided policy recommendations concerning *Access Control* (e.g., “Coded card access,” “Start new keyless system,” “Direct actual visitors to report to control location for access control,” “A program to increase the number of access control monitoring devices”).

One (1) -- seven percent (7%) -- of the respondents provided policy recommendations concerning *Access Control and Territoriality* (i.e., “Fencing around campus property”).

**Question 25: Please provide any additional comments or suggestions concerning the issues presented in this questionnaire.**

Question 25 elicited additional open-ended responses. Of the twenty (20) respondents to the Community Colleges Survey Instrument, eighteen (18) -- ninety percent (90%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response. Two (2) -- ten percent (10%) -- of the respondents provided additional comments.

One (1) respondent suggested that “all institutions of higher education as well as school districts should have one individual familiar with CPTED and that member a key person in any future planning.” The other respondent critiqued the questionnaire insomuch as “Question 19 should be thrown out – does not contain a space for ‘NO’.”

## ***5. School Resource Officers (SRO) Survey Instrument and Related Data Analysis***

### **The Survey Instrument Format**

The survey instrument consisted of twenty-two (22) closed-ended and open-ended questions, requiring approximately thirty (30) minutes to complete.

The survey instrument began with a general introductory statement that provided informed consent information to the respondents. The survey instrument was then divided into the following three (3) sections. The first section, *Part 1: Background and Context* (Questions 1-9), collected basic demographic information on respondents. *Part 1* also focused on respondent experience and familiarity with Safe-School Design and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). The second section, *Part 2: Criminal Activity and School Design* (Questions 10-18), assessed the specific places and locations, as well as the specific period of the day, where, and when incidents of crime are believed by respondents to occur most frequently. The final section, *Part 3: Design and Policy Suggestions* (Questions 19-22), addressed school design and policy concerns of the respondents.<sup>1</sup>

Throughout the survey instrument, the questions also aim to evaluate management trends and the effectiveness of management policy, as proper management is considered a fundamental component of safe-school design.

### **Part 1: Background and Context**

**Questions 1-6, “Date,” “County,” “Person Completing Survey,” “School Name,” “Title/Position,” and “Contact Information”** provided demographic data, which enabled the research team to identify, organize, and catalogue respondents, and the geographic origin of the completed survey instruments.

On May 1, 2002, eighty-nine (89) survey instruments were initially distributed to the addresses of sixty-seven (67) SROs listed in the North East Florida Educational Consortium’s website, <http://www.nefec.org/health/sro.asp>, and to the twenty-two (22) board and regional directors of the Florida Association of School Resource Officers (FASRO). On June 22, 2002, approximately 500 School Resource Officers (SRO) Survey Instruments were distributed at the 23<sup>rd</sup> Annual FASRO Conference in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Fifty-four (54), or slightly more than 8 percent of the survey instruments, were returned by August 14, 2002. Map 5 on page 182 depicts the county-by-county distribution of completed survey instruments from SROs.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that because of rounding, response totals to some questions may not equal 100%

**Question 7: How long have you served as a School Resource Officer?**

- A. \_\_\_\_\_ (Years and Months)**
- B. \_\_\_\_\_ (Years and Months as a Supervisor)**

Fifty-three (53) -- ninety-eight percent (98%) -- of the respondents provided a response to this question. The mean number of years and months of experience reported in the returned SRO survey instruments was five years and six months (5.68 years). Six (6) -- eleven percent (11%) -- of the respondents had supervisory experience. Of those with supervisory experience, a mean of three (3) years of supervisory experience was reported.

**Question 8: Please rate your knowledge of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)?**

- 1. very familiar**
- 2. somewhat familiar**
- 3. have heard of it but not very familiar**
- 4. not familiar at all**

A sizeable majority of respondents to the survey instrument (68% or 37) report that they are either “very familiar” (24% or 13) or “somewhat familiar” (44% or 24) with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. Of the remaining respondents to the question, 25% (13) indicate that they are “not very familiar” or, as in the case of one person (2%) “not at all familiar” with CPTED. These findings track expectation levels about police knowledge of place-based crime prevention approaches since law enforcement agencies around the nation have begun CPTED educational programs at local and state levels over the last decade. Florida is no exception in this regard, and the responses here demonstrate the effect of such training in terms of police, and in this case, School Resource Officer, familiarity.

**Question 9: If you are “very or somewhat familiar” with CPTED (answers A and B above) please tell us how you learned about it? (For example, through Florida Attorney General courses, FASRO, NCPI, other training?)**

Of the thirty-seven (37) respondents to this question who said they were “very or somewhat familiar” with CPTED, thirty-four (34) -- ninety-two percent (92%) -- of the respondents provided additional comments. Many respondents reported having learned about CPTED in SRO Basic Training, through the Florida Association of School Resource Officers (FASRO) and the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO). Several respondents noted CPTED courses given through the Florida Attorney General. Others noted learning of CPTED through current literature and by virtue of their years of experience.

**Part 2: Criminal Activity and School Design**

**Question 10: Of the various types of school designs listed below, which one would you prefer in terms of providing the best school safety and security?**

- 1. A single 2-story (or more) building**
- 2. Multiple 2-story (or more) buildings**
- 3. 1-story centrally organized grouping of buildings**
- 4. 1-story campus plan (spread out) grouping of buildings**

Question 10, also asked in the *1993 Florida Safe School Design Guidelines*, “State of Florida Questionnaire,” measured the preferred school design among respondents in terms of providing the best school safety and security. Thirty-two (32) -- sixty percent (60%) -- of the fifty-three respondents who answered this question preferred a “1-Story Centrally Organized Grouping of Buildings.” And Twelve (12) -- twenty-three percent (23%) -- of the respondents preferred a “1-Story Campus Plan (Spread Out) Grouping of Buildings.” Five (5) -- nine percent (9%) -- of the respondents preferred “A Single 2-Story (or more) Building”. Four (4) -- seven percent (7%) -- of the respondents preferred “Multiple 2-Story (or more) Buildings”. This response directly tracks the respondents to other survey instruments in this research who, by a large majority, tend to favor the 1-story centrally organized plan for security purposes.

**Question 11: Crime Location. Using your best judgement based on past experience, place an “X” in the box or boxes that you believe best represent a significant location (according to the number of incidents) for the occurrence of each particular crime. For example, if you believe that school parking lots represent a significant location where robberies take place, put an “X” in the corresponding box.**

**MATRIX A: CRIME BY LOCATION**  
(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

	Robbery	Battery	Sexual Battery	Alcohol, Tobacco, Other Drugs	Breaking Entering	Larceny/Theft	Vandalism	Trespassing	Fighting	Disorderly Conduct	Weapons Possession	Total
Off Grounds/Adjacent Buildings	8	29	3	38	8	12	13	14	39	24	14	202
Parking Lots	4	18	2	22	19	19	25	26	26	14	20	195
Recreation Areas/ Playgrounds	3	17	4	14	0	6	12	17	25	12	3	113
Exterior Walkways	1	15	0	10	0	2	12	15	21	7	4	87

Exterior Courtyards/Patios	1	12	1	9	0	2	12	12	15	9	1	74
Vehicle Drop-Off/Pick-Up	0	4	0	8	0	1	1	16	9	4	4	47
Bike Racks	3	6	1	5	2	26	14	8	6	4	2	77
Portables	2	4	3	5	16	3	13	6	8	6	1	67
Accessory Buildings	0	0	3	4	11	6	9	8	0	0	0	41
Main Entrance	1	4	0	2	0	0	4	13	7	6	2	39
Secondary Entrances	1	5	0	6	5	1	7	24	7	7	2	65
Lobby/Reception Areas	1	4	0	2	1	1	3	5	7	11	3	38
Interior Courtyards	1	15	2	8	2	5	9	11	25	14	3	95
Interior Corridors	3	17	2	7	1	6	9	5	20	16	4	90
Stairs/Stairwells	6	9	6	11	0	1	16	6	12	9	3	79
Administration Offices	0	3	0	2	6	6	3	3	5	19	2	49
Classrooms	1	16	2	5	9	28	15	7	17	24	15	139
Labs/Shops/Art/Music Rooms	2	8	2	5	7	16	11	5	11	9	6	82
Recreation Rooms	2	14	7	9	4	16	11	10	23	15	4	115
Locker Rooms	7	17	10	17	12	34	21	8	20	12	7	165
Auditorium/Assembly	0	3	1	1	2	5	7	4	7	10	0	40
Media Centers/Computer Rooms	1	2	0	2	6	17	12	1	3	5	0	49
Cafeteria/Food Court	1	19	0	7	5	13	9	11	33	23	7	128
Within/Adjacent Vending Rooms	4	5	1	3	3	7	10	2	6	4	1	46
Restrooms	8	18	10	32	1	5	34	4	22	8	7	149
Rooftops of Walkways	1	1	2	1	3	1	5	9	3	1	2	29
Building Rooftops	0	1	3	1	3	1	7	10	1	0	2	29
Total	62	266	65	236	126	240	304	260	378	273	119	2,329

Question 11 measured various crimes in relation to the corresponding locations in which the crimes are perceived to occur most frequently. When we review the results of Question 11 with criminal activities reported in Florida’s School Environmental Safety Incident Reporting System (SESIR), data for 1999-2000 indicates that “Fighting,” “Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs,” and “Disorderly Conduct” were the most commonly reported crimes relative to the number of incidents.<sup>2</sup> Matrix A indicates that the most serious crimes are believed to occur most frequently in the following locations: (See above, MATRIX A: CRIME BY LOCATION)

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that just released SESIR data show that “Disorderly Conduct” has dropped from 78,948 incidents in 1998-1999 and from 36,091 incidents in 1999-2000 to 7,817 incidents in 2000-2001. This extraordinary decrease is the result of a redefinition of the term to exclude minor threats of disorderly conduct in favor of major campus disturbances, such as bomb threats. (See [http://www.firn.edu/doe/besss/sesir/sesir\\_home.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/besss/sesir/sesir_home.htm)) The survey data categories reported here are based on 1999-2000 statistics, which are part of the trend line consistently showing disorderly conduct among the top three crimes reported by school authorities.

### **CRIME BY LOCATION**

(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

<u>Criminal Activity</u>	<u>Location (Reported Frequency)</u>
• Fighting	Off Grounds (39), Cafeteria/Food Court (33), Parking Lots (26), Recreation Areas/Playgrounds (25), Interior Courtyards (25)
• Disorderly Conduct	Off Grounds (24), Classrooms (24), Cafeteria/Food Court (23)
• Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs	Off Grounds (38), Restrooms (32), Parking Lots (22), Locker Rooms (17)

When we look at those perceived crimes most frequently reported by our respondents, we see that the order is Fighting (378), Vandalism (304), Disorderly Conduct (273), and Battery (266). While this generally tracks SESIR statewide data, it is obvious that our respondents believe that “Vandalism” is a far more serious problem than the SESIR reports indicate.

Of all the reported criminal activities, responses to Question 11 indicate that respondents believe criminal activities occur most frequently in the following locations:

### **FREQUENTLY REPORTED CRIME LOCATIONS**

(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

<u>Location</u>	<u>Reported Frequency</u>
• Off Grounds/Adjacent Buildings	202
• Parking Lots	195
• Locker Rooms	165
• Restrooms	149
• Classrooms	139

From this, one could draw a conclusion that the respondents perceived more crimes occurring in either remote locations where surveillance and guardianship are likely to be low or in interior spaces where the same problems apply. If that is the case, how does one explain the relatively high occurrence in classrooms (139), where both surveillance and guardianship are likely to be intense? One explanation comes from looking at the crimes involved. Classroom crimes that are thought to happen the most frequently are *larceny and theft* (28) and *disorderly conduct* (24), which is likely to be “group” crime. Classrooms contain a high density of targets, both in terms of people and property, which are likely to appeal to opportunistic offenders, especially thieves. The largest numbers of perceived crime in parking lots fit the location there as well: one sees more *fighting* (26), *trespassing* (26), and *vandalism*

(25), since these areas are likely to have low levels of surveillance, especially at non-peak times, and to be poorly supervised. Of all places, off-ground locations are considered to be the highest venues of crime, with the most perceived incidents reported by SROs. They are seen as locales for *fights* (39), the *use of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs* (38), and where *batteries* (29) take place. Indeed, it is the single most significant location for these latter crimes of violence. *Larceny and theft* are seen as the crimes of choice in locker rooms as these are places where personal possessions are constantly at risk because they are often moved about and placed in jeopardy, whereas *vandalism* -- largely a crime of stealth -- is the major problem of restrooms. Both these latter locations, busy yet potentially secluded/private places where people disrobe, are perceived to be the venue where sexual batteries are most likely to occur in the schools which SROs patrol.

**Question 12: Time of Crime Occurrence. Using your best judgement based on past experience, place an “X” in the box or boxes that you believe best represents the most significant time period during which each particular crime occurs. For example, if you believe that batteries are more likely to take place during regular daytime school hours, place an “X” in the corresponding box.**

**MATRIX B: CRIME BY TIME**  
(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

	Robbery	Battery	Sexual Battery	Alcohol, Tobacco, Other Drugs	Breaking and Entering	Larceny/Theft	Vandalism	Trespassing	Fighting	Disorderly Conduct	Weapons Possession	Total
Before School	6	16	2	34	5	10	9	15	19	15	13	144
During School Hours	1	28	9	22	4	39	19	27	35	29	22	235
Between Classes	5	21	5	19	2	18	15	10	38	22	8	163
After School	10	29	5	24	5	15	13	23	38	19	10	191
Evening Hours	9	7	10	18	28	12	31	19	6	5	8	153
Weekends	8	11	11	16	32	12	33	19	7	7	9	165
Total	39	112	42	133	76	106	120	113	143	97	70	1,051

Question 12 measured various crimes in relation to the corresponding time during which the crimes are perceived to occur most frequently. (See above, MATRIX B) When we review the results of Question 12 with criminal activities reported in SESIR data for 1999-2000, which indicates that *Fighting, Disorderly Conduct, and Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs* are the most serious crimes relative to the number of incidents, Matrix B shows that the most serious crimes are believed to occur most frequently at the following times:

**CRIME BY TIME**  
(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

<u>Criminal Activity</u>	<u>Time (Reported Frequency)</u>
• Fighting	Between Classes (38), After Normal Daytime School Hours (38), During School (35)
• Disorderly Conduct	During School (29), Between Classes (22)
• Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs	Before School (34), After School (24), Between Classes (22)

Of all the reported criminal activities, responses to Question 12 indicate that the respondents believe criminal activities occur most frequently during the following time periods: (See below)

**FREQUENTLY REPORTED CRIME TIMES**  
(Based on Perceived Frequency of Incidents)

<u>Time</u>	<u>Reported Frequency</u>
• During School Hours	235
• After School	191
• Weekends	165
• Between Classes	163

In Matrix B, of the crimes reported most frequently *During School Hours*, *Larceny/Theft* and *Fighting* are reported most frequently. Of the crimes reported most frequently *After School*, *Fighting* and *Battery* are reported most frequently. Of the crimes reported most frequently during *Weekends*, *Vandalism* and *Breaking and Entering* are reported to occur most frequently.

**Question 13: If there are other connections or relationships between specific crimes and their location and time of occurrence in your school not covered by the above matrices, please tell us about them.**

Question 13 elicited additional responses to Question 11 and Question 12, and further attempts to connect and relate specific crimes with spatial and temporal features. Of the fifty- four (54) respondents, seven (7) -- thirteen percent (13%) -- of the respondents provided additional information. Several of the statements suggested a broader, but more specific categorization of criminal activities (e.g., “Assaults,” “Truancy needs listed,” “Disruption of a school function is used frequently per 877 Florida Statute (2000),” “Separating tobacco from alcohol and other drugs section would provide

a more accurate report for the serious illicit drugs”). Other respondents emphasized information provided in both Matrices (“Most of the fighting in our school takes place during periods of limited supervision,” “Batteries, fighting/disorderly conduct are all likely to happen anywhere,” “Smoking in the bathrooms”).

**Question 14: Using your best judgement based on past experience, do you believe that allowing public access to recreational (or other) facilities after normal daytime class hours to schools in your school makes them more prone to criminal activities than if schools were closed to such activities?**

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. Cannot Judge

Question 14 asked respondents whether or not they believe public access to school facilities after normal daytime class hours makes schools more prone to criminal activities than if school facilities were closed to such activities. Thirty-seven (37) -- sixty-nine percent (69%) -- of the respondents reported, *Yes*, access to school facilities after normal daytime class hours makes schools more prone to criminal activity, and fifteen (15) -- twenty-eight percent (28%) -- of the respondents reported, *No*. One (1) -- two percent (2%) -- of the respondents reported that they “Cannot Judge”. One (1) -- two percent (2%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

**Question 15: Please provide any comments relative to Question 14 above.<sup>3</sup>**

Question 15 elicited a wide array of comments detailing the perceived advantages and disadvantages of after hours access to public schools. Thirty-nine (39) -- seventy-two percent (72%) -- of the respondents provided additional comments. Fifteen (15) -- twenty-eight percent (28%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

Of those providing data, twenty-five (25) -- forty-six percent (46%) -- of the respondents stated that after-hours access increases the potential for crime (e.g., “Outside people come in to fight and start problems,” “I live on a school campus (to provide security). I see criminal activity at school campus after hours and deal with it on a daily basis,” “This allows people to identify potential target areas for criminal behavior”). Fourteen (14) -- twenty-six percent (26%) -- of the respondents stated that after-hours access does not increase the potential for crime, and may even deter crime (e.g., “More people, more eyes,” “The presence of people helps deter some crimes from happening,” “The more hours the honest public has access to facilities reduces the hours the criminals have for mischief”). Several respondents also provided suggestions for dealing with after-hour access (e.g., “These activities

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that because of rounding, the total percentage exceeds 100% for responses to this question.

would need to be controlled and supervised,” “If this is allowed, it should be controlled by an agency [illegible] (Parks dept) and that person should be held responsible for the event and accountable to the school,” “It varies by activity taking place; sports increase the likelihood of fights -- drama and band activities seem to have no adverse effects”).

**Question 16: Does your school post signs advising visitors about school entry procedures for access control? (Check all that apply)**

- A. During School Hours**
- B. After School Hours**
- C. Don’t Know**

Question 16 elicited responses concerning school access control management. Fifty-two (52) -- ninety-six percent (96%) -- of the respondents reported that district policies exist for posting signs detailing school entry procedures *During School Hours*, and twenty-eight (28) -- fifty-two percent (52%) -- respondents report policies for posting signs detailing entry procedures *After School Hours*. One (1) -- two percent (2%) -- of the respondents provided additional information indicating that policies do not exist detailing school entry procedures. And one (1) -- two percent (2%) -- of the respondents did not provide data.

**Question 17: Please tell us whether the following are serious concerns relative to their *actual occurrence* within your school.**

- A. Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Gang Related Activities**
- B. Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Hate Crimes Related Activities/Incidents**
- C. Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Bomb Threats**
- D. Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Terrorism**
- E. Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Violence in the Workplace**

Reviewing Question 17, thirty-six (36) -- sixty-eight percent (68%) -- of the respondents reported that *Gang Violence Activities* are not serious concerns relative to the number of incidents. Seventeen (17) -- thirty-two percent (32%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Gang Violence Activities* are serious concerns relative to number of incidents.

Forty-three (43) -- eighty-three percent (83%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Hate Crimes Related Activities/Incidents* are not serious concerns relative to the number of incidents. Nine (9) -- seventeen percent (17%) -- of the respondents reported that *Hate Crimes Related Activities/Incidents* are serious concerns.

Thirty-three (33) -- sixty-two percent (62%) -- of the respondents reported that *Bomb Threats* are not serious concerns. Twenty (20) -- thirty-eight percent (38%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Bomb Threats* are serious concerns relative to the number of incidents.

Forty-eight (48) -- ninety-two percent (92%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Terrorism* is not a serious concern relative to the number of incidents. Four (4) -- seven percent (7%) -- of the respondents reported that *Terrorism* is a serious concern relative to the number of incidents.

Thirty-six (36) -- sixty-nine percent (69%) -- of the fifty-two (52) respondents to this question reported that *Violence in the Workplace* is not a serious concern relative to the number of incidents. Sixteen (16) -- thirty-one percent (31%) -- of the respondents indicated that *Violence in the Workplace* is a serious concern relative to the number of incidents.

**Question 18: If you answered yes to any of the items above, does your school have specific plans and policies in place to deal with that situation? Please describe them briefly.**

Question 18 further measured school policies and management practices relative to: A. Gang Violence; B. Hate Crimes; C. Bomb Threats; D. Terrorism; and E. Violence in the Workplace.

Of the twenty-four (24) persons answering this question, eighteen (18) -- seventy-five percent (75%) -- of the respondents indicated that specific plans and policies exist to deal with *Gang Violence Activities*. Six (6) -- twenty-five percent (25%) -- of the respondents reported that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Gang Violence Activities*.

Of the fifteen (15) persons answering this question, ten (10) respondents-- sixty-six percent (66%) -- reported that specific plans and policies exist to deal with *Hate Crimes Related Activities/ Incidents*. Five (5) -- thirty-three percent (33%) -- of the respondents reported that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Hate Crime Related Activities/Incidents*.

Of the twenty-seven (27) persons answering this question, twenty-five (25) respondents -- ninety-three percent (93%) -- reported that specific plans and policies exist to deal with *Bomb Threats*. Two (2) -- seven percent (7%) -- of the respondents reported that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Bomb Threats*.

Of the thirteen people answering this question, five (5) respondents --thirty-eight percent (38%) -- reported that specific plans and policies exist to deal with *Terrorism*. Eight (8) -- sixty-two percent (62%) -- of the respondents reported that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Terrorism*.

Of the twenty (20) persons answering this question, fifteen (15) respondents -- seventy-five percent (75%) -- reported that specific plans and policies exist to deal with *Violence in the Workplace*. Five (5) -- twenty-five percent (25%) -- of the respondents reported that specific plans and policies do not exist to deal with *Violence in the Workplace*.

### **Part 3: Design and Policy Suggestions**

**Question 19: What do you see as the *most critical areas of school design* with respect to safety and security from crime relative to your district? Please rank the areas noted below such that 1=the most critical area and 14=the least critical area.**

- A. Maintaining visual surveillance from the street**
- B. Maintaining visual surveillance in corridors (interior and exterior)**
- C. Minimizing niches, alcoves, and other residual spaces that provide places for hiding**
- D. Window design**
- E. Exterior door design**
- F. Enclosure of school property perimeter (fencing, walls)**
- G. Landscaping**
- H. Location of key cabinets**
- I. Alarm systems**
- J. Miscellaneous openings and outbuildings**
- K. Electronic Surveillance systems (for example CCTV)**
- L. Other (please specify)**

Question 19 measured respondent perspectives concerning the most critical areas of school design related to safety and security. The responses were grouped into three categories: Most Critical (Rankings 1-5), Moderately Critical (Rankings 6-10), and Least Critical (Rankings 11-14). *Corridor Surveillance* (38) was reported to be the most critical area of school design. *Perimeter Enclosure* (35) was reported to be the second most critical area of school design, and *Minimal Niches* (34) was reported to be the third most critical area. Two (2) -- four percent (4%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response. (See below)

#### **CRITICAL AREAS OF SCHOOL DESIGN**

<u>Area of School Design</u>	<u>Reported Frequency</u>
• Corridor Surveillance	38
• Perimeter Enclosure	35
• Minimal Niches	34
• Electronic Surveillance	33
• Street Surveillance	23
• Exterior Lighting	23

**Question 20: If funding were available, what *design changes* would you implement in your district (or school) to make it safer from crime?**

Question 20 elicited a variety of open-ended responses. Fifty-three (53) -- ninety-eight percent (98%) -- of the respondents provided additional comments and recommended design considerations. One (1) -- two percent (2%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

Among the respondents providing additional data, twenty-eight (28) of the respondents recommended design changes involving issues of *Surveillance* (e.g., “School cameras,” “Electronic Surveillance,” “More SROs,” “Hire adult hall monitors,” “Hallway Cameras and Monitors,” “Exterior cameras on social gathering points on and off campus,” “Making all schools have camera surveillance not only inside the school but outside, too,” “Design all so office can see entrance and parking in order to see visitors prior to entering buildings”).

Nineteen (19) of the respondents suggested design changes involving issues of *Territoriality* (e.g., “Enclosure of school property,” “A fence in front of the school,” “Install perimeter fence near front of school,” “I would have the entire school fenced in,” “Remove fences and walls that turn our schools into prisons instead of places of learning”). The majority of the fencing recommendations appeared as much an issue of *Access Control* as *Territoriality*.

Fourteen (14) of the respondents suggested design changes involving issues of *Access Control* (e.g., “Better access controls,” “People should have to buzz and identify themselves before the office lets them in,” “Change locks on classrooms so you could lock your classroom from the inside,” “Design parking lots in such a manner that once school begins it can be arranged to have only one way in and one way out. Check station outside parking lot, checking people coming in and out”).

Several of the respondents suggested design changes involving the combined issues of *Surveillance*, *Territoriality*, and *Access Control* (e.g., “Cameras, better alarm system, improve exterior lights, fence perimeter, proper signs for entrance procedures,” “Electronic Surveillance/perimeter fencing and alarm systems,” “Video surveillance and secured perimeter”). And still other respondents made recommendations dealing more with issues of *Guardianship* and *Management* (e.g., “Reduce students per school,” “Remove portables,” “Phase out the use of portables,” “More enclosed corridors and get rid of portables and build to accommodate classrooms,” “Increase awareness and knowledge of all staff in understanding the true importance of security issues,” “Get money for Crime Watch and attempt to get the people that live in the area and parents involved in a safe school program”).

**Question 21: If funding were available, what *single policy or procedure* would you implement within your district (or school) to increase safety and security?**

Question 21 elicited forty-six (46) -- eighty-five percent (85%) -- responses from the respondents

to the SRO survey instrument. Eight (8) -- fifteen percent (15%) -- of the respondents did not provide additional comments.

The majority of the responses from respondents concerned policy recommendations involving issues of *Guardianship* and *Management*, in addition to *Surveillance*, *Access Control*, and *Territoriality*. Several respondents offered program recommendations [e.g., “I’d have more programs/classes for the staff and students,” “Self-policing system by students,” “Get programs as SAVE (Students Against Violence Everywhere) some awareness program that targets youth offenders in school”]. Others strictly presented policy changes (e.g., “Mandatory uniforms for students,” “Students would have to wear uniforms,” “Uniforms for all students and identification cards for staff and visitors,” “Not let subjects arrested for drugs and fighting in school until the next school year,” “I would purchase portable drug and chemical detectors,” “School search and drug dogs”). Many dealt specifically with issues of *Guardianship* [e.g., “More campus advisors or additional SRO on campus,” “Hire a permanent full-time security guard to assist SRO,” “More SROs on campus,” “Mandatory SRO/Student ratio (SRO to 1000 students),” “SRO to Student Ratio: Many schools have too many students for officers to protect,” “Train staff on problem recognition and to effectively patrol between classes, etc.,” “All teachers and administrators roaming in halls between classes”]. One (1) of the respondents recommended “true and accurate reporting of crimes and situations occurring.”

In combination with issues of *Guardianship* and *Management*, others suggested policy changes involving issues of *Territoriality* (e.g., “Fencing”), *Surveillance* (e.g., “CCTV and personnel to man it”), and *Access Control* (e.g., “Limit access onto/off campus - manned security,” “To have the ability to have a buzzer for access to my school,” “Absolutely zero visitors during school hours. If money or personal items need to be dropped off, have it done at check station -- receipts -- eliminate visitors in the main building of schools. Only faculty and students allowed inside”).

**Question 22: Please provide any additional comments or suggestions concerning the issues presented in this questionnaire.**

Question 22 elicited additional responses. Forty-five (45) -- eighty-three percent (83%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response. Nine (9) -- seventeen percent (17%) -- of the respondents provided additional suggestions (e.g., “Teachers need to be a more active part of crime prevention,” “Need to fence the school property - update and increase cameras and train teachers for critical incidents,” “Open areas with wide walkways and hallways reduce crime and violence more than any other policy or improvement I’ve seen,” “All school building plans should be required to go through a CPTED review”). Others offered additional miscellaneous comments (e.g., “We have a state law that makes it mandatory that all violate misdemeanors be reported to law enforcement, but there is no penalty if the school officials don’t report crime on their campus”). And words of appreciation (e.g., “Thank you”).

## ***6. Design Professionals Survey Instrument and Related Data Analysis***

### **The Survey Instrument Format**

The survey instrument consisted of twenty-five (25) closed-ended and open-ended questions, requiring approximately thirty (30) minutes to complete. The survey instrument began with a general introductory statement that provided informed consent information to the respondents. The survey instrument was then divided into the following three (3) sections:<sup>1</sup>

The first section, *Part 1: Background and Context* (Questions 1-13), collected basic demographic information on respondents. *Part 1* also focused on respondent experience and familiarity with Safe-School Design and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). The second section, *Part 2: Criminal Activity and School Design* (Questions 14-23), assessed the perceived usefulness of Safe School Design Principles. The final section, *Part 3: Design and Policy Suggestions* (Questions 24-25), addressed school design and policy concerns of the respondents.

### **Part 1: Background and Context**

**Questions 1-5, “Date,” “Firm Name,” “Person Completing Survey,” “Title/Position,” and “Contact Information”** provided demographic data, which allowed the research team to identify, organize, and catalogue respondents.

On June 27, 2002, survey instruments were mailed to the addresses of 45 design firms and individual design professionals and architects involved in the planning and construction of public schools in the state of Florida since 1993. Nineteen (19) -- forty two percent (42%) -- of the survey instruments were returned by August 14, 2002.

**Question 6: How many years experience does your firm have providing design services for school facilities?**

- A. 0-5**
- B. 5-10**
- C. 10-15**
- D. 15-20**
- E. over 20**

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that because of rounding, response totals to some questions may not equal 100%.

The clear majority, sixteen (16) -- eighty-four percent (84%) -- of the respondents reported at least ten (10) years of experience providing design services for school facilities. Thirteen (13) -- sixty-eight percent (68%) -- of the respondents reported *Over 20* years of experience. Three (3) -- sixteen percent (16%) -- of the respondents reported *15-20* years of experience. And three (3) -- sixteen percent (16%) of the respondents reported *5-10* years of experience. (This question's categories are non-exclusive, which makes it difficult to better identify specific lengths of experience.)

**Question 7: How many public school facilities has your firm designed, including building design and/or master planning projects?**

- A. 0-5**
- B. 5-10**
- C. 10-15**
- D. 15-20**
- E. over 20**

As in the previous question, a large majority, sixteen (16) -- eighty-four percent (84%) -- of the respondents reported having designed at least ten (10) public schools. Thirteen (13) -- sixty-eight percent (68%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *Over 20* public schools. Two (2) -- eleven percent (11%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *15-20*, and two (2) -- eleven percent (11%) -- of the respondents reported *0-5*. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *10-15*, and one (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents reported *5-10*. (This question's categories are non-exclusive, which makes it difficult to better identify the range of experience.)

**Question 8: What types of school facilities has your firm designed?**

- A. Elementary School**
- B. Middle School**
- C. High School**
- D. Community College**

The vast majority, seventeen (17) -- eighty-nine percent (89%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *Elementary Schools*, *Middle Schools*, and *High Schools*. Thirteen (13) -- sixty-eight percent (68%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *Community Colleges*. All respondents provided a response.

**Question 9: Where are these schools located?**

- A. Inner City Context**
- B. Suburban Context**
- C. Rural Context**

Eighteen (18) -- ninety-five percent (95%) -- of the respondents reported having designed schools located in the *Suburban Context*. Nine (9) -- forty-seven percent (47%) -- of the respondents reported having designed schools in the Rural Context, and eight (8) -- forty-two percent (42%) -- of the respondents reported having designed schools in the Inner City. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

**Question 10: How many schools has your firm designed since 1993?<sup>2</sup>**

- A. 0-5
- B. 5-10
- C. 10-15
- D. 15-20
- E. over 20

The majority, thirteen (13) -- sixty-eight percent (68%) -- of the respondents reported having designed at least ten (10) school facilities since 1993. Seven (7) -- thirty seven percent (37%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *Over 20*. Four (4) -- twenty one percent (21%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *15-20*, and two (2) -- eleven percent (11%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *10-15* school facilities since 1993. Three (3) -- sixteen percent (16%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *0-5*. And two (2) -- eleven percent (11%) -- of the respondents reported having designed *5-10* school facilities since 1993. (This question's categories are non-exclusive, which makes it difficult to better identify ranges of experience.)

**Question 11: Is your firm currently working on any school projects?**

- A. Yes
- B. No

The large majority, thirteen (13) -- sixty-eight percent (68%) -- of the respondents reported being currently involved with school projects. Two (2) -- eleven percent (11%) -- of the respondents reported that they were not currently involved with a school project. Four (4) persons -- twenty-one percent (21%) -- did not answer the question.

**Question 12: Are you familiar with “CPTED” (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) or other crime mitigation design or planning strategies?**

- A. Very Familiar
- B. Somewhat Familiar
- C. Not Very Familiar
- D. Not At All Familiar

---

<sup>2</sup>This question's categories are non-exclusive, which makes it problematic to precisely specify ranges of experience and which cause total percentages to not add to 100%.

A large majority of the respondents reported being familiar to some degree with CPTED or other crime mitigation design or planning strategies. Thirteen (13) -- sixty-eight percent (68%) -- of the respondents reported being *Somewhat Familiar*. Five (5) -- twenty-six percent (26%) -- of the respondents reported being *Very Familiar*. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents reported being *Not Very Familiar*. (Because of rounding, percentages do not total to 100%.)

**Question 13: What resources does your firm rely on to keep current with building security issues?**

- A. AIA Seminar**
- B. Graphic Standards**
- C. Trade Journals**
- D. Other**

Eighteen (18) -- ninety-five percent (95%) -- of the respondents rely on *Trade Journals*. Thirteen (13) -- sixty-eight percent (68%) -- of the respondents rely on *AIA Seminar*. Six (6) -- thirty-two percent (32%) -- rely on *Graphic Standards* and *Other* resources. All respondents provided a response and many provided multiple responses, which accounts for percentages not equaling 100.

**Question 14: How would you rate your familiarity with the design principles listed in Table-A above?**

- A. Very Familiar**
- B. Somewhat Familiar**
- C. Not Very Familiar**
- D. Not At All Familiar**

Fourteen (14) -- seventy-four percent (74%) -- of the respondents reported being *Very Familiar* with the identified principles. Four (4) -- twenty-one percent (21%) -- of the respondents reported being *Somewhat Familiar*. And one (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents reported being *Not Very Familiar*.

**Question 15: In addition to the design principles listed in Table-A above, The FDOE provides “Florida Safe School Design Guidelines” which illustrate how the above design principles can be implemented. How familiar are you with these Guidelines?**

- A. Very Familiar**
- B. Somewhat Familiar**
- C. Not Very Familiar**
- D. Not At All Familiar**

All but one of the eighteen (18) respondents to this question reported being familiar to some degree with the *Florida Safe School Design Guidelines*. Ten (10) -- fifty-six percent (56%) -- of the

respondents reported being *Somewhat Familiar*. Six (6) -- thirty three percent (33%) -- reported being *Not Very Familiar* with the Guidelines. One (1) -- six percent (6%) -- respondent indicated being *Very Familiar* with the Guidelines. One (1) -- six percent (6%) -- of the respondents reported being *Not At All Familiar*. (Because of rounding, percentages do not total 100%.)

**Question 16: Whether you are familiar or not with the *Guidelines*, how would you characterize the incorporation of the Safe School Design Principles listed in Table-A into the design and construction (including retrofit) of the schools your firm has designed?**

- A. Extensively Incorporated**
- B. Incorporated Somewhat**
- C. Not Incorporated Much At All**
- D. Not Incorporated At All**
- C. Cannot Judge**

Ten (10) -- fifty-three percent (53%) -- of the respondents reported that Safe School Design Principles are *Incorporated Somewhat*. Eight (8) -- forty-two percent (42%) -- of the respondents reported that Safe School Design Principles are *Extensively Incorporated*. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

**Question 17: If incorporated “*extensively or somewhat*,” in your judgement what have been some of their most important features relative to school safety and security? Provide a brief answer.**

Question 17 elicited a variety of responses related to the most important features of the Safe School Design principles. Sixteen (16) -- eighty-four percent (84%) -- provided additional comments. Three (3) -- sixteen percent (16%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

The responses provided tended to fall into the following categories, with illustrative examples in each: *Surveillance*: “Visual Surveillance. Being able to achieve visual control over a given area with as few staff as possible.” “Maximize visibility and central control points,” “No niches at doorways to hide in; low shrubs near buildings, security lighting with motion detection, temporal glass in high security areas - computer labs, etc.” “Natural Surveillance of Exterior,” “Continuous visual control of student environment by admin.”

*Access Control*: “Controlled access to campus and buildings,” “Natural access and control of campus,” “Control of access points and the placing of administrative functions in close proximity. Use of open exterior stairways to control and monitor vertical circulation,” “Control of Schools and Campuses,” “The overall design of the building -- i.e., minimize points of entry, hidden corners, and all access to upper floors.”

*Combined Elements (Surveillance/Access Control/Design/Territoriality)*: “Courtyard visibility and open access to restrooms; Durable construction/materials; public access buildings at school front;

Consideration of landscape design,” “Campus Integrity, Natural Surveillance,” “Controlled Access/Visibility,” “Few and secured entrances, interior corridors, interior views to exterior spaces, few hidden areas,” “More uniform design standards -- elicit understanding,” “Limited access- controls traditionally open campuses; Decentralized administration -- enhances passive surveillance,” “Natural Surveillance and Natural Access Control. The use of these passive elements provides safety and security without the costs or maintenance of active mechanical systems.”

**Question 18: In your estimation, has the incorporation of the safe school Design Principles helped make your school facilities designs safer?**

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. Cannot Judge

Question 18 estimated respondent perspectives related to the effectiveness of Safe School Design principles in promoting a safe and secure school environment. Sixteen (16) -- eighty-four percent (84%) -- of the respondents report, *Yes*, the Safe School Design principles helped make schools safer. Two (2) -- eleven percent (11%) -- of the respondents reported that they Cannot Judge. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

**Question 19: Safe School Design Principles: Using your best judgement based on past experience, rate each of the issues below (high, medium, or low) in terms of your ability to fulfill their design intent. For example, if “K. Locks on roof hatches” is not easily achieved, place an “X” in the box marked “low.” Additionally, if the design intent related to the issue is not clear, place an “X” in that box.**

**ABILITY TO FULFILL SAFE SCHOOL DESIGN PRINCIPLES**

Responses from architects tended to fall into the following categories:

<b><u>High Ability</u></b>	Site and Building Lighting Natural Surveillance Tamper-Proof Doors and Locks Open Hand Rails for Surveillance Open Space Visibility
<b><u>Low Ability</u></b>	Slippery Finishes Audio/Motion Detection Systems Separation of After-School Activities
<b><u>Issue Not Clear</u></b>	Territorial Integrity Slippery Finishes

**Question 20: If your firm has used the *Florida Safe School Design Guidelines*, in your opinion**

and experience, *how useful* have these *Guidelines* been in informing your own design decisions relative to school safety issues?

- A. Very Useful
- B. Somewhat Useful
- C. Not Very Useful
- D. Don't Use the Guidelines

While the vast majority, sixteen (16) -- eighty-four percent (84%) -- of the respondents have found the *Florida Safe School Design Guidelines* to be useful to some degree, it is interesting to note, however, that only a small minority have found the existing (1993) *Guidelines* to be *very* useful. Thus, thirteen (13) -- sixty-eight percent (68%) -- of the respondents reported that the *Guidelines* have been *Somewhat Useful*. Three (3) -- sixteen percent (16%) -- of the respondents find the *Guidelines* to be *Very Useful*. Three (3) -- sixteen percent (16%) -- of the respondents *Don't Use the Guidelines*.

**Question 21: What are the *most useful* elements or components of the *Guidelines*? (Note: this can include both process and substance issues -- how the *Guidelines* are presented as well as what is in them.) Provide a brief answer.**

Ten (10) -- fifty-three (53%) -- of the respondents provided additional comments which defy simple categorization. They are: "Natural access and surveillance," "Bringing attention to various areas of safety," "Extensive listing of design element categories (site, building, alarm systems, etc.) associated diagrams," "The most useful element is that the *Guidelines* do not dictate how exactly to achieve a certain CPTED element. They only give criteria and the goal," "Makes the school designer aware of various elements that should be considered during the design process," "Organization and use of graphics allow non-technical clients (principals, board members, parents, etc.) to understand and help prioritize critical issues for their campus," "Provide support for the architect in 'selling' the importance and slightly added cost of some features -- to school boards," "You need to see that all architects working with schools get copies."

**Question 22: What are the *least useful* elements or components of the *Guidelines*? (Note: This can include both process and substance issues - how the *Guidelines* are presented as well as what is in them.) Provide a brief answer.**

Seven (7) -- thirty-seven percent (37%) -- of the respondents provided additional comments. They are grouped in the following categories: *Territorial Integrity*: "Schools should strive to engage the neighborhood, not isolate themselves in a "territory" that becomes a no-man's land after school and at night."

*Building Organization*: "[The] majority of projects are renovation and remodeling -- how do you modify an existing design which has poor organization? How can we assist the districts in setting priorities? Issues related to organization need to be expanded."

*Economics:* “Some elements are not economically feasible”.

*Guidelines Organization:* “The fact that the *Guidelines* do not differentiate between types of schools (elementary, middle, high) has caused problems. Since behavior of students, as well as building type/functions, changes with school types, *Guidelines* cannot be applied across the board.”

“Additional diagrams would be helpful,” “Stating the obvious.” In field interviews with architects, the researchers found that some found the existing *Guidelines* “uninteresting” to look at from a design standpoint. (One said, “Why would I ever want to look at these?” While others found that the drawings were sometimes difficult to interpret or understand.”) A common theme was that the information they sought to convey was too often “hidden” in the text and suggested that bullet points be used to highlight important comments and ideas. Indeed, this strategy was used in the revised *Guidelines*.

**Question 23: Of the various types of school facilities designs listed below, which one would you prefer in terms of providing the best school safety and security?**

- A. A Single Multi-Story Building**
- B. Multiple Multi-Story Buildings**
- C. Single-Story, Centrally Organized Group of Buildings**
- D. Single-Story (Spread Out) Grouping Of Buildings**

The majority, eleven (11) -- fifty-eight percent (58%) -- of the respondents prefer *Single-Story, Centrally Organized Group of Buildings*. Three (3) -- sixteen percent (16%) -- of the respondents prefer *A Single Multi-Story Building*, and three (3) -- sixteen percent (16%) -- of the respondents prefer *Multiple Multi-Story Buildings*. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents preferred *Single-Story (Spread Out) Grouping of Buildings*. One (1) -- five percent (5%) -- of the respondents did not provide a response.

### **Part 3: Design and Policy Suggestions**

**Question 24: What do you see as the most critical areas of school design with respect to safety and security from crime? Please rank the areas noted below such that 1 = the most critical area and 14 = the least critical area.**

- A. Maintaining visual surveillance from the street**
- B. Maintaining visual surveillance in corridors**
- C. Minimizing niches, alcoves, and other residual spaces that provide places for hiding**
- D. Window design**
- E. Exterior door design**
- F. Interior Lighting**
- G. Exterior Lighting**
- H. Enclosure of school property perimeter (fencing, walls)**

- I. Landscaping
- J. Location of key cabinets
- K. Alarm Systems
- L. Miscellaneous openings and outbuildings
- M. Electronic Surveillance Systems (for example CCTV)
- N. Other (please specify)

Question 24 measured respondent perspectives concerning the most critical areas of school design related to safety and security. The responses were grouped into three categories: Most Critical (Rankings 1-5), Moderately Critical (Rankings 6-10), and Least Critical (Rankings 11-14), to assess the most frequently recorded areas of concern.

*Minimal Niches* (16) was reported to be the most critical area of school design, and *Corridor Surveillance* (15) was reported to be the second most critical area of school design, followed by *Street Surveillance* (11), which was tied with *Perimeter Enclosure* (11). (See below)

Two (2) respondents noted *Other* critical areas of school design [i.e., “Enclosure of all non-public school spaces; limited and controlled access to school space (single point of ‘public’ entrance),” and “Small Schools #1”].

### **FREQUENTLY REPORTED AREAS OF SCHOOL DESIGN**

<u>Area of School Design</u>	<u>Reported Frequency</u>
• Minimal Niches	16
• Corridor Surveillance	15
• Street Surveillance	11
• Perimeter Enclosure	11
• Exterior Door	9
• Exterior Lighting	9

### **Question 25: If funding were available, what single-policy or procedure would you recommend to increase safety and security in school facilities design?**

The responses to this open ended question were grouped into the following categories, with illustrative examples from each:

*Guardianship and Surveillance:* “Night watchman at facilities” and “Electronic Surveillance systems and personnel to use them, onsite safety officers as a deterrent.”

*Management/Oversight/Education:* “Better enforcement by plan reviewers of Section 423.7b”; “Provide campus type school designs. Groups of buildings laid-out with control and surveillance

in mind for a more pleasant student learning environment and provide better control for daily use.”; “DOE presently utilizes the Castaldi generalized formula to determine facility replacement vs. renovation. No element of the formula considers safe school criteria. This should be added and weighted appropriately. End result should be that unsafe facilities be replaced rather than renovated.”; “Require CPTED conformance”; “First, Pick an architect with a good track record for good design; second, prepare a program making safety and security most important. Have reviews to see that the program has been met—if not, go back to the drawing board”; “Places that engender respect for school buildings, not solely SREF type space standards. #1 Smaller schools”; and “Education of students and staff.”

*Territoriality, Access Control:* “Utilize building exterior as a means of providing perimeter security, establishing open courtyards at interior of site” and “Security of campus boundary through controlled perimeter access points.”

*Surveillance and Maintenance:* “CCTV throughout exterior campus areas” and “Provide funding for additional security features such as exterior lighting systems, and the operation and maintenance of lighting through joint program between utilities and State of Florida.”

*Access Control, Surveillance:* “2 CPTED principles: limited/controlled access, natural/passive surveillance” and “Establish one main control point of entry into the school.”