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In 2010, the Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium (RDPC) implemented a post-training evaluation program to evaluate the effectiveness of its courses. This report details the results of the course evaluation for *AWR 148 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents: Partnering Rural Law Enforcement, First Responders, and Local School Systems*, which is one of several awareness-level courses that RDPC currently offers to rural communities. *AWR 148* was designed to educate rural law enforcement personnel as well as K-12 school administrators and personnel on the elements that must be in place to effectively respond to an emergency at a school building or an entire school system.

The population drawn for the evaluation consisted of all participants who had completed *AWR 148* between May 2009 and February 2011. The adjusted population size was 2,510 and a total of 534 completed surveys were received, resulting in an adjusted response rate of 21.3%.

The evaluation data indicates that the course helped the majority of the respondents gain a better understanding of how to prepare for and respond to school-based crisis incidents. For example, at least 85% of the survey respondents indicated that as a result of the course they are:

- Better prepared to communicate with all stakeholders using common school emergency management terminology (96%);
- More confident to identify potential vulnerabilities with the school(s) in the community (95%);
- Better prepared to identify possible solutions to potential vulnerabilities within the school(s) in the community (93%);
- Better able to identify and mitigate potential threats that schools in the community face including those involving workplace violence, terrorism, bullying, and domestic issues (85%); and
- Better able to describe the various levels of lockdown and the response protocols appropriate to each (89%).

Other positive actions taken by the survey respondents indicate that learning from the course was applied to their daily job setting. For example, approximately 35% of the responders have conducted risk/vulnerability assessments. Further, the respondents indicated that the most common action that took place was the updating of policies, procedures, and plans. Updating these important planning documents is a foundational step in preparing for a school-based incident.

Overall, the results of the evaluation indicate that participants are in fact taking the information they acquired and applying it to their organizations and job responsibilities. It is evident that *AWR 148* was a positive learning experience for the respondents and the primary learning objectives of the course had been met.
1.0 Introduction and Program Purpose

The Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium (RDPC) was established in 2005 by Congress to develop and deliver all-hazards preparedness training to rural communities across America. The mission of RDPC is to coordinate the development and delivery of preparedness training in support of rural homeland security requirements and facilitate relevant information sharing. It is essential that emergency responders in small, rural, and remote communities are properly trained to deal with all-hazards events. It is also important that the training delivered to rural emergency responders be effective in meeting its goals and objectives. For more information on the RDPC, please visit http://www.ruraltraining.org/.

In 2010, the RDPC established a Level 3 Course Evaluation Program to evaluate the training effectiveness of its courses. This program is based on Level 3 of Donald Kirkpatrick’s Four Levels of evaluating training programs — behavior.¹ The purpose of the program is to measure the transfer in behavior that has occurred in the participant due to his/her completion of the training course. Therefore, the program assesses whether the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) that each participant acquires via the training course are being applied in the daily work setting of the participant.

Kirkpatrick claims that four conditions are necessary for change to occur in a participant’s behavior once he/she has attended a training course. The first two conditions — the person must have a desire to change and the person must know what to do and how to do it — can be accomplished through a training course by “...creating a positive attitude toward the desired change and by teaching the necessary knowledge and skills.” Furthermore, these two conditions are bestowed upon the participants and their willingness to learn the training curriculum, as well as the training instructor and his/her ability to educate the participants to meet the learning objectives. The third condition — the person must work in the right climate— is outside of the training program’s (e.g., RDPC) control, as this condition pertains to the participant’s immediate supervisor or work environment as a whole. Kirkpatrick lists five different kinds of climate, which range from a supervisor intentionally preventing a participant from implementing the KSA that he/she acquired from the training course to a kind of climate in which a supervisor requires the participant’s learning transfer courses. It is likely that participants in RDPC training courses will work in climates more like the latter, since the participants of such courses are middle-to-senior management level and the training courses are essential to participants’ job duties. The final condition — the person must be rewarded for changing — can be either intrinsic or extrinsic, according to Kirkpatrick. Kirkpatrick explains that intrinsic rewards may include the feelings of satisfaction, pride, and achievement that can occur when change in behavior has positive results, while extrinsic rewards include praise from the boss, recognition by others, and monetary rewards, such as merit pay increases and bonuses. The RDPC may contribute to either type of rewards by simply encouraging participants throughout the training process and by providing an incentive to participants, such as continuing education units.

The RDPC used these conditions as a framework in developing the four criteria that courses must meet in the Level Three Course Evaluation Program.

1. The Terminal Learning Objective (TLO) for each training module must be observable and measurable for research and training purposes.

2. A process and the needed tools must be in place to be able to evaluate the transfer in behavior from the classroom to the workplace (e.g., RDPC’s Level 3 Course Evaluation Program).

3. Participants can and must use the tools that are in place to fulfill their responsibilities in the evaluation of the transfer in behavior.

4. Participants must be provided with on-the-job opportunities to demonstrate the TLO for each module learned in the training course.

Based on the criteria above, AWR 148 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents: Partnering Rural Law Enforcement, First Responders, and Local School Systems was selected as a suitable candidate for evaluation. Further, the evaluation was conducted in parallel with the required three-year course update of AWR 148, which is a requirement of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to ensure that training courses remain timely and relevant. The remainder of this report details the results of the course evaluation.

2.0 Course Overview

The purpose of AWR 148 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents: Partnering Rural Law Enforcement and the Local School Systems is to educate rural law enforcement personnel as well as school administrators and personnel on the elements that must be in place to effectively respond to an emergency at a school building or an entire school system. The training offered in this course is extremely critical due to the nature of possible incidents that occur within and around schools. In particular, schools, law enforcement personnel, and other emergency responders in rural communities are often times limited in resources, so it is very important for all parties to plan, prepare, and communicate before an incident occurs. This course provides rural law enforcement officials and school personnel with information and training tools to collaborate on the planning and preparing for, responding to, and recovering from a school-based incident. By collaborating, they are better prepared to actively work together to make the entire school system and community safer and more secure.

Among the numerous topics covered through the course, specific attention is placed on the following topics:

- Vulnerability assessments;
- Threat assessments;
- Threat Assessment Management (TAM) process;
- Security roles and responsibilities of school and law enforcement personnel;
- Domestic threats;
- Domestic violence spill-over;
- Workplace violence;
- After action review;
- Parent reunification;
- Recovery efforts;
- Anniversary, memorials, and “copy-cats;” and
- Training tools and resources.

The safety and security of schools is very important. Whether one is a student, parent, teacher, staff member, board member, local official, or emergency responder, an incident that occurs at any school – whether urban or rural – will have a major impact on the entire community. According to the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics,² there were 98,817 operating public elementary and secondary schools in the 2010-2011 school year with a total population of 49,212,583 students. Further, more schools (29,219) were located in rural locations than in any other locale in 2010-2011. Additionally, approximately 25% of all students attend school in rural areas. In some states, however, the percentage of students attending schools is in rural locations is significantly higher than the national percentage. For example, the following states have a ratio of student population in rural schools over 40%.

- Alabama (47%)
- Arkansas (43%)
- Kentucky (44%)
- Maine (57%)
- Mississippi (52%)
- North Carolina (47%)
- North Dakota (43%)
- South Carolina (44%)
- South Dakota (45%)
- Tennessee (40%)
- Vermont (58%)
- West Virginia (47%)

Emergency responders in rural areas must work with school staff and administrators towards continuous improvement of the preparedness efforts with regard to school safety. This is achieved through planning, preparedness, increased communication, and coordination of resources when a response is necessary.

Lastly, AWR 148 supports the strategic goals of Presidential Policy Directive 8–National Preparedness and the following Core Capabilities within the National Preparedness Goal.

- Planning
- Intelligence and Information Sharing
- Long-term Vulnerability Reduction
- On-scene Security and Protection
- Operational Communications
- Operational Coordination
- Threat and Hazard Identification

To cover the topical areas and Core Capabilities identified above, AWR 148 is comprised of seven modules each with individual TLOs. Figure 2-1 presents the modules and their corresponding TLOs, which were utilized in the research design.

## 3.0 Methodology

An evaluation survey was used for the AWR 148 Level 3 course evaluation to assess whether the KSAs that each participant acquired via the training course have been applied in the daily work setting. The sample drawn for this study was comprised of all participants who had completed the course from May 2009 to February 2011. This timeframe was determined to be an adequate amount of time for participants to have utilized the KSAs acquired from the training. A total of 4,183 participants were invited to participate in the survey. The postal addresses and e-mail addresses that a course participant provided during course registration were used to disseminate the evaluation invitation letter as well as the survey instrument.

Multiple methods were implemented to collect data for the study. Most respondents (n=3,627, or 87%) were contacted via e-mail with a letter inviting them to participate in the study by completing it online (see Appendix A for a copy of the invitation letter). For those responders without an e-mail address (n=556, or 13%), invitation letters were sent via post mail. The mailing date for the first mailing (both e-mail and post mail) was June 7, 2011. On July 30, 2011, as a courtesy reminder of the RDPC’s invitation to participate in the survey, e-mails and postcards were mailed to all subjects who did not respond to the initial mailing. Lastly, in a final attempt to solicit a response from those subjects who had not yet participated in the study, the RDPC e-mailed and postal mailed another reminder on September 29, 2011. The RDPC officially ended data collection on January 4, 2012.

The course evaluation was completed via a survey instrument, which included thirteen single-choice and two open-ended questions. All but two questions were directly aligned with the TLOs listed in Section 2.0. The final two questions were focused on obtaining details of actions which took place as a result of attending AWR 148. Please see Appendix B for a copy of the survey instrument.

The RDPC utilized two survey formats to collect data for the evaluation. The first format was a pen or pencil self-administered survey in which respondents returned via postal mail. The other format was an online self-administered survey which enabled the RDPC to download the data from a central server via the Internet. SurveyMonkey®, an online survey hosting service, was used to create the online version of the survey instrument and collect the data. Respondents were provided the online link to the survey in the cover letter or e-mail that accompanied each mailing. Additionally, each subject was assigned a unique three-digit survey code as an identifier to track his/her completion of the survey, which was also provided within the invitation letters. Subjects had to enter their survey codes in order to access the online survey. When participants preferred to mail the hard copy of the survey back the research personnel at the RDPC, the data was manually entered into a database. After data collection was complete, both databases (online and hard copies) were combined and analyzed with Statistical Package for the Social Sciences® (SPSS) 19.0.

## 4.0 Results

The adjusted population size was 2,510 due to some subjects having an insufficient mailing or e-mail address. Overall, a total of 534 completed surveys were received, resulting in an adjusted response rate of 21.3%. In terms of survey completion method, an overwhelming majority completed the survey online (n=510, or 95.5%) with the remaining completing the survey by returning it via postal mail (n=24, or 4.5%). This is an anticipated result as close to 80% of the population size was contacted via e-mail.

The data from each of the 534 surveys were analyzed using the SPSS® 19.0. Statistical analyses to include frequencies and percentages were conducted to analyze the data. It was determined that these methods of univariate analysis were...
the most appropriate given the research objective. The objective of this study was to determine if participants who successfully completed AWR 148 have a better understanding of concepts related to school safety as well as if they have utilized the KSAs acquired from the course in their work setting.

Overall, the data indicates that the course helped participants to better understand concepts discussed in the class. For example, more than 80% of the responders indicated “Yes” on nine questions designed to capture whether the participants felt that the course was helpful in learning the following school security concepts as noted below:

1. Better describe the importance of a collaborative role between law enforcement and schools in post-crisis communication (95%)
2. Describe the actions that should be taken during shelter-in-place (95%)
3. More confident in the ability to identify potential vulnerabilities (94%)
4. Better prepared to communicate with all stakeholders (93%)
5. Better prepared to identify possible solutions to potential vulnerabilities (93%)
6. Enhanced ability to describe the various levels of lockdown (89%)
7. Better able to identify and mitigate potential threats (85%)
8. Better describe the actions and expectations of school-based incident mental health debriefing sessions (85%)
9. Enhanced abilities to assist with a Dual Gate Parent Reunification procedure (83%)

There were several concepts for which participants answered that they did not have a chance to implement or use obtained KSAs and/or recommended tools and procedures. These questions covered the following course topics.

- Implemented elements of the Threat Assessment Management (TAM) process (39%)
- Conducted a risk/vulnerability assessment at a school (35%)
- Utilized any of the additional training tools and/or resources (26%)
- Became a member of a school TAM team (9%)

The research team included one question focused on the reasons why participants did not have a chance to implement certain KSAs. Specifically, respondents were asked if they had implemented elements of the TAM process. If the respondent indicated they have not implemented the TAM process (an answer of “No”), then a follow up question asked them what has prevented them from implementation. Overall, 61% (n=275) of the respondents indicated they had not implemented the TAM process. Further, of the 234 provided comments on why it has not been implemented, 169 responses were relevant to the question. The most common challenge people face in their work environment is lack of time. Thirty-seven percent (n=63) of responders indicated that the lack of time was the main factor preventing TAM process implementation. The main challenges, including lack of time, noted by the respondents are:

- Lack of time (37%; n=63);
- Not part of job or responsibilities (32%; n=52);
- Lack of support from administration (18%; n=31);
- Lack of resources, such as financial and manpower (28%; n=14); and
- Not needed nor a priority at the school (5%; 9).

Of the 39% (n=179) that indicated they had implemented TAM process elements, 67 respondents provided details on what was implemented. Notably, 44% (n=30) indicated that one or more elements had been implemented. Additionally, 20% (n=13) stated that the TAM process (or a similar process) was already in place at the school. Further, while less than ten percent (9%; n=41) of the respondents indicated that they had been a member of a TAM team that received a threat referral, some respondents did provide details on how they applied what they learned via the course, which are noted below.
• Used questions from the course in assisting with the analysis of the threat. After that assessment we determined the best action was to keep school in session while the student who threatened was located.

• As a principal, I issued the level 1 lockdown for exterior threats due to the referral we received about a student who might show up at our school. The rest of the TAM team, complied with my lockdown issuance and monitored their own classroom as and hallway movement between class and supported the command to keep all students inside the building. I also made sure that teachers referred to their emergency action kits (a briefcase containing protocols, rosters, attendance sheets, basic first-aid, etc) if we needed to move to a higher lockdown level. I also tried to make sure that someone else (in this case, our guidance counselor), could take over for me if I were to get separated from the school for some reason. These were some of the great points that I learned from the training.

• A student received threatening text messages from an altercation that occurred over the weekend. There was a report of a weapon. We detained/isolated the person who had sent the threat, searched lockers, vehicle and person. We also interviewed other students and found the threat to be real and was averted through reporting and action.

In addition to TAM referrals, the respondents were also asked whether they have responded to or assisted with a school-based incident and, if so, how they applied what they learned via the course. Overall, 15 respondents indicated that they have responded to or assisted with a school-based incident. While specific application of knowledge details was not provided within the comments, some of the more revealing comments are presented below:

• All concepts presented in the course have been utilized and are helpful.

• Through this training I have been much better prepared to deal with problems affecting these students and mediate between school children, parents, and school administration.

• Assisted in a bomb threat. Implemented procedures described in the training. Assessed situation and did searches (interior/exterior). Resumed normal activity.

• The information from the AWR 148 course has been quite helpful in the post-trauma debriefing deployments following recent student and staff fatalities.

Lastly, the respondents were asked if their organization had taken any actions as direct result of attending AWR 148. Overall, there were 157 relevant responses to this question in which the respondents identified the following actions:

• Updating policies, procedures, and plans (26%; n=40)

• Participation in additional training (16%; n=26)

• Performing a risk, threat, and/or vulnerability assessment (14%; n=22)

• More cooperation and collaboration with stakeholders (8%; n=12)

• Formed or implemented specific teams (4%; n=7)

• Updated lockdown procedures (3%; n=5)

• No actions taken (29%; n=45)

Please see Appendix C for individual data on each survey question.

5.0 Discussion

In The Kirkpatrick Four Levels: A Fresh Look After Fifty Years, 1959-2009, authors Dr. Jim Kirkpatrick and Wendy Kirkpatrick state that the actual execution of learning programs and overall corporate strategy occurs primarily at Level 3. In this article, the authors also quote 2008 research by Bersin and Associates that indicates that as much as 70% of learning may take place when a trainee takes the learning material back onto the job. The course designers of AWR 148 wanted to ensure that the learning objectives of the course focused on providing information that would educate rural law enforcement personnel as well as school administrators and staff on the elements that must be in place to effectively collaborate on planning and preparing for, responding to, and recovering from a school-based incident. An in-depth examination of the survey data provides some interesting insight about the respondents’ opinions of the course’s effectiveness. An overwhelming majority of participants responded positively by indicating they have gained a better understanding of how to prepare for and respond to school crisis events as evidenced by the responses below:

• Better prepared to communicate with all stakeholders using common school emergency management terminology (96%): Although the responder community has been trained extensively on a common incident management system, school personnel have not been trained in this regard. It is critical in the planning phase to ensure all stakeholders speak the same language regarding topics such as the National Incident Management System (NIMS) Incident Command System (ICS), school response teams, and vulnerabilities/threat assessments, all of which are covered in detail within AWR 148. The vast majority of participants indicating that they are significantly more prepared to communicate using common school emergency management terminology as a result of their completion of the course is a key step in the collaboration and cooperation needed by all stakeholders.

• More confident to identify potential vulnerabilities with the school(s) in the community (95%) and Better prepared to identify possible solutions
to potential vulnerabilities within the school(s) in the community (93%): In order for a school to reduce the risk of a crisis incident occurring, vulnerabilities must be identified and mitigated. **AWR 148** encourages school personnel to involve the local responders in vulnerability assessments so they can lend their expertise to the process of reducing risk. The overwhelming majority of participants indicating that they are more confident in identifying and mitigating vulnerabilities satisfies a key objective of AWR 148.

- **Better able to identify and mitigate potential threats that schools in the community face including those involving workplace violence, terrorism, bullying, and domestic issues (85%)**: As was the case with vulnerability assessments noted above, having a majority of participants indicate they are better able to identify and mitigate the numerous threats that schools face is critical in reducing the risk of school-based incidents.

- **Enhanced ability to describe the various levels of lockdown and the response protocols appropriate to each (89%)**: Based on feedback obtained throughout the delivery of AWR 148, not all schools approach lockdown in the same manner. The high rate of respondents (89%) who indicated a better understanding of the various levels of lockdown as a result of course participation demonstrates that the discussion is effective for both responders and school personnel alike.

When looking at the data regarding risk/vulnerability assessments, 65% of respondents indicated that they have not conducted these assessments, while 35% indicated that they have. It is encouraging that over a third of the respondents have conducted the assessments as a result of participation in AWR 148.

While there were no survey questions that gathered information about the factors that impeded a participant's ability to conduct a risk/vulnerability assessment, those participants who did conduct these assessments indicated their findings and suggested solutions as part of the survey. There were a variety of vulnerabilities and solutions reported as findings, with physical vulnerabilities such as ease of access to entrances/unlocked doors being the most common. There were also interesting discussions in the respondent's findings about the collaborative work between school and law enforcement personnel as emphasized throughout AWR 148, specifically while performing vulnerability assessments. As evidenced in the comments below, positive relationships are being fostered between school and law enforcement when collaboration on vulnerability assessments occurs.

- **We are working on identifying classrooms from the outside of the building with room numbers in a common location so support personnel can easily identify a room.**

We are also working on building security measures, chain of command, and updating our crisis plan.

- **We reviewed the camera coverage, time schedule on electronic door locks, and shared Internet Protocol (IP) addresses of cameras with local law enforcement.**

- **Best part of the course was that we got school officials at the local and district levels together to work out terminology and processes... which was one of the biggest problems we have. The schools and the police department were calling the same thing by different names. We have also resolved other communication issues.**

- **Provide local law enforcement with maps of school facilities. Attempt to provide greater perimeter security measures.**

- **Consistency for our 15 schools in terms of crisis response and management; unification of multiple elements of Safe School Plans; Our police department now has real-time annually updated information on all of our school sites including school staff contact numbers, evacuation plans, site maps, and potential helicopter landing locations, this information is available at police dispatch and is accessible through all patrol car laptops.**

- **Met with fire and police officials following training. As a result of this meeting we: updated the safety plans for all four schools and provided copies to the fire and police departments; updated the floor plans for school facilities and gave copies to police and fire officials; updated the collection of keys to school facilities we provide to the police and fire departments; and placed room number signs in each classroom window as requested by police and fire officials. We updated our anti-bullying policy. We tweaked our procedures to match the various levels of lockdown and the response protocols we learned in this training.**

With TAM being a relatively new concept to most of the participants in AWR 148, it was not surprising that a majority of respondents (61%) reported an inability to implement TAM, in which most participants listing issues beyond their control as the primary reason implementation inability. The biggest reason reported was lack of time (37%), followed by threat assessment being outside the scope of their job responsibilities (32%), lack of support from administration (18%), lack of financial, personnel, and other resources (8%), and finally the belief that threat assessment is not needed or is not a priority at the school (5%).

It was encouraging that 39% of respondents were able to implement the TAM process with 87% of those indicating that TAM occurred in their school because they had implemented one or more elements of TAM, taken other specification implementation actions, or that the TAM process or similar processes already were in place at the school. These numbers indicate the respondents are taking the KSAs back to their jobs.
Another interesting component was the response to the question asking respondents if their organization had taken any actions as a direct result of attending AWR 148. The majority of people who responded (71%) indicated they had taken some sort of action. The most common action that took place according to the respondents was the updating of policies, procedures, and plans (26%). Updating these important planning documents is a foundational step in preparing for a school-based incident.

It is evident from some of the responses that the practical concepts that are presented are being understood, yet are not being implemented. In some instances there has not been a chance to put these concepts into action, while others are hindered by administrative or monetary restraints. While things like financial constraints and lack of opportunity for implementation cannot be controlled, ensuring participants understand the importance of administration support of their efforts is critical during the AWR 148 discussions. A concerted effort in the marketing materials to emphasize the importance of building and district level administrators attending AWR 148 could aid in more respondents indicating that they have implemented concepts learned in the course like vulnerability assessments and TAM. Through the delivery of AWR 148 across the United States, it has been determined that the best AWR 148 courses occur when there is an equal representation between school administration/staff and emergency responders, especially law enforcement, in the course attendance. It is critical to bring all of the stakeholders together to discuss the important elements of planning and preparing for, responding to, and recovering from a school-based incident. Emphasizing the importance of a multidisciplinary audience should continue to be a major focus of all marketing materials for this course.

### 6.0 Conclusion

Due to AWR 148 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents: Partnering Rural Law Enforcement, First Responders, and Local School Systems being an awareness level course, many of the course topics are discussed at a higher level and not at a performance level. As such, although it is hoped that participants take the information learned and apply it to their specific situation, the objectives of the course are to educate the participants on what they can do and leaves it up to the participants to implement the concepts learned. The results of this survey indicate that participants are in fact taking the information they acquired and applying it to their organizations and job responsibilities. It is evident that AWR 148 was a positive learning experience for the respondents and the primary learning objectives of the course had been met.

The findings from this study suggest that the course development and evaluation processes developed and administered adopted by the RDPC are effective at producing training courses that achieve the goal of increasing the KSAs of participants. The RDPC utilized the information obtained from this level three course evaluation to refine the AWR 148 course curriculum during its scheduled three-year review and update and will integrate the lessons learned from this evaluation into future assessments. In addition, the RDPC developed a 2-day companion management/planning level course in which many of the operational level details of the concepts discussed in AWR 148 will be covered. MGT 417 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents for Key Decision Makers, is designed for key school and emergency services decision makers, which benefited from the results of this survey by incorporating the feedback obtained from respondents.
Dear AWR 148 Participant:

You have been selected to participate in an evaluation research study regarding your completion of the course AWR 148 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents – Partnering Rural Law Enforcement and the Local School Systems, a training sponsored by the Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium (RDPC). This study is being conducted by the Justice and Safety Center (JSC) at Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) and is funded by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Training and Education Division. In this study, researchers are assessing the transfer of knowledge from the classroom to the job in order to determine the success of the training, as well as to help guide the development and delivery of future training.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There will not be any consequences for refusal to participate, nor will we identify those who refuse to participate. Your willingness to participate, however, will result in highly beneficial information for RDPC. It is important that your unique perspective is represented, so we ask that you not transfer the survey to another individual to complete without first consulting us. The information that you provide us will be kept confidential and you will not be identified in any way. Your information will only be combined with information from other respondents taking part in the study.

This project was reviewed and approved by EKU’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Research Subjects. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the EKU IRB Administration at 859-622-3636.

You may access the survey online at the following link: www.ruraltraining.org/awr-148-survey. Once you access the survey, you will be required to enter a one to four-digit survey code number. Please locate your survey code number in the top-right corner of the first page of the paper version of the survey. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

If you have any questions, please contact Erin Henry at (859) 622-6763 or erin.henry@eku.edu. Thank you for your willingness to share your experiences with us. We appreciate your participation.

Sincerely,

Dr. Pam Collins
Principal Investigator, RDPC / Executive Director, JSC – EKU
This page intentionally left blank
8.0 Appendix B: Survey Instrument

If you prefer to complete the survey online, you may access the survey at the following link: TBD. Before you can begin the survey, you will be required to enter a survey code. The survey code is the three or four-digit number printed at the top-right of the cover page. Please answer the questions based on your experiences since taking AWR 148 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents: Partnering Rural Law Enforcement and the Local School Systems. If you encounter any problems while taking the survey, or have any questions or comments in general, please contact Erin Henry at (859) 622-6763 or erin.henry@eku.edu. Thank you in advance for your participation.

1. Since taking this course, do you feel better prepared to communicate with all stakeholders using common school emergency management terminology?
   - Yes
   - No

2. Since taking this course, do you feel more confident in your ability to identify potential vulnerabilities with the school(s) in your community?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Since taking this course, are you better prepared to identify possible solutions to potential vulnerabilities within the school(s) in your community?
   - Yes
   - No

4. Since taking this course, have you conducted a risk/vulnerability assessment at a school(s) in your jurisdiction?
   - Yes
   - No

   (a) If "yes," please discuss, if any, the potential vulnerabilities you identified during the assessment and the solutions you proposed to correct them.

   (Open-Ended Response)

5. Since taking this course, are you better able to identify and mitigate potential threats that schools in your community face including those involving workplace violence, terrorism, bullying, and domestic issues?
   - Yes
   - No

   (a) If "yes", please provide details on what threats were identified and measures taken to mitigate the threat.
6. Has taking this course allowed you to implement elements of the Threat Assessment Management (TAM) process (i.e., Referral, Threat Assessment Inquiry, Evaluation and Response, and Post Assessment/Action Plan)?
   
   Yes
   No

   (a) If “yes,” which elements have you been able to implement?
   (b) If “no,” what has prevented you from implementing the TAM process (e.g., time, no support, etc)?

7. Since taking this course, have you been a member of a school Threat Assessment Management (TAM) team that has received a threat referral?

   Yes
   No

   (a) If “yes,” please explain your role on the TAM team and how you applied what you learned in this course during the process.

   (Open-Ended Response)

8. Has taking this course enhanced your ability to describe the various levels of lockdown and the response protocols appropriate to each?

   Yes
   No

9. Since taking this course, can you describe the actions that should be taken by both school personnel and law enforcement officers when sheltering-in-place?

   Yes
   No

10. Since taking the course, do you feel confident in your abilities to assist with a Dual Gate Parent Reunification procedure in the event of a school emergency?

     Yes
     No

11. Since taking this course, can you better describe the actions and expectations of school-based incident mental health debriefing sessions for responders and victims?

     Yes
     No

12. Since taking this course, can you better describe the importance of a collaborative role between law enforcement and schools in post-crisis communication?

     Yes
     No
13. Please list any actions your organization has taken as a direct result of attending AWR 148 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents: Partnering Rural Law Enforcement and the Local School Systems (e.g., performed a risk/vulnerability assessment, assessed and evaluated a threat using the TAM process, assisted on a mental health team during incident recovery, etc.)?  

(Open-Ended Response)

14. Because of what you learned in AWR 148 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents: Partnering Rural Law Enforcement and the Local School Systems, have you responded to or assisted with a school-based incident in your jurisdiction? If so, please explain the incident and how you applied the knowledge you learned through the course.  

(Open-Ended Response)

15. Have you utilized any of the additional training tools and/or resources provided during the course?  

Yes  
No

(a) If “yes,” please list the training tools and/or resources you have utilized since taking the course and discuss how they were used.  

(Open-Ended Response)
### Appendix C: Individual Question Data

#### Figure C-1: Question 1 Results
Question 1: Since taking this course, do you feel better prepared to communicate with all stakeholders using common school emergency management terminology? (n=490)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-2: Question 2 Results
Question 2: Since taking this course, do you feel more confident in your ability to identify potential vulnerabilities with the school(s) in your community? (n=490)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-3: Question 3 Results
Question 3: Since taking this course, are you better prepared to identify possible solutions to potential vulnerabilities within the school(s) in your community? (n=489)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-4: Question 4 Results
Question 4: Since taking this course, have you conducted a risk/vulnerability assessment at a school(s) in your jurisdiction? (n=490)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-5: Question 5 Results
Question 5: Since taking this course, are you better able to identify and mitigate potential threats that schools in your community face including those involving workplace violence, terrorism, bullying, and domestic issues? (n=478)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-6: Question 6 Results
Question 6: Has taking this course allowed you to implement elements of the Threat Assessment Management (TAM) process (i.e., Referral, Threat Assessment Inquiry, Evaluation and Response, and Post Assessment/Action Plan)? (n=454)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-7: Question 6a Results
Question 6a: If “yes”, which elements have you been able to implement? (n=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implemented one or more elements</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other actions taken</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM process or similar processes already in place at school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All elements</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No actions taken to date</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-8: Question 6b Results
Question 6b: If “no”, what has prevented you from implementing the TAM process (e.g., time, no support, etc)? (n=169)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not part of job/responsibilities</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Resources</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed/not a priority/no requests</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-9: Question 7 Results
Question 7: Since taking this course, have you been a member of a school Threat Assessment Management (TAM) team that has received a threat referral? (n=438)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-10: Question 8 Results
Question 8: Has taking this course enhanced your ability to describe the various levels of lockdown and the response protocols appropriate to each? (n=409)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure C-11: Question 9 Results
Question 9: Since taking this course, can you describe the actions that should be taken by both school personnel and law enforcement officers when sheltering-in-place? (n=408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure C-12: Question 10 Results**

Question 10: Since taking this course, do you feel confident in your abilities to assist with a Dual Gate Parent Reunification procedure in the event of a school emergency? (n=408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure C-13: Question 11 Results**

Question 11: Since taking this course, can you better describe the actions and expectations of school-based incident mental health debriefing sessions for responders and victims? (n=409)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure C-14: Question 12 Results**

Question 12: Since taking this course, can you better describe the importance of a collaborative role between law enforcement and schools in post-crisis communication? (n=1409)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure C-15: Question 13 Results**

Question 13: Please list any actions your organization has taken as a direct result of attending *AWR 148 Crisis Management for School-Based Incidents: Partnering Rural Law Enforcement and the Local School Systems* (e.g., performed a risk/vulnerability assessment, assessed and evaluated a threat using the TAM process, assisted on a mental health teams during incident recover, etc.)? (n=157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated policies, and procedures, and plans</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participated in additional training</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed risk, threat, and/or vulnerability assessment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cooperation and collaboration with stakeholders</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formed and/or implemented specific teams</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Lockdown procedures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None and N/A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure C-16: Question 15 Results**

Question 15: Have you utilized any of the additional training tools and/or resources provided during the course? (n=408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-17: Question 15a Results**

Question 15a: If "yes," please list the training tools and/or resources you have utilized since taking the course and discuss how they were used. (n=30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials (CD/DVD, class manual, other items)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat assessment tool/process</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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