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Abstract

Theodore Pugliese  The Effects of the Development and Implementation of the School Sanctuary Program on Safety and the Climate of Safety at Egg Harbor Township High School  2003  Dr. Dennis Hurley  M.A. School Administration

The purpose of this study was to describe and evaluate the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program on safety and the climate of safety at Egg Harbor Township High School (EHTHS). Using a case-study design, 56 teachers were first surveyed to provide a description of the climate of safety in the high school. It was found that, on average, the staff felt physically, psychologically, socially, and morally safe. Teachers also used the word safe to describe the overall climate of safety at school. Furthermore, this data would be used as a baseline for further comparisons and was to help the sanctuary team determine their future efforts at increasing safety. However, many factors prevented the sanctuary team from moving forward, and no further efforts were made at creating sanctuary in the school. Regardless, a final survey was again administered to another sample of 56 teachers, and it was found that there was no change in the climate of safety or the feelings of safety at EHTHS. Moreover, since the efforts of the sanctuary team were nonexistent after the initial data were collected, this study cannot yet describe and evaluate properly the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program on safety and the climate of safety at EHTHS.
The purpose of this study was to describe and evaluate the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program on safety and the climate of safety at Egg Harbor Township High School (EHTHS). However, the efforts of the school sanctuary team were nonexistent after the initial data were collected, and no change in the climate of safety or the feelings of safety at EHTHS was found to have occurred thereafter. The initial and final surveys both described the climate of the school and the feelings of the staff as safe. Therefore this study cannot yet describe and evaluate properly the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program on safety and the climate of safety at EHTHS.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Focus of the Study

Ever since the Columbine tragedy of 1999, the education community of Atlantic County has been mobilized like never before. Everyone responded to the need for cohesive preparation in the event of a similar emergency. With the cooperation of law enforcement, emergency management, and health care agencies countywide, crisis management plans were compared and reviewed.

The result of this response was a proposal to construct a statewide model for the development of a district plan for the prevention, intervention, and postvention of school violence. Several models were reviewed, and Atlantic County superintendents selected Dr. Sandra Bloom’s Sanctuary in the Schools program to serve as the basis for the county’s Safe Schools Safe Communities initiative.

This plan is the effort of a consortium of all Atlantic County school districts with The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey acting as lead agency. The consortium will also include community organizations with expertise in crisis control, including the county prosecutor’s office, local law enforcement agencies, family and human service organizations, and faith-based representatives. As a result of this program, all schools will have a plan to deal with a crisis at both the time of violence and during the healing process afterwards.
Egg Harbor Township Schools is concerned with helping to create a linkage that will make a difference in dealing with violence in schools and looks forward to doing its part to help. As one of three pilot districts in this program, Egg Harbor Township Schools has participated in a yearlong series of workshops presented by Dr. Sandra Bloom with an emphasis on the prevention of violence through a venue called “Sanctuary” that creates a climate of safety in schools.

Toward this end, Egg Harbor Township High School has created its own school sanctuary program. The effectiveness of this program is the focus of this study, which seeks to determine how school sanctuary affects safety and the climate of safety at Egg Harbor Township High School. Hopefully, the effects of the school sanctuary program will prove to be positive, allowing Egg Harbor Township to help lead New Jersey towards a safer state of education.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to describe and evaluate the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program on safety and the climate of safety in the high school using a case study design. The design will result in a findings report to inform administrators and the school management team (SMT) of the effectiveness of the program and the state of safety in the high school. It will also include recommendations for future policy decisions.
**Definitions**

*Creating Sanctuary* – a group experience of forming a safe space of containment where the group is either creating it, destroying it, or failing to protect it at any given moment in time. Everyone is responsible for his or her contribution to the creation of this safety, and it takes everyone’s participation for a net of safety to be sustained (Bloom, 1995).

*Deviance* – departure from the accepted norm (Bloom, 1995).

*Dissociation* – a disruption in the usually integrated functions of consciousness, memory, identity, or perception of the environment (APA, 1994).

*Endorphins* – important neurochemicals released as part of the stress response to provide relief from anxiety and distress (Bloom, 2001).

*Fight-or-flight response* – the basic internal protective mechanism characterized by a rapid heart rate, increased respiration, increased sweating, dilated pupils, and fear, terror, and rage (Van der Kolk, 1996).

*Learned helplessness* – a phenomenon where repetitive exposure to helplessness is so toxic to one’s emotional and physiological stability that in service of continued survival, one is compelled to adapt to the helplessness itself (Bloom, 2001).

*Safe Schools Safe Communities* – an Atlantic County initiative administered by The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey and funded by the New Jersey Department of Education whose goal is to create a pilot program in one county in which a lead agency, in collaboration with school and community partner agencies, develops a process resulting in a model for the establishment and coordination of violence prevention, intervention, and postvention strategies for local school districts.
The Sanctuary – an inpatient therapeutic milieu designed to treat adults who have been traumatized as children (Bloom, 1994).

Sanctuary trauma – the experience of expecting a protective environment and finding only more pain (Silver, 1986).

SMT – School Management Team.

Trauma – sudden, unexpected, overwhelming intense emotional blow (Terr, 1990).

Trauma-bonding – a relationship based on terror and the twisting of normal attachment behavior into something perverse and cruel (James, 1994).

Volume control – an internal device like the one on a stereo that allows us to modulate the amount of emotional response one has to anything that concerns one’s self (Bloom, 2001).

Limitation of the Study

Any study of the school sanctuary program and its effectiveness will be limited initially by the ability to properly implement this new program. Similarly, this study will be limited by the implementation of the new SMT. Poor introduction of both these programs could hamper the ability to properly measure their effectiveness.

Other limits include the use of small, nonrandom samples from only one school in data collection. While this might not be a problem in determining the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program at Egg Harbor Township High School, it does limit reliability and validity. Therefore the results of this study will lack generalizability, from both one year to the next and from school to school.
Setting of the Study

Egg Harbor Township is located in the geographical center of Atlantic County, New Jersey, approximately 8 miles west of Atlantic City. According to the Census 2000, it is a rural community with a population of 30,726 that reside within an area of 67 square miles. Egg Harbor Township is predominately White with 23,512 Caucasians comprising 76.5% of the population. Blacks number 3,185 and represent 10.4% of the population. Hispanics comprise 6.8% of the population and number 2,076. The Asian population numbers 1,552 and represents 5.1% of Egg Harbor Township. The remaining 401 citizens comprise 1% of the population and include American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians, other Pacific Islanders, or some combination of race.

Egg Harbor Township is a family community (72.4%) with over 40% of households with individuals under 18 years old. The median household income is approximately $55,000.00, yet the percentage of people below the poverty level is at 20%, representing over 2,000 people. The township is comprised mainly of high school graduates (82.8%). 19% of the population has at least a Bachelor's degree, and 5.5% of the population has a graduate degree or higher professional degree.

According to the New Jersey School Report Card (2000-2001), the Egg Harbor Township school district (NJDE Code: 1310) is a Type II district with an enrollment of 5,689 students attending 7 different schools, grades K - 12. The board president is Doris Dilly, and the superintendent of schools is Dr. Philip Heery. The average class size is 18 students, but there is an average of one faculty member per 10 students throughout the district. English is the predominant language spoken at home (over 90%), while Spanish is spoken in approximately 9% of students’ homes. Student attendance is approximately
94%, while teacher attendance is over 97% district wide. The student mobility rate is 10.4% at the junior and high school levels, and the “students with disabilities” rate is 13% at the junior and high school levels. The school budget is in excess of 57 million dollars, but the teachers are working without a contract as the 2002-2003 school year begins.

Egg Harbor Township High School (NDDE Code: 005/15) is a comprehensive high school, grades 9 –12, with an enrollment of 1750 students. Currently, the high school is undergoing the construction of an additional wing and the renovation of the existing structures. This study will involve Egg Harbor Township High School students and teachers from all departments, grades 9 through 12, including teachers who have volunteered to serve on the SMT and those that have not. This staff includes tenured and non-tenured teachers, males and females, including Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians with different levels of post-baccalaureate credentials.

**Organization of the Study**

The remainder of this study will be organized as follows. Chapter 2 - Review of the Literature - will provide the reader with a detailed description of the sanctuary model and an overview of its beginnings. It will also describe the relationship between sanctuary and trauma, supporting the claim that children are only able to learn within a context of safety and security.

Chapter 3 - The Design of the Study – will provide the reader with a general description of the research design. It will also describe the development and design of the research instruments used in this study. Chapter 3 will also provide the reader with a
description of the sample and the sampling technique used in the study. It will also
describe how surveys were used to collect data and provide the reader with a description
of the data analysis plan.

Chapter 4 - Presentation of the Research Findings – describes the results of the study
and their meanings, while Chapter 5 - Conclusions, Implications, and Further Study –
describes the study’s major conclusions and their corresponding implications, as well as
the conclusions and implications of the study on the intern’s leadership development. It
also describes the effects of the study on the organization and addresses the need for
further study.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Safe Schools Safe Communities is an Atlantic County initiative whose goal is to create a pilot program in one county in which a lead agency, in collaboration with school and community partner agencies, develops a process resulting in a model for the establishment and coordination of violence prevention, intervention, and postvention strategies for local school districts. This three-pronged approach emphasizes the prevention of violence through a venue called “Sanctuary” that creates a climate of safety in schools, a climate that supports learning.

Sanctuary is a voluntary initiative; it is a journey instead of a destination. It leads participants towards an understanding of where violence begins and then towards its prevention. Research shows that violence begins long before the actual outbreak (Bloom, 1995). It stems from lack of respect, hurt feelings, rudeness, and other internal repressions (Bloom, 1995). Sanctuary explains contrary, destructive, student behavior by changing the fundamental question from “what is wrong with you” to “what has happened to you.” Sanctuary strategies become the solution to managing emotion for students who are surviving the stresses of growing up. The power that results from managing emotions is not manifested in bullying, dominance, or submission. Instead, when Sanctuary strategies are used in the classroom, the processes that lead to violence cannot begin. It is the power of control shaping positive actions that is rewarded and
reinforced in the classroom. Fear is removed, and a true sense of safety can develop as staff and students become more focused on learning.

CREATING SANCTUARY

Children are only able to learn within a context of safety and security (Bloom, 1995). Therefore schools must become safe places – sanctuaries – for students and the staff that work there. Creating Sanctuary in schools is based on knowledge gained from The Sanctuary, an impatient therapeutic milieu unit designed to treat adults who have been traumatized as children (Bloom, 1994).

The first goal of The Sanctuary was to reduce sanctuary trauma, or the experience of expecting a protective environment and finding only more pain (Silver, 1986). Everyday, schools are involved with the actual process of providing a safe and healing environment for children who need to recover from the effects of trauma, and for less traumatized children as well. This is one of many reasons that the shifts in perspective that accompany Creating Sanctuary are relevant for all institutions within which human beings must live, learn, and function (Bloom, 1995).

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTITUDES

Normality & Health: Trauma-Organized Systems

Creating Sanctuary challenges many basic paradigms about human nature (Bloom, 1995). The first assumptions challenged were the definitions of “normality” and “health,” which are not necessarily the same thing. In fact, many social systems, including the family, are “trauma-organized” (Bentovim, 1992). That is, the repeated
experience of trauma becomes one of the central organizing experiences. Throughout the course of human development, the role of trauma has been so great that social organization around trauma is more the norm than health (Bloom, 1995).

From Sickness & Badness to Injury

Deviance is defined as departure from the accepted norm. Two examples are sickness and badness. When people are sick, we generally excuse them from responsibility until they are well. When people are bad, we hold them totally responsible and feel justified in punishing them (Whitley, 1972). Regardless of the difference, it is very difficult for deviant children to “get better” (Bloom, 1995). People assume that sick or bad is who they are, and their assumptions serve only to reinforce the children’s own deviant identities. They are robbed of the hope that they can be anything other than sick or bad, even before the healing process begins.

The trauma model, however, provides an entirely different way of understanding human behavior. It allows others to relate more easily to suffering children, regardless of their behavior. The trauma model states that sickness and badness are both a result of injury often inflicted in childhood by a caregiver (Bloom, 1995). This implies that these children were normal before they were injured, and then they became sick or bad. It also implies that they can be normal again. However, the individual hurt child can only move towards change if he or she believes that such change is possible (Bloom, 1995). Therefore the experiences a child has with school personnel are vital to the healing process. The entire school must go through a similar shift in assumptions about human
nature, that children are not to blame, that it is not their fault. Only then can the healing
begin and the violence stop.

Responsibility – Theirs and Ours

The shift to an injury model, however, in no way implies the abdication of
responsibility. There is no excuse for violence, but it is now recognized that the response
is as important in determining the outcome of any course of action as the action itself
(Bloom, 1995). Responses should be designed to teach a lesson that the child might need
to learn and to provide a corrective emotional experience. Punishment is not revenge,
and it should not use the child as a social example to others. Moreover, punishment must
never be traumatic, because if it is, the problem is deepened instead of corrected (Strauss,
1994).

The key to handling “bad” children is figuring out what not to do. They are
comfortable with harsh discipline, hostility, and pain. It is predictable and safe for them.
They are not comfortable with firm but fair limits, clear expectations, compassion,
kindness, respect, and understanding. They see these as suspicious and threatening, and
must move through a testing period before they feel safe enough to make the internal
adjustments necessary to redefine the external world as different from their parental
homes (Bloom, 1995). Unfortunately, this can sometimes carry too much conflict and
negative emotions. Inclusion of the seriously injured child can prove disastrous for
everyone if the school community has not been properly trained.

“Sick” children present a different problem. Since they pose more of a risk to
themselves than to others, they are sometimes overlooked when schools are dealing with
"bad" children. However sick children need to understand that they have a choice not to be sick. They must move past their feelings of learned helplessness and form bonds with those who will encourage them to take charge of their lives. It is vital that these children develop an identity that is not based on illness and weakness but which is instead built on their unique individual and survival skills (Bloom, 1995).

**Knowledge is Power**

The job of schools may be to educate children, but the trauma model clearly illustrates why the traditional methods of education are hopeless today. Traumatized, over stimulated children cannot learn their schoolwork in the hyperaroused state which inevitably accompanies and follows trauma. They cannot calm themselves down and tend to react to even minor stimuli (Van Der Kolk, 1987). They are also prone to flashbacks and may revisit traumatic experiences as strange physical sensations, pain, or overwhelming feelings of terror and sadness. These flashbacks often take the form of behavioral reenactments, as when the sexually abused child is sexually provocative with other children (James, 1992). These experiences are easily triggered by cues in the environment. If the environment is similar to the environment surrounding the original traumatic experience, it can reinforce a child’s sense of helplessness and estrangement from others (James, 1992; Van Der Kolk, 1987).

The normal process of educating children cannot proceed until a sense of physical and psychological safety is established in the school (Bloom, 1995). Today, steps must be taken to insure physical safety, as it is no longer assumed. Schools must also address psychological safety, especially as fallout from the lack of physical safety nationwide.
Traumatized students are especially at risk, and methods like cooperative learning, where students learn to help each other, may prevent secondary trauma (Bloom, 1995). Moreover, if children cannot be taught how to get along with other people and feel better about themselves, the other educational skills are almost irrelevant.

**Interconnectedness & the Necessity for group Process**

The trauma model demonstrates the interconnectedness of past, present, and future. People who are traumatized often become frozen in the past, unable to develop further until they are able to take the nonverbal images and feelings associated with trauma and put them into words that can be understood and shared (Bloom, 1995). The trauma model also establishes connections between trauma, health, illness, and criminal behavior. The psychological problems associated with repeated trauma affect the immune system, predispose children to substance abuse and other addictions, and are not easily controlled by the victim (Davidson, 1993).

Interconnectedness also applies to groups of people working together. Creating Sanctuary is an attempt to work with a group as a group. When people come together to form a system, the system takes on a life of its own that is greater than the sum of the individuals within it. If further progress is to be made in schools, or in any aspect of human functioning, then people must become more skilled at functioning as a whole group (Bloom, 1995).
BASIC GOALS

The basic goal for schools must remain the education of children, but that goal must be widened to include a definition of education that reflects the real needs of children today. Regardless of right or wrong, today’s family is evolving. For the sake of the children, schools must assume the functions not being fulfilled at present. The goals of schools must also address the health of the teachers and the administrators. Like parents in the family, the staff cannot provide a healthy environment for learning if they are behaving in a dysfunctional way (Bloom, 1995).

PROCESS

Questioning Basic Assumptions

Creating Sanctuary is a process, always happening in the present, not fixed and static. It is impossible to engage in such a process without changing one’s basic paradigm structure. Any process that seeks to change a system must begin its work at the level of basic assumptions. If, as a culture, we have not based our inventions on the assumption that the protection of children from harm is an overriding social responsibility, then we will not commit ourselves to the investment of time, energy, and money necessary to guarantee that such protection actually occurs (Bloom, 1995).

Reorienting the System

The first step in changing the paradigm is education. The goal of this educational change is to deliberately shift attitudes, to move the fundamental question that we pose when we confront a troubled or troubling person from “What is wrong with you?” to
"What has happened to you?" and "How can we help?" (Bloom, 1995). Once those questions are asked and the staff's approaches are changed, students are more able to trust teachers and risk change. Teachers also feel better about themselves, and these questions must be extended to the troubled parents of the children. The effects of trauma are multigenerational, and demonstrating compassionate concern for the parents can be instrumental in helping the parents help their children (Bloom, 1995).

Gathering Consensus and Leadership

Everyone goes through a period of disequilibria before settling down to a new vision (Bloom, 1995). Those who are least afraid can assume the responsibility for leading the group towards change and finding a way to integrate all points of view into a cohesive whole. If the entire school cannot reach agreement, then a pilot program can be tried. If a pilot study is implemented, however, it must receive the full support of the administration, especially from negative forces. The mandate for change must come from school leadership and must be supported by them, as long as it is in the best interest of the children (Bloom, 1995).

Creating a Vision

The process of creating a shared vision should be initiated by a team composed of key members of the school community, including members of the school board, administration, faculty, support personnel, parents, and students, particularly in regards to secondary schools. If the adults can figure out how to change themselves, they can serve
as models for the children. If the adults do not “walk the walk and talk the talk” the system will not change (Bloom, 1995).

**System Maintenance**

System maintenance and therapy are vital if any real change is to occur. Maintaining the system is accomplished by meetings and is not a waste of time. They provide immediate conflict resolution for misunderstandings before they become major battles. Unfortunately, in most systems, this maintenance function is the first thing to go when budgets are tightened and responsibilities doubled. This is a major cause of system failure (Bloom, 1995).

**Self-Governance**

Schools need to turn more power over to the students (Bloom, 1995). Students must actively participate in creating the environment that is most conducive to their growth and learning. Let them participate in the creation of their own rules, and let them formulate the consequences for breaking those rules. The teacher’s job in this system would be to provide the structure, guidance, questioning, provocation, and final say necessary for the consensus approach to work. The teacher must hold everyone accountable for the creation and system of rules. If children are expected to turn into responsible adults, then they must be treated first as responsible children (Bloom, 1995).
Conflict Resolution

One of the most critical lessons we can learn, and teach children, is that of conflict resolution. There are now available many programs in peer counseling and conflict resolution that are entirely consistent with Creating Sanctuary (Bloom, 1995). Students should be urged to deal directly with those they are having problems with first. People do have the ability to resolve conflict, to compromise, and to see other people’s point of view, but that capacity must be encouraged, exercised, and expected routinely (Bloom, 1995).

Artistic Performance and the Transformation of Trauma

Writing, drawing, sculpting, dancing, and acting are all ways that people transform their nonverbal experiences into a verbal narrative that can be shared with others. Children should be encouraged to engage in these forms of “self therapy” and the arts programs, because of this, should have more funding and credibility. It is possible that a healthy arts program in a school of traumatized children may be more important in preparing those children to learn, than any other skills we can provide. Engagement in these forms of therapy is also highly educational and consistent with the goals of the school (Bloom, 1995).

Community Tolerance for Violence

Special programs are needed for children who do not fit into the system, especially for the “conduct-disordered” child who is usually a victim of serious trauma (Bloom, 1995). Such a child cannot be allowed to interfere with the functions of a healthy
classroom. The basic position of Creating Sanctuary is the absolute refusal to tolerate violence (Bloom, 1995), and schools must stand firm in their resolve to protect children from harm. The school must have the power to find alternative placements for the violent child instead of being forced to sacrifice the physical and psychological safety of the entire class. Therefore, each school must have provisions for even the most disturbed children, especially while they are still young enough to be helped.

Critical Incident Debriefing

Another important part of the process of Creating Sanctuary in the schools is to establish “critical incident debriefing” teams to help decrease the long-term effects of trauma when violent incidents occur within the school itself (Bloom, 1995). Well-established models exist for this type of intervention in the fields of disaster research (Mitchell, 1983) and in hospital psychiatry (Flannery, 1990), and they seem to be effective. Violence disrupts the sense of safety in the school and in the community. Steps must be taken to ensure that these disruptions are only temporary. When the whole community works together to seal these rifts, the active process of Creating Sanctuary is engaged.

Parenting & The Next Generation

Parents at both the elementary and secondary level should be expected to be involved in the school community. The more communication there is between parents and faculty, the more likely it is that the child will have a network of support (Bloom, 1995). When
parents refuse to be involved, steps should be taken to evaluate how the community can assist the parents to be better parents for their children (Bloom, 1995).

There should also be programs for teenage parents to keep them in school, to help them provide adequate nurturing for their children, and to offer intensive parenting education to help them become better parents (Bloom, 1995). Excellent model programs are now available to help high-risk mothers develop skills through parent-mentoring programs (Breakey & Pratt, 1991). Ideally, schools would have day-care on-site so that the mothers could stay in school without neglecting their infants, and the infants could have the benefit of high-quality care that the mothers could learn from as well (Bloom, 1995). Ultimately, schools would become community centers, forming a network of communication and safety that could help reclaim the community for the people who live in it.

Conclusion: The Shift to Group Consciousness

There is an alternative to individual consciousness or a herd mentality, an alternative called group consciousness. Just as a group can amplify negative attributes and feelings of its individual members, so too can a group amplify positive attributes and affects, if there is an agreed upon and practiced set of established values. The results of group consciousness constitute an entity that surpasses the sum of the individual skills and efforts. It is this entity that is called The Sanctuary (Bloom, 1995).

Creating Sanctuary wants to provide environments within which the individual's particular complex of trauma-organized and self-destructive habits can be understood and then redirected. (Bloom, 1995). Children who have been traumatized unconsciously do
the same thing over and over. They give other people in their environment certain cues for behavior that will induce an outcome similar to the original trauma (Terr, 1990). Then, when people respond to the cues, the children are retraumatized.

In schools, it becomes the job of the educators to understand the expected outcome and redirect the traumatic scenario so that the trauma is not repeated. If the members of each classroom and the members of the school community can begin to function in this way, the group itself can become the agent for change for the individuals, but this can only occur within a context of safety and trust (Bloom, 1995). Staff and students must work together to create something far greater than that of each individual alone. When that happens, when each individual in a system donates his or her best contribution to the well being of the whole, Creating Sanctuary is happening.
Chapter 3
Design of the Study

This case study involved Egg Harbor Township High School (EHTHS) teachers from all departments, grades 9 through 12, including teachers that volunteered to serve on the new school sanctuary team and the new school management team (SMT), as well as those that did not. The staff included tenured and non-tenured teachers, males and females, including Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, and Asian Americans with different levels of post-baccalaureate credentials.

This study was designed to use a survey first to determine the initial climate of safety in the high school. Results of this survey also were to help determine the focus of the school sanctuary program as it tried to improve safety and the climate of safety in the high school during the school year. The intern also planned to interview the sanctuary team and the SMT throughout the year to formatively evaluate the change process. These informal evaluations were to help the sanctuary team continue to have a positive effect on safety at the high school.

Towards the end of the school year, the intern was to again survey the entire staff to determine how the efforts of the sanctuary team affected safety and the climate of safety in the high school. The intern would rather survey the initial test population to better determine the results of this study, but this is not possible due to the anonymous nature of the initial survey. Upon final analysis of the data, the intern was to produce a findings report to inform administrators and the SMT of the effectiveness of the school sanctuary
program and the state of safety in the high school. It was also to include recommendations for future policy decisions.

The initial survey was designed to provide the intern with a qualitative description of the overall climate of safety at EHTHS. It also aimed to identify areas of concern to be addressed by the sanctuary team while they implemented the school sanctuary program. Towards this end, the questions posed in the survey utilized qualitatively descriptive answers that were later matched to numerical values that allowed the intern to quantitatively analyze the data.

The intern developed the questions in early September, attempting to create a survey that would provide him with a description of the climate of safety in the high school that included physical safety, as well as psychological safety, social safety, and moral safety. After school finally started in late September, the intern met with his principal and assistant principal to finalize the survey questions.

Unfortunately, due to more immediate construction concerns and the uncooperative atmosphere of the high school, the initial survey was not finalized until early November. Circumstance delayed the implementation of the school sanctuary program, and when it finally got started, the sanctuary team had decided to implement sanctuary in the school by focusing on the staff. This meant that all of this year’s sanctuary efforts would revolve around the staff and would include things like staff appreciation breakfasts. The survey then evolved into a letter (see Appendix A) that bridged the initial coffee and donut offering to the holiday apple giveaway.
A copy of the letter survey was then placed in every teacher's mailbox, and a box was set up for collection in the main office. It was hoped that by tying the survey to the sanctuary team’s offerings, the intern could elicit a greater response from the teachers.

The initial surveys were then analyzed statistically. Statistical analysis began with the calculation of both the sums and means of each response included in the initial survey. Again, the questions posed in the survey utilized qualitatively descriptive answers that were matched to numerical values that allowed the intern to quantitatively analyze the data and determine the average responses in the school by adding these values and dividing their sums by the total number of responses.

For example, one question asked teachers, “How physically safe do you feel here at school?” The choices included: Very Concerned for My Safety, Not Safe, Safe, Very Safe, and No Concerns for My Safety. These qualitative answers were then assigned numerical values ranging from 1 to 5 respectively. These rankings were then used to calculate the sum and mean for each question (see Chapter 4). The mean was then used to determine the qualitative description for the entire sample (see Chapter 4). Other questions were answered yes or no (see Appendix A). For these questions, the percent of each response was calculated and used to express the concerns of the sample population (see Chapter 4). These concerns were then presented to the sanctuary team who were then able to use these concerns to help better determine their future endeavors.

The intern then began a formative evaluation period that used interview for qualitative data collection. This data was not analyzed statistically and was not intended to measure directly the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program. Instead, the data
collected during this period, from December 2002 through the end of March 2003, was used to provide the sanctuary team with feedback concerning its activities.

The intern administered the final staff survey in March 2003. Again, this survey was distributed to all teachers via their mailboxes as part of a thank you letter from the sanctuary team. The data was analyzed statistically using the same protocols as the initial survey. However, this time the two data sets were compared, and the differences between the final values and the initial values were calculated (see Chapter 4).

Thereafter, the intern drew conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program (see Chapter 4). The intern also prepared a findings report for the administration and the SMT that contained the results and conclusions of this study, as well as recommendations. Another copy was also prepared for the intern’s portfolio.

The ultimate goal of creating sanctuary in schools is to prevent violence by first making staff and students feel safe. This is the continuing goal of the sanctuary team, and while the surveys used in this study do reveal a change in the climate of safety (see Chapter 4), the intern cannot be certain that the efforts of the sanctuary team are solely, if at all, responsible for the changes amongst the staff. Lack of experimental control in this study was a major limitation.

Other limitations included the use of small, nonrandom samples from only one school in data collection. While this may not have been a problem in determining the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program at EHTHS, it does limit reliability and validity. Therefore the results of this study lack generalizability, from both one year to the next and from school to school.
The school year 2002-2003 began two weeks behind schedule at Egg Harbor Township High School (EHTHS) due to numerous construction concerns and delays. Staff and students returned to a building that was unprepared for the new school year. The new additions were not ready for use, and the cafeteria renovations were behind schedule. Students would have to eat lunch in a tent while construction continued. Moreover, negotiations had failed, and teachers were working without a contract.

Morale was low, so the EHTHS sanctuary team began the school year focused on the staff. They had decided previously that any attempts at creating sanctuary in the school would have to begin with the teachers, as it was their responsibility to create sanctuary for the students. The sanctuary team believed that this could not be done unless, or until, the teachers were comfortable and safe in their own work environment. Therefore the sanctuary team declared the 2002-2003 school year "The Year of the Staff" and planned their activities accordingly.

The sanctuary team met in early October and decided to help create sanctuary with a couple of staff appreciation breakfasts for their coworkers. After much planning and effort, the first sanctuary breakfast occurred in November. The second was held in December. It was during this second sanctuary breakfast that the initial survey was distributed to the teachers at EHTHS. A total of 56 surveys were returned, a sample representing 30% of the staff population. The results of the initial survey are as follows.
Results of the Initial Survey

The average responses to each question and the statistical breakdowns of each reply are included below. The corresponding numerical values for all responses are also included in parentheses.

1. How physically safe do you feel here at school?

The average response to this question was Safe (2.98). There were 56 responses to this question; 7 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 12 replied Not Safe (2), 19 replied Safe (3), 11 replied Very Safe (4), and 7 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 1).

2. How psychologically safe do you feel?

The average response to this question was Safe (2.96). There were 55 responses to this question; 7 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 9 replied Not Safe (2), 20 replied Safe (3), 14 replied Very Safe (4), and 5 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 1).

3. How socially safe do you feel?

The average response to this question was Safe (3.16). There were 55 responses to this question; 6 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 2 replied Not Safe (2), 28 replied Safe (3), 12 replied Very Safe (4), and 7 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 1).
4. How morally safe do you feel?

The average response to this question was Safe (3.02). There were 55 responses to this question; 7 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 10 replied Not Safe (2), 20 replied Safe (3), 11 replied Very Safe (4), and 7 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 1).

5. How would you describe the overall climate of safety here at school?

The average response to this question was Safe (2.75). There were 56 responses to this question; 6 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 15 replied Not Safe (2), 23 replied Safe (3), 11 replied Very Safe (4), and 1 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 1).

6. Do you ever feel afraid here at school?

The average response to this question was Not Afraid (2.25). There were 55 responses to this question; 13 teachers replied Not Afraid At All (1), 17 replied Not Afraid (2), 23 replied Afraid (3), and 2 replied Very Afraid (4), (see Table 1).

7. How do drugs in school make you feel?

The average response to this question was Not Safe (2.1). There were 54 responses to this question; 14 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 19 replied Not Safe (2), 21 replied They do not affect my feelings of safety (3), (see Table 1).
8. Do you think it is possible to keep drugs out of school?

The average response to this question was **Not Sure (2.2)**. There were 56 responses to this question; 5 teachers replied **Yes (1)**, 14 replied **Not Sure (2)**, and 27 replied **No (3)**, (see Table 1).

9. Do you think there are guns in school?

The average response to this question was **Not Sure (1.9)**. There were 56 responses to this question; 17 teachers replied **Yes (1)**, 27 replied **Not Sure (2)**, and 12 replied **No (3)**, (see Table 1).

10. Do you worry about guns in school?

The average response to this question was **At Times (2.4)**. There were 56 responses to this question; 9 teachers replied **Yes, often (1)**, 23 replied **At times (2)**, 19 replied **Not really (3)**, and 5 replied **No, never (4)**, (see Table 1).

11. Do you think we need metal detectors?

The average response to this question was **Not really, but they would help (2.1)**. There were 56 responses to this question; 17 teachers replied **Yes (1)**, 18 replied **Not really, but they would help (2)**, and 21 replied **No (3)**, (see Table 1).

12. Regardless, would metal detectors make you feel safer than you do now?

The majority of teachers responded **Yes**. There were 56 responses to this question; 35 teachers replied **Yes (63%)**, and 21 replied **No (37%)**.
13. Do you think we need a security guard or police officer on campus?
   
   The majority of teachers responded Yes. There were 56 responses to this question; 30 teachers replied Yes (54%), 17 replied Not really, but it would help (30%), and 9 replied No (16%).

14. Regardless, would a police officer make you feel safer than you do now?
   
   The majority of teachers responded Yes. There were 55 responses to this question; 42 teachers replied Yes (76%), and 13 replied No (24%).

15. Would you want your children to attend this school?
   
   The majority of teachers responded No. There were 53 responses to this question; 20 teachers replied Yes (38%), and 33 replied No (62%).

16. Are you familiar with the prevention of school violence through a venue called “Sanctuary?”
   
   The majority of teachers responded No. There were 56 responses to this question; 18 teachers replied Yes (32%), and 38 replied No (68%).

17. Would you like to see professional development time spent on “Sanctuary” in-service training?
   
   The majority of teachers responded Yes. There were 54 responses to this question; 35 teachers replied Yes (65%), and 19 replied No (35%).
Table 1

Results of the Initial Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average response value</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Response (1)</th>
<th>Response (2)</th>
<th>Response (3)</th>
<th>Response (4)</th>
<th>Response (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the initial survey were promising. On average, the staff felt physically, psychologically, socially, and morally safe. The staff also used the word safe to describe the overall climate of safety at school. Unfortunately, drugs in school make the staff feel not safe, and they are not sure if it is possible to keep drugs out of school. They are also not sure if there are guns in school and worry about guns at times. They do not think that metal detectors are necessary, but think they would help. Metal detectors would at least make the staff feel safer than they do now. They think we need a security guard or police officer on campus, and agree that a police officer would make them feel safer than they do now.

Unfortunately, when asked if they would want their children to attend this school, the majority of teachers (59%) replied no. An even greater number of staff members (68%) were not familiar with the prevention of school violence through a venue called Sanctuary, and the majority of respondents (63%) indicated that they would like to see professional development time spent on Sanctuary in-service training.

Fortunately, the next professional development day focused on “Sanctuary in the Schools” and featured an in-service presentation by Dr. Sandra Bloom. Here she outlined the program for all staff members at EHTHS. However, the decision to have Dr. Bloom address the staff was made earlier by central administration. It had nothing to do with the efforts of the sanctuary team or the results of the survey.

Truthfully, the sanctuary team has never addressed the results of the survey as a group. Moreover, due to the lingering effects of renovation, construction, and negotiation, the sanctuary team has not met since preparing the December 2002 breakfast.
The team was not disbanded and does hope to meet again. Meanwhile, Egg Harbor Township remains a partner agency in the Atlantic county Safe Schools Safe Communities initiative, however the efforts of EHTHS are not currently focused on creating sanctuary.

Regardless, the results of the initial survey were not just to be shared. They were intended to provide the sanctuary team with a description of the climate of safety at EHTHS and help determine their future efforts at creating sanctuary in the school. It was the effects of these efforts that were to be evaluated by this study. As months passed, it became apparent that the workings of the sanctuary team were not progressing, and that it would be difficult at best to determine the effectiveness of a program that was no longer in effect. As a result, alternate plans for data collection were adopted, and the staff was again surveyed in regards to the climate of safety at EHTHS. The new sample included 56 teachers, a number equal to the original sample, representing nearly 30% of the staff population. The results of their survey would be used to determine whether or not there was a change in the climate of safety among teachers at EHTHS. The results of the final survey are as follows.

Results of the Final Survey

The average responses to each question and the statistical breakdowns of each reply are included below. The corresponding numerical values for all responses are also included in parentheses.
1. How physically safe do you feel here at school?

The average response to this question was Safe (3.11). There were 56 responses to this question; 8 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 6 replied Not Safe (2), 22 replied Safe (3), 12 replied Very Safe (4), and 8 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 2).

2. How psychologically safe do you feel?

The average response to this question was Safe (3.18). There were 56 responses to this question; 6 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 10 replied Not Safe (2), 16 replied Safe (3), 16 replied Very Safe (4), and 8 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 2).

3. How socially safe do you feel?

The average response to this question was Safe (3.25). There were 56 responses to this question; 6 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 2 replied Not Safe (2), 28 replied Safe (3), 12 replied Very Safe (4), and 8 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 2).

4. How morally safe do you feel?

The average response to this question was Safe (3.07). There were 56 responses to this question; 8 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 8 replied Not Safe (2), 20 replied Safe (3), 12 replied Very Safe (4), and 8 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 2).
5. How would you describe the overall climate of safety here at school?

The average response to this question was Safe (2.75). There were 56 responses to this question; 8 teachers replied Very Concerned For My Safety (1), 14 replied Not Safe (2), 20 replied Safe (3), 12 replied Very Safe (4), and 2 replied No Concerns For My Safety (5), (see Table 2).

Table 2

Results of the Final Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average response of value responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.11 56 8 6 22 12 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.18 56 6 10 16 16 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25 56 6 2 28 12 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.07 56 8 8 20 12 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.75 56 8 14 20 12 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the final survey were then compared to the results of the initial survey. There was no change in the average qualitative responses to the five questions common to both surveys. However the numerical values of the average quantitative
responses to questions 1 - 4 increased slightly, while the numerical value of the average quantitative response to question 5 remained the same. The average responses to both surveys and the changes in their quantitative values are as follows.

Results of the Comparison between the Initial and Final Surveys

The average responses to each question common to both surveys are included below. The corresponding numerical values for all responses are included in parentheses.

1. How physically safe do you feel here at school?
   The average response to this question increased from Safe (2.98) in the initial survey to Safe (3.11) in the final survey, an increase of 0.13 (see Table 3 & Graph 1).

2. How psychologically safe do you feel?
   The average response to this question increased from Safe (2.96) in the initial survey to Safe (3.18) in the final survey, an increase of 0.22 (see Table 3 & Graph 1).

3. How socially safe do you feel?
   The average response to this question increased from Safe (3.16) in the initial survey to Safe (3.25) in the final survey, an increase of 0.09 (see Table 3 & Graph 1).

4. How morally safe do you feel?
   The average response to this question increased from Safe (3.02) in the initial survey to Safe (3.07) in the final survey, an increase of 0.05 (see Table 3 & Graph 1).
5. How would you describe the overall climate of safety here at school?

The average response to this question did not change from Safe (2.75) in the initial survey to Safe (2.75) in the final survey (see Table 3 & Graph 1).

Table 3

Results of the Comparison between the Initial and Final Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average response Initial survey</th>
<th>Average response Final survey</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safe (2.98)</td>
<td>Safe (3.11)</td>
<td>+ 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safe (2.96)</td>
<td>Safe (3.18)</td>
<td>+ 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Safe (3.16)</td>
<td>Safe (3.25)</td>
<td>+ 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Safe (3.02)</td>
<td>Safe (3.07)</td>
<td>+ 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Safe (2.75)</td>
<td>Safe (2.75)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above graph shows a slight increase in the average quantitative responses to the five questions common to both surveys. The blue bars represent the average response values of the initial survey, and the red bars represent the average response values of the final survey. However, the slight increases observed in these values between the initial and final surveys are not significant and do not alter the average qualitative responses. That is, the initial average qualitative responses and the final average qualitative responses are unchanged. All are described as safe. Moreover, the slight increases in the average response values cannot be attributed to the efforts of the school sanctuary team or the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program, as no efforts were made to create sanctuary in the school during the time between surveys. It is therefore impossible to determine the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program at this time (see Chapter 5).
Chapter 5
Conclusions, Implications, and Further Study

This study cannot yet describe and evaluate properly the effectiveness of the school sanctuary program on safety and the climate of safety at Egg Harbor Township High School (EHTHS). Many factors, including the logistical concerns of construction and renovation, led to the temporary suspension of the activities of the school sanctuary team at EHTHS. Their efforts were non-existent after the initial data were collected. Therefore any and all trends observed in subsequent data collection were the result of other uncontrolled variables.

The most obvious trend in the data collected was the apparent increase in the feelings of safety at EHTHS (see Chapter 4). The average quantitative values for physical safety, psychological safety, social safety, and moral safety all increased from their initially determined values to the values collected in the final survey. Possible variables that may have contributed to the greater feelings of safety at EHTHS and the correlating increase in the average quantitative responses to the survey questions were the settlement of contract negotiations on a new collective bargaining agreement (CBA) and the gradual completion of construction and renovations at the high school. Both of these factors had served to lower morale amongst the staff at EHTHS, while failed negotiations were also responsible for many job actions that interfered with the normal operations of the high school.

It is also possible that these two variables had nothing to do with the observed increases in the average quantitative values for physical safety, psychological safety,
social safety, and moral safety at EHTHS. Both sets of data correlate to the same
descriptive responses. That is, the average qualitative response to all of the questions in
both surveys was safe. This means there was no difference between the data collected
from these two surveys. Therefore, there was no real change in the feelings of safety at
EHTHS. The slight differences between the numerical values for the responses could be
the result of experimental error resulting from the size of the sample populations. If so,
the numerical differences are small enough to suggest that the survey is at least reliable, if
not valid.

It is also impossible to determine what effect, if any, the initial efforts of the school
sanctuary team had on safety and the climate of safety at EHTHS. Both of the sanctuary
breakfasts were designed to attend to the emotional needs of the high school staff.
However, both of these efforts were planned and carried out prior to the administration of
the initial survey. Without knowing the feelings of the staff prior to the sanctuary
breakfasts, it is unknown whether or not these efforts were effective. Therefore these two
initial attempts at creating sanctuary may have contributed to the feelings of safety and
the overall climate of safety at EHTHS.

This was not an oversight. The initial efforts of the sanctuary team were to be an
introduction to sanctuary at EHTHS, and the results of the initial survey were to help
provide focus for the development of future attempts at creating sanctuary. Now, the
similar results of both surveys and their promising results will be used to help determine
the future of the school sanctuary team.

However, that future must begin with a commitment towards creating sanctuary at
EHTHS, and such a commitment can only begin with determined, effective leadership. If
the leadership is not committed to creating sanctuary at EHTHS, then the staff cannot be expected to be committed either. It was this lack of commitment that led to the breakdown of the efforts of the school sanctuary team involved in this study. As soon as contract negotiations were completed, their efforts should have continued to move forward. This was especially important considering that EHTHS was acting as part of the Safe Schools Safe Communities initiative funded by the Department of Education (see Chapter 2).

Regardless, the efforts of the administration related to creating sanctuary were not in keeping with the accepted standards for school leaders. Creating sanctuary in the school is a vision that must be shared and supported by the entire school community, and it requires an administrator that is an educational leader to promote that vision (ISLLC #1). Thereafter, creating sanctuary may actually allow administrators to be better leaders by helping them sustain a school culture more conducive to staff professional growth and student learning (ISLLC #2). It may also allow them to better manage their schools and ensure a safe, effective learning environment (ISLLC #3). Outgrowths of sanctuary may also affect the community (ISLLC #4) and influence the larger social context of the school (ISLLC #6).

It is important to note, however, that the efforts of the administration were very much in line with all of the accepted standards when it came to the district-wide building project. Many construction and renovation problems arose before and during the 2002-2003 school year, and they were all handled effectively and professionally. Considering the scope of the building project and the effects it had on this program and others, it may
have been better to not participate in the Safe School Safe Communities initiative at this time.

Regardless, these problems will be of no concern next year, and with contract negotiations behind them, EHTHS can truly move forward with their attempts to create sanctuary. The effects of creating sanctuary in the school may be endless, but they all revolve around promoting safety and preventing violence. Therefore it is important that the sanctuary team directs their efforts towards these goals and continues to monitor the effectiveness of their labors. Results of this study suggest that they begin their work in a moderately safe school environment. Hopefully, their efforts will serve to foster and enhance the climate of safety at EHTHS and prevent the violence that threatens the safety and feelings of safety of all its staff and students.


Appendix A

Research Instruments
Salutations from the School Sanctuary Team

We hope you enjoyed your coffee and donuts last month. It was our way of saying thanks to our coworkers and just the first step towards creating sanctuary in our school. In an effort to help you feel safe at work and to better share your feelings with the administration, we ask that you take a few moments and complete this survey. It is not the most scientific of instruments, but the results will be analyzed and presented to Dr. Miller and the Board. The surveys are anonymous, so please be as honest as possible. Afterwards, you can deposit them in the box here in the main office. Enjoy the apples, and have a great holiday season!

The Sanctuary Team

1. How physically safe do you feel here at school?
   Very Concerned  Not Safe  Safe  Very Safe  No Concerns
   For My Safety

2. How psychologically safe do you feel?
   Very Concerned  Not Safe  Safe  Very Safe  No Concerns
   For My Safety

3. How socially safe do you feel?
   Very Concerned  Not Safe  Safe  Very Safe  No Concerns
   For My Safety

4. How morally safe do you feel?
   Very Concerned  Not Safe  Safe  Very Safe  No Concerns
   For My Safety

5. How would you describe the overall climate of safety here at school?
   Very Concerned  Not Safe  Safe  Very Safe  No Concerns
   For My Safety

6. Do you ever feel afraid here at school?
   Not Afraid At All  Not Afraid  Afraid  Very Afraid
7. How do drugs in school make you feel?  
Very Concerned  Not Safe  They do not affect my feelings of safety

8. Do you think it is possible to keep drugs out of school?  
Yes  Not sure  No

9. Do you think there are guns in school?  
Yes  Not sure  No

10. Do you worry about guns in school?  
Yes, At times  Not really  No, never often

11. Do you think we need metal detectors?  
Yes  Not really, but they would help  No

12. Regardless, would metal detectors make you feel safer than you do now?  
Yes  No

13. Do you think we need a security guard or police officer on campus?  
Yes  Not really, but it would help  No

14. Regardless, would a police officer make you feel safer than you do now?  
Yes  No

15. Would you want your children to attend this school?  
Yes  No

16. Are you familiar with the prevention of school violence through a venue called “Sanctuary”?  
Yes  No

17. Would you like to see professional development time spent on “Sanctuary” in-service training?  
Yes  No
1. How physically safe do you feel here at school?

   Very Concerned Not Safe Safe Very Safe No Concerns
   For My Safety For My Safety

2. How psychologically safe do you feel?

   Very Concerned Not Safe Safe Very Safe No Concerns
   For My Safety For My Safety

3. How socially safe do you feel?

   Very Concerned Not Safe Safe Very Safe No Concerns
   For My Safety For My Safety

4. How morally safe do you feel?

   Very Concerned Not Safe Safe Very Safe No Concerns
   For My Safety For My Safety

5. How would you describe the overall climate of safety here at school?

   Very Concerned Not Safe Safe Very Safe No Concerns
   For My Safety For My Safety
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