

Copyright
by
William Lee Atkins
2014

**The Thesis Report Committee for William Lee Atkins
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:**

**Emergency Planning and Response
In Texas Catholic Schools**

**APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

Supervisor:

Jane Arnold Lincove

Jeffery R. Patterson

**Emergency Planning and Response
In Texas Catholic Schools**

by

William Lee Atkins, B.A.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Public Affairs

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2014

Dedication

I would like to thank my wife, Myra, for her love, support and encouragement in completing this report. I would also like to thank my readers, Dr. Jane Lincove and Dr. Jeff Patterson, for their extreme patience.

This report is also dedicated to the many women and men who make up the Catholic education system in Texas.

Abstract

Emergency Planning and Response In Texas Catholic Schools

William Lee Atkins, M.P.Aff.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Jane Lincove

The Texas Education Code has specific requirements for public schools as it relates to emergency planning and response expectations. There are no similar requirements for Catholic schools in state statute. Through a survey, this report will show that Catholic schools in Texas already have planning and response programs in place. This report will make specific recommendations intended to enhance those current programs.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Public School Safety Requirements	1
Overview of School Incidents	3
Overview of Report	6
Chapter 2: Survey of Texas Catholic Schools	7
Survey Design	7
Survey Administration	7
Survey Results	9
Survey Conclusions	19
Chapter 3: State Comparison	22
Emergency Plans	22
Fire Drills	24
Emergency Drills	25
Chapter 4: Recommendations	27
Introduction	27
Planning	28
Planning Committee	29
Emergency Plan Elements	30
Authority	30
Purpose	31
Explanation of Terms	32
Situation and Assumptions	32
Concept of Operations	33
Organization and Assignment of Responsibilities	34
Direction and Control	35
Readiness Levels	35

Administration and Support.....	36
Plan Development and Maintenance	37
Attachments	37
Training.....	37
Incident Command System (ICS).....	39
School Specific Training.....	41
Recommendations.....	45
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	48
For Further Study.....	49
Appendix.....	51
Appendix 1 – Survey Instrument	51
Appendix 2 – Planning Checklist	57
Appendix 3 – Sample Emergency Response Plan Template	58
Appendix 4 – Training Resources.....	66
Appendix 5 – Training Curriculum.....	67
Bibliography	71
Vita	74

List of Tables

Table 1.1:	Number of Incidents by Location	5
Table 2.1:	Safety Actions	9
Table 2.2:	Planning Activities	11
Table 2.3:	Emergency Teams, Schools	12
Table 2.4:	District Plans	14
Table 2.5:	Emergency Teams, Diocese	15
Table 2.6:	Tools Available	16
Table 2.7:	Confidence Levels	18
Table 3.1:	School Emergency Plans	22
Table 3.2:	Fire Drills	24
Table 3.3:	School Emergency Drill	25

Chapter 1: Introduction

PUBLIC SCHOOL SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

Section 37.108(a) of the Texas Education Code “Code” requires public school districts in Texas to adopt a “multihazard emergency operations plan” that addresses “mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery as defined by the commissioner of education.” The same section of the Code further requires that those plans contain provisions for: 1) the training of employees in skills needed to respond to an emergency, 2) provisions for “drills and exercises” related to emergencies, 3) coordinating with a variety of responder organizations in an emergency, and 4) a “safety and security audit” of district facilities every three years.

This is a major undertaking for Texas public schools which had a total enrollment of over 5 million students in the 2012-2013 school year.¹ The plans required by Section 37.108 of the Code must cover the more than 8,500 schools in the more than 1,200 school districts in Texas.²

Other provisions of Section 37 in the Texas Education Code related to public school safety measures include the recent implementation of a School Safety Certification Program in Section 37.1082. This certification program provides for the awarding of a “school safety certificate” to schools that are in compliance with Section 37.108 of the Code, have a means to communicate with “parents and the media in the event of an emergency,” and conduct a number of specific types of drills and exercises.

¹ Texas Education Agency. Division of Research and Analysis, Department of Assessment and Accountability. *Enrollment in Texas Public Schools 2012-2013*. March 2014. ix.

² *Ibid*, 1.

Although there is no exact provision at the national level for public schools to have emergency response plans enacted, there are an estimated 31 states in addition to Texas that require some sort of emergency planning to take place at the school or school district level.³

These are sound policy measures since schools are subject to the same issues and hazards that affect society as a whole. However the provisions of Section 37 in the Texas Education Code only apply to public schools.

According to the Texas Catholic Conference, there are two Archdioceses and fifteen Dioceses in the State of Texas all with Catholic schools. Statistics from the Texas Catholic Conference indicate that in 2012 there were 224 Diocesan or Parish schools with a student population of just over 60,000 and another 55 private Catholic schools with a student population over 20,000.⁴

Although smaller in number and student population the safety of students, as well as, faculty and staff, at Catholic schools is just as important as it is in public schools. Neither natural disasters, man-made disasters nor acts of violence differentiate between public and private schools.

Examples of events that have impacted Texas Catholic schools include a hazardous material spill in Corpus Christi in 1990 that required students at a local Catholic school to shelter-in-place. Catholic schools in Galveston were forced to close permanently while other schools in Houston were either closed permanently or merged with other schools as a result of Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Also in 2005, Catholic schools throughout Texas received students evacuating from both Hurricane's Katrina and Rite. Finally, although not directly impacted by the explosion, the Catholic school in

³ U.S. Government Accounting Office. *Emergency Management: Status of School Districts' Planning and Preparedness*. May 2007. 5.

⁴ Texas Catholic Conference website. About Us. <http://www.txcatholic.org>. Accessed: 5 April 2014.

West, Texas opened its doors to students from the local public school when that school was damaged.⁵

OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL INCIDENTS

Unfortunately “Columbine” and “Sandy Hook” have become a part of the national consciousness.

On April 20, 1999, two students entered Columbine High School with the intent to “kill as many teachers and fellow students as possible.”⁶ The original intent of the attackers was to create a fire using explosives and then shoot students and teachers attempting to escape.⁷ When their attempt to create a fire using explosives failed the attackers simply entered the school and began firing.⁸ Forty-seven minutes after the attack began the two students took their own lives⁹ and left twelve students and one teacher dead along with twenty-four wounded.¹⁰

After shooting and killing his mother at home on December 14, 2012, a heavily armed assailant was able to gain entry into a “locked school building”, Sandy Hook Elementary School.¹¹ Before taking his own life, the shooter would kill twenty first graders and six adults¹² as well as wounding two others.¹³ It is estimated that the entire incident took place in eleven minutes or less.¹⁴ It was determined that other than having

⁵ M. McGettrick (personal communication, May 1, 2014).

⁶ Columbine Review Commission. *The Report of Governor Bill Owens*. May 2001. i.

⁷ *Ibid.* i.

⁸ *Ibid.* ii.

⁹ *Ibid.* iv.

¹⁰ New York City Police Department. *Active Shooter: Recommendations and Analysis for Risk Mitigation*. 2012 Edition. 121.

¹¹ Office of the State’s Attorney Judicial District of Danbury. *Report of the State’s Attorney for the Judicial District of Danbury on the Shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School and 36 Yogananda Street, Newtown, Connecticut on December 14, 2012*. November 25, 2013. 1.

¹² *Ibid.* 2.

¹³ *Ibid.* 5.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

attended Sandy Hook Elementary the shooter had no other involvement with the school.¹⁵ The State’s Attorney concluded that in combination with law enforcement responders “the staff of Sandy Hook Elementary ... acted heroically” and “saved many children’s lives.”¹⁶ The State’s Attorney for Connecticut stated that as to why this happened, “that question may never be answered conclusively.”¹⁷

Shortly after the shootings at Sandy Hook the New York City Police Department issued its updated *Active Shooter: Recommendations and Analysis for Risk Mitigation*. This publication included a summary of 324 active shooter incidents.¹⁸ As a part of the analysis conducted by the New York City Police they classified the location of shootings. They then categorized those locations as: office buildings, open commercial areas (which included locations such as malls), schools, factories and warehouses, and other (which includes an accumulation of locations that individually appeared under a pre-determined threshold.)¹⁹

Table 1.1 shows the findings of the analysis conducted by the New York Police Department as it relates to the location where shootings occur.

¹⁵ Ibid 29.

¹⁶ Ibid 4.

¹⁷ Ibid 3.

¹⁸ New York City Police Department. 1.

¹⁹ Ibid. 7.

Location Type	Number of Incidents	Percentage
School	68	24%
Office Building	31	11%
Open Commercial	67	24%
Factory/Warehouse	33	12%
Other	80	29%
Total	279*	100%

* The 230 cases in the active shooter data set occurred at 279 locations because several attacks involved more than one location. The increase in incidents at “other” locations since the 2010 Edition is primarily due to the shootings in Wixom, Michigan, which occurred in at least 24 locations along a highway. Source: New York City Police Department. *Active Shooter: Recommendations and Analysis for Risk Mitigation*. 2012 Edition. 8.

Table 1.1: Number of Incidents by Location

Although shootings and other acts of violence are not the only incidents that schools are subject to, they are more likely to gain media attention due to the exceptional vulnerability of the victims.

Weather is another hazard that schools are as vulnerable to as any other location or group.

Over April 3-4, 1974 over 150 tornados were recorded from Canada to the Deep South in the United States. This event became known as “Super Outbreak” and it took the lives of 330 individuals. Xiena, Ohio lost seven of its twelve schools in this event.²⁰

The hazards specific to a school are as varied as the location of the school itself. Schools on the coast may be subject to hurricanes while others inland may be subject to flooding or tornados. Some schools may need to plan for earthquakes while others need to plan for severe winter weather conditions.

Regardless of the type of school, public or private, or its location there is always a need to plan for any possible incident.

²⁰ Finger, Stan. “After Forty Years, Super Outbreak Remains a Tornado Benchmark,” The Kansas City Star. March 31, 2014. <http://www.kansascity.com/2014/03/30/4926237/after-40-years-super-outbreak.html> Accessed 5 April 2014.

OVERVIEW OF REPORT

This report will consist of a review of common emergency planning and response efforts in schools and make recommendations for the application of some of those select efforts in Texas Catholic schools.

Chapter two will discuss a survey that was distributed to Catholic school superintendents to gain a base line level of knowledge of current emergency planning efforts. Chapter two discusses in detail the administration of the survey as well as the survey results.

Chapter three will consist of a comparison of a variety of emergency planning requirements in other states as it relates to private schools. Additionally, chapter three will introduce and discuss the idea of best practices in other states.

Chapter four will contain specific recommendations for Texas Catholic schools based on the information gathered for this report. These recommendations will include suggested planning actions for both individual schools as well as at the Diocesan level. Additionally, this chapter will include recommended training for Catholic school personnel in emergency planning and response areas. It should be noted that the use of the term 'response' should not be confused with efforts of public safety agencies such as law enforcement, fire or emergency medical service providers (EMS). In this report the term response refers to the actions taken by school personnel immediately following an incident to preserve life and property and ultimately return the school to normal operations.

Chapter five of the report will contain recommendations for areas of further development or study as Catholic schools in Texas continue to enhance their school safety efforts.

Chapter 2: Survey of Texas Catholic Schools

SURVEY DESIGN

In order to obtain a better understanding of current attitudes toward emergency planning and response activities in Texas Catholic schools, a simple on-line survey was created. The survey was developed using the Qualtrics survey tool provided by the University of Texas. Within the following description of the survey instrument and discussion of the survey results the terms “Diocese” and “District” may be used interchangeably.

The survey was designed to capture information at the Diocesan level, that is, to capture information for all of the schools within a particular Diocese.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

The survey was distributed via e-mail to the Catholic school superintendents in Texas on September 3, 2013. The list of superintendents was reviewed and confirmed by the Texas Catholic Conference. In addition to the e-mail distribution of the survey, there was at least one communication from the Texas Catholic Conference to superintendents encouraging them to complete the survey.

The cover letter included with the survey indicated the purpose of the survey and how the researcher could be contacted. It was also noted in the cover letter of the survey that due to the small number of surveys being distributed, participation would be both very important and greatly appreciated. A copy of the survey instrument is attached to this professional report as appendix one.

A total of eleven surveys were completed. For unknown reasons, some participants did not respond to all of the questions. Since this appears to have been limited primarily to only one respondent it does not appear to be a flaw in the survey

instrument but a deliberate action on the part of the respondent. It is important to note that the respondent that did not respond to all of the questions was also the respondent reported the largest enrollment of students. This lack of information could skew some results.

The responses from participants related to the number of schools in the Diocese by type, along with reported student population was reviewed and compiled. Respondents were then ranked based on the total number of schools and total student population. These figures did not always match up exactly. For example, the Diocese with the largest number of schools also reported the largest student population. However, the Diocese reporting the third largest number of schools reported having the fourth largest student population of all respondents, that is, while a Diocese may have a larger number of schools than a Diocese, their total student enrollment may be lower. This type of anomaly occurred among several of the respondents but the variation was generally within one point. In general, Dioceses reported an equal number of negative responses. Those negative responses were, on average, a total of three to four. The two Diocese with the largest number of negative responses were two Diocese with the smallest student population. As noted earlier, the Diocese with the largest student population was also the Diocese with the largest negative responses (or more accurately they failed to provide any response). In total, a student population of 42,108 was provided by respondents.

SURVEY RESULTS

Question	Response
Does your district require schools to have Automatic Electronic Defibrillators (AEDs) on each campus?	Yes-9, No-2
If yes, does your district require training on the use of AEDs?	Yes-9, No-0
Who is required to be trained on the use of AED's?	Faculty-7 Staff-7 Students-2 Parents-3 Other-4
Does your district require schools to have fire extinguishers on each campus?	Yes-11, No-0
If yes, does your district require training on the use of fire extinguishers?	Yes-5, No-5
Who is required to be trained on the use of extinguishers	Faculty-4 Staff-6
Does your district require any faculty or staff to receive any level of first aid training?	Yes-11, No-0
Do any of your schools have full time nursing staff available on campus?	Yes-9, No-2
If yes, please identify the type of school and the number of schools of each type that have full time nursing staff available on campus:	Elementary-39/128 JH/Middle School-6/22 HS-17/33

Table 2.1: Safety Actions

Table 2.1 shows the responses to the questions on the survey intended to capture the level of participation of schools as it relates to fundamental safety actions. The responses indicate that the majority of schools are required to have AED's on campus and all reported that fire extinguishers were required on campus. The two respondents reporting that AED's were not required totaled 1,336 students. Also, all respondents reported that some level of first aid training was required of faculty or staff.

Nine of the eleven respondents reported that training on the use of AED's was required. The survey results indicated that the majority of the training was required of Faculty and Staff with Students, Parents and Other being listed but to a lesser degree. Respondents were evenly split on the requirement for training in the use of fire extinguishers and that training was limited to Faculty and Staff.

Nine of the Diocese responding to the survey indicated that at least some of their schools had full time nursing staff available. In table 2.1 the results are coded as follows: the first figure indicates the number of schools reported to have a full time nursing staff while the second number indicates the total number of schools reported in the survey. Therefore, 39 of the 128 elementary schools, 6 of the 22 junior high/middle schools and 17 of the 33 have full time nursing staff on campus. These figures may be somewhat misleading in that some respondents indicated that their junior high/middle school count was included in the count of elementary schools.

The next series of questions in the survey were designed to gauge the emergency planning activities that currently occur in Catholic schools in Texas and are contained in table 2.2.

Question	Response
Does your district require each school to have an emergency response plan?	Yes-11, No-0
If yes, does your district require the independent review of school emergency response plans?	District Personnel-9 Other-2
Are schools required to review/update their emergency response plans?	Yes-11, No-0
If yes, how often?	Annually-8 Every two yrs-2 Every three yrs-0 Other-1
Are schools required to exercise or otherwise test their emergency response plans?	Yes-10, No-1
Are you aware of any incidents where a school has had to implement all or part its emergency response plan?	Yes-9, No-2
Are school emergency response plans required to address potential issues both on campus as well as events off campus, i.e., field trips, off-site sporting events, etc.?	Yes-9, No-2

Table 2.2: Planning Activities

All respondents indicated that schools in their Diocese were required to have an emergency response plan. Also, all respondents indicated that those plans were required to be reviewed by either District Personnel or some Other reviewer. Finally, all respondents indicated that the school emergency response plans were required to be

reviewed or updated with the majority of the plans having to be reviewed/updated on an annual basis.

Respondents were asked to indicate, in a free text box, the method used to ensure that plans were reviewed/updated according to the schedule previously indicated. Of the ten responses received, a Diocesan level office of some type was named as being responsible for tracking this information. Superintendents and Principals were reported almost evenly as either being responsible for this function or for sharing the responsibility between their offices.

Ten of the respondents indicated that schools were required to exercise or test their plan and nine of the respondents indicated they were aware of incidents that actually required a school to implement part or all of their emergency response plan. The Diocese indicating there was not a requirement to test or exercise their plans represented 2,933 students. Nine of the respondents also reported that emergency response plans in their Diocese were required to address potential issues both on campus as well as off-site.

Table 2.3 contains the responses to the survey questions intended to determine the assignment of personnel to emergency response efforts and their required training.

Question	Response
Does your district require each school to have an emergency response team?	Yes-10, No-1
Does your district require training of any personnel in emergency planning?	Yes-5, No-4, N/A-2

Table 2.3: Emergency Teams, Schools

While ten of the eleven respondents reported that schools in their Diocese were required to have an emergency response team a majority of respondents reported that either no training was required for these teams or did not answer the question at all. Only five of the eleven respondents indicated that training was a requirement for the emergency response teams in their Diocese.

The Diocese not requiring an emergency response team was the Diocese with the smallest reported enrollment at 470. A total of 26,644 students were in a Diocese that reported training for members of the emergency response team was not a requirement. While this total is over 60% of the total students population reported it is important to note that almost 15,000 of those students are from a Diocese that did not respond to the question.

Respondents were asked to identify, by position title only, who in their schools was required to receive training in emergency training. A review of the answers provided indicated that the position cited the most was “Principal” which appeared in four of the responses. The position “Nurse” and “Counselor” both appeared twice. Other positions appearing once included: Assistant Principal, Coaches, P.E. Teachers, Health Coordinators, Cafeteria Personnel, Parents, Superintendent, Teachers and Claims Risk Manager. One Diocese responded that “all administrative staff” were required to receive training.

When asked to describe the training required for the personnel mentioned above two respondents referred to training on their plans, two referred to training provided by outside providers such as the Diocese or other organization. One respondent reported receiving training from their region service center and local emergency management office.

Question	Response
Does your district, as a whole, have an emergency response plan?	Yes-7, No-3, N/A-1
Does your district, as a whole, identify the potential hazards that could impact schools in your district?	Yes-8, No-3
Does your district require individual schools to identify the hazards specific to each school?	Yes-9, No-0, N/A-2

Table 2.4: District Plans

The responses from survey participants to questions related to district-wide plans and vulnerability analysis are contained in table 2.4. Seven of the eleven respondents indicated that their Diocese had an emergency response plan. The Diocese with the largest student population did not respond to this question while the three responding in the negative represented a student population of almost 5,000 students. Also, the majority of respondents indicated that hazards that could potentially impact schools were required to be identified on either the Diocesan or individual school level. Seven of the responses showed that this analysis was required at both levels. Two of the three Dioceses responding no to this question also indicated in the previous question the Diocese as a whole did not have a plan. The total of the student population for these three negative responses was 6,582.

A series of questions in the survey questioned respondents further about response teams and required training at the Diocese and individual school level. The responses to those questions are in table 2.5.

Question	Response
Does your district have personnel identified as an emergency response team?	Yes-8, No-2, N/A-1
If yes, are those individuals required to attend or obtain any training specific to their emergency response roles?	Yes-5, No-2, N/A-4
Does your district require individual schools to have personnel identified as an emergency response team?	Yes-9, No-1, N/A-1
If yes, are those individuals required to attend any training specific to their emergency response roles?	Yes-5, No-4, N/A-2

Table 2.5: Emergency Teams, Diocese

While eight of the eleven respondents indicated that an emergency response team had been identified at the district level, only five respondents reported that any level of training was required for those team members. The Diocese with the largest student population did not respond to the question regarding a district level response team the two that did respond in the negative represent a population of 4,885. The five Diocese reporting a training requirement for Diocesan team members had a student population of 12, 700 while the total student population for Diocese not requiring training or not responding to the question totaled 29, 403 students.

When asked to describe the training that was required at the District level two described training that was provided by a Diocesan office, two described specific forms of training such as CPR, first aid, etc., and one described training specific to an individual's area of responsibility.

The next series of questions, contained in table 2.6, were designed to assess the tools currently available and used by schools to respond to an incident.

Question	Response
Does your district have a system to communicate with school personnel in the event of an emergency?	Yes-9, No-1, N/A-1
Does your district require the schools in your district to have a system to communicate with faculty/staff in the event of an emergency?	Yes-9, No-1, N/A-1
Does your district require the schools in you district to have a system to communicate with parents in the event of an emergency?	Yes-10, No-0, N/A-1
Does your district require the use of the Incident Command System (ICS) in the planning and response to emergencies?	Yes-1, No-9, N/A-1

Table 2.6: Tools Available

The majority of respondents indicated that their District and individual schools had systems in place to communicate to others in the event of any emergency. Nine of eleven respondents stated that the District could communicate with school personnel and nine of eleven also reported that schools had systems to communicate with faculty and staff in an emergency. The Diocese with the second highest student population at 6,032 reported not having system to communicate with schools during an incident and the Diocese with the largest enrollment did not respond to the question. The Diocese with the smallest student population (470) reported lacking a system to communicate with

faculty during an incident. Ten of eleven respondents indicated that schools had systems in place to communicate with parents in an emergency. All of the Diocese that responded indicate they did have a system to communicate with parents, while the largest Diocese did not respond to the question.

The types of systems used to communicate ranged from a variety of commercially available emergency notification systems to the use of e-mail, telephonic messaging and school websites.

When asked if their district required the use of the Incident Command System (ICS) in emergency planning or response actions only one Diocese responded in the affirmative. An overwhelming majority of respondents indicated the use of ICS was not a requirement in their Diocese. The Diocese responding in the affirmative reported a student population of almost 6,000 meaning that almost 85% of the students are in schools unfamiliar with ICS, the system all first responder organizations use when responding to incidents.

Table 2.7 contains the final series of questions in the survey. These questions were intended to obtain the level of confidence the respondents had to their district as a whole or individual schools in their district to respond to an incident.

Question	Response
How confident are you in the ability of your district to respond to an event (natural or man-made) or other emergency?	Very-5 Somewhat-4 Not Very Much-1 N/A-1
How confident are you in the ability of your schools in your district, as a whole, to respond to an event (natural or man-made) or other emergency?	Very-6 Somewhat-4 Not Very Much-0 N/A-1
Are there specific areas you believe your district needs additional assistance as it relates to emergency planning and response capabilities?	Yes-7, No-3, N/A-1

Table 2.7: Confidence Levels

When asked to rate their level of confidence in their district to respond to an event or emergency, five respondents indicated they were very confident while four indicated they were somewhat confident. One respondent indicated they were not very confident in their districts ability to respond to an event or emergency.

Six respondents reported being very confident in their schools ability to respond to an event or emergency with another four indicating they were somewhat confident. No respondent reported lacking any confidence in their schools to respond.

Finally, seven respondents indicated there were areas where they believed their district needed additional assistance. When asked to describe those areas two respondents mentioned training related to chemical spills while one cited training on possible disasters.

SURVEY CONCLUSIONS

All of the survey respondents indicated that they already require an emergency response plan to be in place, to be reviewed and to be regularly updated. Also, over eighty percent of the survey respondents indicated that they test their plans and that their plans cover potential incidents occurring both on and off campus and that in the development of their school plans they conducted a vulnerability analysis.

Additionally, all respondents reported requiring schools to have fire extinguishers on campus and someone on their facility or staff had some level of first aid training. Eighty percent of respondents reported having Automated Electronic Defibrillators on campus as well as having a full time nursing staff on some campuses. Eighty to ninety percent of those responding indicated having communication systems or tools in place to communicate with schools, faculty/staff or parents in an emergency.

These results clearly indicate that Catholic schools in Texas consider the safety of their students, faculty and staff to be of such importance that they currently commit the staff and resources necessary to plan for and respond to incidents that may threaten their campus.

One area for improvement based on the responses to the survey would be in the area of training as it relates to emergency planning and response. While ninety percent of the schools and seventy percent of the districts reported having personnel assigned to an emergency response team, only forty-five percent of the respondents reported any specific training requirements for those team members. Another potential disconnect between districts and schools is that while one hundred percent of those surveyed indicated that their individual schools were required to have an emergency response plan, only sixty percent of respondents reported having an emergency response plan at the district level.

This may explain the reason for the slightly lower confidence rating respondents exhibited as it relates to a districts ability to respond to an event versus the confidence of their individual schools to respond. Only fifty percent of the respondents reported being very confident in their schools ability to respond to an emergency.

It should be noted that these confidence levels do not automatically translate into a deficiency on behalf of either the district or their schools but could simply indicate a desire to improve in certain areas.

A “majority of Texas Catholic Schools” are insured by Catholic Mutual Insurance Association which performs an “annual safety and crisis response audit” of the schools they insure contributing another level of preparedness review to Catholic schools in Texas.²¹

Finally, the Texas Catholic Conference (TCC) Accreditation Commission requires schools to “have an emergency action plan in place” and that plan is required to be “reviewed as part of the school’s accreditation.”²² Also, the TCC Commission Compliance Checklist details the documentation that must be supplied as part of the accreditation process and that documentation includes, but is not limited to:

- Crisis Management Plan
- Fire/Safety Inspection Records
- Plan for Evacuation in Case of Emergency
- Fire/Tornado drill records²³

Based upon the results of the survey conducted for this professional report as well as the steps currently taken by the TCC Accreditation Commission it can be assumed that

²¹ J. Patterson (personal communication, April 25, 2014)

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

a healthy, honest desire to further develop, expand upon and grow the current efforts related to emergency planning and response in Texas Catholic schools already exists.

This professional report is written based on this assumption and will offer specific recommendations to develop, expand upon and grow those pre-existing efforts.

Chapter 3: State Comparison

The United States Department of Education published the *State Regulation of Private Schools* to, in part; demonstrate that while there are certain similarities in the way private schools are regulated, there are also a number of differences.²⁴ This publication was reviewed and the sections from each states summary relevant to this professional report were compiled by the report author into the tables that appear in this chapter. These findings will be discussed and certain elements will used as recommendations for Texas Catholic schools to consider in chapter four.

EMERGENCY PLANS

State	Requirement	State	Requirement
California	Earthquakes & school bus emergencies	Nevada	Must have a committee to develop a plan, includes committee make-up. Provides for annual review & update of plan.
Maine	Must have written emergency & safety procedures	New Hampshire	Must conform to ICS & NIMS. Must address listed hazards & others identified by the school.
Nebraska	Must have safety & security plan		

Table 3.1: School Emergency Plans

²⁴ U.S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement. *State Regulation of Private Schools*. Washington, DC, 2009. 1.

Five states have specific language requiring private schools to have some sort of emergency response plan (table 3.1). Those requirements range from simply requiring a plan, Maine and Nebraska, to specifying exactly what the plan should cover, such as the earthquakes required for California. Nevada requires schools to have a committee in place to develop their plan and New Hampshire goes even further and requires plans to conform to the Incident Command System (ICS) and the National Incident Management System (NIMS) which will both be discussed in greater detail in chapter four.

Table 3.2 shows the number of fire drills private schools are required to conduct. These drills are in addition to the specific requirements for other emergency drills which are listed in table 3.3.

Two states, Illinois and Wyoming, require that fire drills conducted by private schools either be conducted in conjunction with the local fire department or that the fire department at least be invited to observe the fire drill. This type of involvement with local responder agencies is another practice that will be included in chapter four.

The additional emergency drills that are included in table 3.3 cover a variety of topics. Several states require drills to be conducted related to a specific type of hazard. Iowa, Kansas and Wisconsin all require several tornado specific drills each year. This is prudent given that this particular type of weather emergency is common in those states.

Six states require drills on how to safely exit a building, Illinois requires one drill to be related specially to an active shooter scenario while Minnesota requires five lock-down drills annually.

Many of the practices cited in this chapter are consistent with the requirements of other public schools throughout the United States. The states of Mississippi and Minnesota have published extensive guides for public schools to use in developing emergency plans.

FIRE DRILLS

State	Requirement	State	Requirement
Alabama	Monthly	Nebraska	Monthly
Arkansas	Monthly	Nevada	At least 1 per month during school year
Delaware	At least one a month	New Jersey	At least two per month.
Illinois	At least 3 per term including 1 w/local fire dept.	New Mexico	At least 1 per wk during first 4 wks of school & then once a month thereafter
Iowa	Two per term	New York	12 per year. Provides for different types.
Kansas	1 per month	N. Carolina	1 drill per month during school session.
Maine	Periodic	Tennessee	2 per month
Minnesota	5 to 9 per school year.	Wisconsin	Monthly
Montana	At least four per year	Wyoming	1 per month. Local fire dept should be invited to observe & comment.

Table 3.2: Fire Drills

Likewise those same guides offer extensive information on the number and type drills or exercises the schools in those states should conduct. More important for the purposes of this report, these same requirements exist for Texas public schools.

EMERGENCY DRILLS

State	Requirement	State	Requirement
Alaska	Monthly drills, weather permitting, on how to safely exit a school building	Nevada	Not more than 3 drills can be related to chemical explosion, related emergencies and other disasters.
Arizona	Fire Marshall responsible for program on evacuating school buildings	Ohio	1 per month
Illinois	1 bus evacuation per term, 1 weather or shelter in place per term, encouraged to conduct 1 LE drill w/bomb, active shooter scenario, etc.	Oregon	1 per month on exiting the building & finding shelter in an earthquake.
Iowa	Two tornado drills per term	Pennsylvania	Must provide instruction on exiting the building. Drills must be held once per month. Must conduct two emergency evacuation drills from busses every year
Kansas	3 tornado drills per year	Rhode Island	Must provide drills for exiting the building. 15 per yr. Provides for various types.
Minnesota	5 lock-down drills per year	Vermont	Must conduct drills once a month on how to exit the building.
Montana	At least four per year based on hazards identified.	Wisconsin	Tornado & other hazards twice annually

Table 3.3: School Emergency Drills

The Texas School Safety Center at Texas State University has published the Texas Unified School Safety and Security Standards (Standards) that are designed to “assist school districts in developing and implementing a comprehensive emergency management program.”²⁵

Specifically, the Standards include recommendations for public schools to have a “multi-hazard emergency operations plan”²⁶ and an established “school safety and security committee.”²⁷

Additionally, the Standards recommend a “comprehensive multi-hazard exercise/drill program and schedule” and that school districts operate under the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and use the Incident Command System (ICS).

All of these recommendations will be explored further and developed with specific recommendations for Texas Catholic Schools in chapter four.

²⁵ “Emergency Management Tool Kit. Texas Unified School Safety and Security Standards,” Texas State University, Texas School Safety Center. <http://txssc.txstate.edu/tools/emergency-management-toolkit/safety-security-standards>. Accessed: 7 April 2014.

²⁶ Texas Education Code, Section 37.108.

²⁷ Texas Education Code, Section 37.109(a).

Chapter 4: Recommendations

INTRODUCTION

As previously noted in chapter two of this report, the responses from all of the Catholic schools surveyed indicates they already have an emergency response plan in place for their school (Table 2.2). Additionally, as was noted in chapter three, there are five states (Table 3.1) that require private schools to develop emergency response plans through statute. Finally, Texas law requires all public schools to have a multi-hazard emergency response plan in place.

However, plans by themselves will not necessarily make schools safer or even improve a schools ability to respond and recover from an incident. The individuals closest to the incident, those present when it occurs, must be able to respond based on the contents of the plan.

This chapter will make specific recommendations on the minimal content and the format for Texas Catholic schools to use in developing their emergency response plans. Also, this chapter will propose a suggested ‘curriculum’ for school personnel to obtain. To better assist schools with their planning efforts a suggested checklist has been developed and attached to this professional report as appendix two. This checklist includes recommendations for a planning process as identified by the Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Texas Department of Public Safety, Texas Division of Emergency Management.

The final recommendation will provide suggestions for the implementation of the planning and training processes proposed in this report that take into consideration the assumption that Texas Catholic schools have limited access to additional funding or personnel to implement any new programs. Additionally, serious consideration should be given to another simple way to increase the resources available to a school during an

incident. This can be accomplished by the application of the recommendations in this professional report to any parish co-located with a school. The addition of parish based planning and training activities will only enhance the school's capabilities. Likewise, the same consideration should be given at the Diocesan level. The familiarity with the planning and training outlined in this professional report will strengthen the ability of a Diocese to offer the leadership and coordination of response efforts following a large-scale or wide-spread incident.

PLANNING

A common quote cited by emergency managers is: It's not a question of if, it's a question of when. In this quote, 'if' is a reference to probability while 'when' is a reference to certainty. Put another way, emergency management professionals think in terms of: "It's not a question if something bad is going to happen. Something bad will happen and I just don't know how bad it will be, what it will be or when it will happen."

Regardless of where incidents occur, the public expects leaders to be able to respond quickly and efficiently.²⁸ Likewise, when incidents occur at schools parents expect teachers and administrators to respond the same way. Additionally, it has been shown that having emergency response plans in place "saves time in getting operations underway, facilitates integrated effort, and helps ensure essential activities are carried out efficiently."²⁹

²⁸ Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Guide for All-Hazard Emergency Operations Planning. State and Local Guide (SLG) 101*. September 1996. 1-2.

²⁹ Texas Department of Public Safety. Governor's Division of Emergency Management. *Local Emergency Management Planning Guide*. GDEM-10. Revision 4. January 2008. 2-1.

Since, as previously noted, schools already have emergency response plans in place this should be the easiest recommendation to implement. This particular recommendation will focus primarily on the planning process and format.

Planning Committee

The majority of the Catholic schools surveyed for this report (Table 2.3) indicated that schools are required to have an emergency response team. Catholic schools should ensure that the members of the emergency response team and the planning team are the same. This will help to create a sense of commitment to the process and also begin to further develop and instill within the school a culture of preparedness.

Knowing what to do when faced with a crisis can be the difference between calm and chaos, between courage and fear, between life and death.³⁰

There is not one, definitive list of who should serve on a Catholic school planning committee, but common school planning committee members consist of:

- Administrators
- Educators
- School psychologists
- Nurses
- Facilities managers
- Transportation managers
- Food personnel³¹

Others potential members for the planning committee to consider include those representing specific groups such as: parents, students, those with “access and functional

³⁰ U.S. Department of Education. Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools. *Practical Information on Crisis Planning: A Guide for Schools and Communities*, Washington, DC, 2003. Revised 2007. 1-2.

³¹ U.S. Department of Education. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Safe and Healthy Students. *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans*, Washington, DC, 2013. 6.

needs,” and representatives from local responder organizations.³² Catholic schools, especially those co-located with a parish, should consider having the pastor or other member of the parish staff/community serve on the planning committee.

Emergency Plan Elements

This section will discuss the ten specific elements recommended for the emergency plans developed by Catholic schools in Texas. This particular format is based on the template recommended by the Texas Department of Public Safety, Texas Division of Emergency Management. This template has been amended and is included in this professional report as appendix three.

These recommendations are not intended to be “a cookbook approach” to the development of a schools plan.³³ However, the specific reasoning for the standardization among plans will be discussed later in this professional report.

Authority

This element may also be referred to as the “Promulgation Document” and will generally appear at the beginning of a plan. The Authority Section contains the “legal basis” for the development and implementation of the plan.³⁴

For Catholic schools the references in this section of the plan could come from one or more of the following:

- A school charter
- By-laws
- Diocesan or parish direction
- Accreditation requirements

³² Ibid.

³³ *Practical Information on Crisis Planning: A Guide for Schools and Communities. 1-3.*

³⁴ *Guide for All-Hazard Emergency Operations Planning. State and Local Guide (SLG) 101. 4-1.*

Purpose

The Purpose Section of the plan is a “general statement” outlining what the plan “is meant to do.”³⁵ For example, this section may indicate if the plan is intended to cover incidents that occur both on and off campus. Additionally, this section should provide a “brief synopsis” of the plan.³⁶

Other information that can be included in the Purpose Section may be: 1) who the plan applies to; 2) who is responsible for certain actions, 3) how responsible parties are to carry out their functions; and 4) additional or hazard specific plans or procedures that may supplement this plan.

An example of a school’s Purpose Section may include the following language:

“The purpose of the *Name of School* emergency response and preparedness plan is to help ensure that faculty and staff are able to quickly and efficiently respond to any hazard that may impact the school or its students. This plan is intended to covers actions that could occur throughout the campus including all school academic buildings, athletic facilities and school grounds.

The principal of *Name of School*, or his/her designee, is primarily responsible for the implementation of this plan.

This plan applies to: 1) all faculty and staff regardless of employment status, i.e., permanent or temporary, 2) all students, 3) staff of *Name of Parish* who provide any category of service or support to *Name of School*, including clergy and religious, and 4) any personnel who provide volunteer services to *Name of School*, i.e., parents for a period of more than four consecutive hours in any one day.

NOTE: In some circumstances, volunteers providing services for less than four consecutive hours may be subject to this plan and any annexes depending on the service provided. For example, parents serving as school crossing guards or morning drop off/afternoon pick-up traffic control.

The persons responsible for the implementation of this plan as identified by the principal are required to perform their duties as identified in the plan utilizing the Incident Command System (ICS). Additionally, persons responsible for this plan are required to be familiar with all associated school safety and security procedures as well as all hazard specific annexes referenced in this plan.”

³⁵ *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans*. 24.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

Explanation of Terms

In this section any acronyms used in the plan should be identified and listed and any terms specific to an individual school should be defined. In developing this section it is usually beneficial to have someone who is not intimately familiar with the school or its operation review the plan. If there are acronyms or terms the individual is unfamiliar with, that is a key indicator that those acronyms/terms should be included and defined in this section.

Situation and Assumptions

These two headings will require some thoughtful work by the planning team. The Situation Section should describe the “planning environment” of the school factually.³⁷ This could include a physical description of the campus and its facilities, enrollment, the size of faculty and staff as well as a description of the school’s surroundings, i.e., a rural verses an urban setting.

It is particularly important that this section contain a list of the specific hazards the school may be subject to as well as the potential impact from those hazards.³⁸ Much of this information may be a “matter of judgment” by the planning team but it is important to go through this process to ensure the school is planning for the appropriate hazards.³⁹

Assumptions are the planners “best guess” of what the environment will look like in the event the emergency response plan is implemented. Since no plan is perfect, assumptions “show the limitations” of the plan and also notify those who use the plan that “improvisation or modification may become necessary” in responding to an event.⁴⁰

³⁷ *State and Local Guide (SLG) 101*. 4-2.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

Concept of Operations

In this section the planning team should begin to develop the “overall picture” of what the schools response efforts will look like.⁴¹ This section will include the “sequence and scope of the planned emergency response.”⁴²

Sub-categories of this section may include: Objectives, Operational Guidance and Outside Assistance. Objectives should always place an emphasis on protecting lives and property.⁴³ Additionally, this sub-category can also describe how the plan will be implemented and used “before, during, and after” and incident.⁴⁴

The Operational Guidance sub-category should briefly describe the overall emergency management program for the school. Also, this sub-category should include a description of some of the steps taken to mitigate hazards cited earlier in the plan, identify the specific school departments or positions responsible for implementing the plan and confirm that personnel are familiar with and have been trained to carry out the plan.

Finally, under Outside Assistance the plan should refer to the other agencies or departments that may play a part in responding to the plan.⁴⁵ For Catholic schools those could include:

- First responder organizations (fire, law enforcement, EMS)
- The parish, if one is associated with the school
- Other Catholic schools
- Diocesan personnel/resources

⁴¹ *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans.* 25.

⁴² *State and Local Guide (SLG) 101.* 4-2.

⁴³ *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans.* 25.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 2.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 25

Organization and Assignment of Responsibilities

The Organization Section should include a brief description of the organization of the school during normal operations but the majority of this section should discuss how the response to an incident will be organized.⁴⁶ For example, the principal of the school may not necessarily be the incident commander during an event. This needs to be determined beforehand and included in the plan.

The planning team should also give some consideration to how they envision the organization of the school changing during an incident and identify that structure in this section. During an incident, facilities staff may be assigned to work with first responders while members of the parent's organizations may work with teachers on student related issues.

The Assignment of Responsibilities section should be a brief description of the specific "tasks to be performed" by the different groups identified under the Organization section. For example, if teachers are charged in general with the care of students during an incident, a parent's organization could be assigned to assist by obtaining needed comfort items such as water.⁴⁷

Some examples of specific assignments to include and define in this section are, but are not limited to:

- Incident Command
- Student/Staff accountability and safety
- Incident Response
- Incident Recovery
- Public Information and Communications
- Liaison with other organizations and responders

⁴⁶ *State and Local Guide (SLG) 101.* 4-4.

⁴⁷ *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans.* 26.

Direction and Control

This section of the plan will describe who will be responsible for ensuring the actions taken during an incident are consistent with the plan as well as who and how the response will be carried out.⁴⁸ Additionally, this section should identify:

- The incident command post, that is, where the management of the incident will occur. This may be on campus or depending on the event off-site such as an office at the parish or other nearby facility. It is a prudent practice to have several locations pre-identified
- Who is authorized to activate the emergency response plan along with a list of successor at least three persons deep; and,
- Lines of succession for key positions. Once again, it is preferably that these lists are a minimum of three persons deep.⁴⁹

Readiness Levels

This section should include a list of the different levels of readiness or preparedness the school will take based on conditions that may have a possibility of occurring. These levels could represent a natural progression of events such as an approaching weather event or they could be a sudden, unanticipated event such as a fire. This section should also include a brief summary of the actions that may be taken at the various levels. These levels and associated actions may include:

- Normal conditions. There are no planned or anticipated activities or events on the horizon and the school is operating under normal conditions.
- Increased Awareness. At this level nothing has occurred yet but there is some indication that an event could be pending. This would most commonly be a weather related watch issued by the National Weather Service. At this level, specific actions may not be taken but plans may be reviewed and necessary response equipment, supplies or personnel may be put on notice.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Texas Department of Public Safety. Texas Division of Emergency Management. *Basic Plan. Sample Plan.* v2.0. 05/2005. 24.

- High Awareness. This level indicates that the possibility of an incident occurring, maybe one previously identified in the Increased Awareness level, has been deemed more likely to occur. For example, the National Weather Service may have moved from a watch to a warning. At this level, certain actions in the emergency response plan may be activated.
- Activation. An event has occurred and the plan has been activated and the incident response is occurring.⁵⁰

Administration and Support

This section should include a broad description of the needs a school may have during the activation of its emergency response plan and the way that the official records of the response will be kept and maintained.⁵¹ This section should take into consideration the various needs that may arise following the specific hazards previously identified by the school.⁵²

Specific examples of the type of information that may be included in this section include:

- A listing of any mutual aid agreements the school has entered into with other entities.
- School policies or procedures on the acquisition of property or general purchasing policies and how those policies are/are not amended during an incident.
- Expectations of school personnel during an incident.⁵³
- Any contracts or vendors that have been identified as being a potential resource in responding to an incident.
- Training requirements for school personnel.
- Actions to be taken after an incident to review the response to the incident and correct any noted deficiencies.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Ibid. 31.

⁵¹ *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans.* 27.

⁵² *State and Local Guide (SLG) 101.* 4-15.

⁵³ Ibid. 4-16.

⁵⁴ *Basic Plan. Sample Plan.* v2.0. 05/2005. 33.

Plan Development and Maintenance

This section should identify, by position title, who is responsible to ensure the plan is regularly updated and maintained.⁵⁵ It should provide for a specific time⁵⁶ when the plan should be reviewed, i.e., annually. Additionally, this section should recognize that intermittent updates to the plan may be made due to requirements from external sources (Diocesan directives, etc.); insights gained following exercises of the plan, significant staff or facility changes or an activation of the plan in response to an incident.

Attachments

Attachments to the plan include those items that will be beneficial to users responsible for the implementation of the plan and these attachments may include:

- Staff/Parish/Diocesan contact lists,
- Maps of the facility,
- A list of individuals who should receive the plan; or,
- Guidance or plans specific to a particular incident. For example, specific guidance to take when an incident occurs off campus versus on campus.⁵⁷

TRAINING

As mentioned in the Introduction to this chapter, plans by themselves will not ensure the safety of students and school personnel. Personnel need to be trained on how to effectively prepare for and respond to an incident. The training requirements as indicated by the survey results in chapter two appear to vary significantly among Catholic schools in Texas. As it relates to fundamental safety actions (table 2.1) a majority of

⁵⁵ *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans*. 28.

⁵⁶ *Basic Plan. Sample Plan*. v2.0. 05/2005. 36.

⁵⁷ *Basic Plan. Sample Plan*. v2.0. 05/2005. 37.

respondents require training on the use of AEDs and in first aid. Respondents were evenly split between requiring and not requiring training on the use of fire extinguishers.

Only five respondents reported requiring personnel to receive any training in emergency planning (table 2.3). Additionally, only five respondents indicated that any training was required for personnel who would respond to an incident (table 2.5). The training that was required appeared to vary greatly from one Diocese to another.

Finally, only one Diocese reported a requirement for personnel to use the Incident Command System (ICS) in their planning or response efforts. The following sections in this chapter will introduce the Incident Command System and suggest training that should be taken by all personnel with an identified role or responsibility in the planning for or response to a school based incident.

Appendix five contains a recommended curriculum for schools and personnel. The curriculum is broadly categorized by role or responsibility. This is intended to allow personnel responsible for planning activities to focus on that area while other personnel focus on overall response or position specific training. The categories, the targeted skills and abilities for each, are:

- Planning – Intended to provide a broad overview of the emergency planning process and concepts. Includes planning considerations specific to schools and entities serving children.
- Incident Command System (ICS) – Provides instruction on ICS as it relates specifically to schools and broader incidents. Intended to help school personnel more effectively respond to an incident as well as better integrate with local first responders.
- Communications – This is a key area that should be given close attention at both the school and Diocesan level. Personnel who will serve as Public Information Officers (PIO's) should be familiar with the plan and ICS. This will help ensure that if an incident occurs the schools message will get out and be better integrated with first responder PIO's.

- Exercises – Provides information on the development and execution of a school based exercise. Once plans have been developed and staff has been trained in ICS exercises should be conducted. Exercises not only help further train personnel in the proper execution of the plan they also strengthen the plan by identifying any unintentional planning gaps.
- Hazard Specific – These courses provide further information on specific hazards and will be beneficial if a particular hazard has been identified for a school.
- Special Event – This training will provide information that may be beneficial for school personnel or volunteers involved with special events or other extra-curricular activities at school.
- Preparedness – This training is beneficial to the broadest range of personnel including: school faculty and staff, parents and students, as well as parish staff, if applicable.

In general, it is recommended that the training be taken in the order listed above. Appendix five includes a suggested order for the specific courses in a category to be taken along with the target audience. It should be noted that different segments of the school community can be taking training in different categories, at different times, based on their particular role or responsibility. For example, members of the planning team will begin with the planning specific training while other school personnel will be focused on the ICS training. Contemporaneously, school families can be encouraged to take the general preparedness related training.

Incident Command System (ICS)

As a result of a number of wildfires in California in the 1970s the Incident Command System (ICS) was created.⁵⁸ A review of the fires indicated that the issues with the response to the fires weren't due to a lack of resources or personnel but a lack of

⁵⁸ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *ICS-100: Introduction to ICS for Schools. Instructor Guide*. September 2007. Revised 2009. 2-8.

proper management.⁵⁹ The United States Congress instructed the U.S. Forest Service to develop a system to improve the response to large, multi-jurisdictional incidents and that system ultimately evolved to the Incident Command System.⁶⁰

ICS is a widely applicable management system designed to enable effective, efficient incident management by integrating a combination of facilities, equipment, personnel, procedures, and communications operating within a common organizational structure.⁶¹

ICS consists of fourteen management characteristics that make it suitable for use by governmental jurisdictions at all levels as well as “by many NGOs and the private sector.”⁶² The fourteen management characteristics of ICS include:

- The use of a common terminology. Plain English is used by responders to an incident.
- Modular organization. The organizational structure to a response can be specific to the type or size of the incident.
- Management by objective. Objectives for an incident are developed along with the strategies and tactics needed to achieve the objectives.
- Incident Action Planning. A plan is developed for each incident that coordinates the response effort.
- Manageable span of control. ICS recommends that supervisors manage between 3-7 individuals with 5 individuals being optimal.
- Incident facilities and locations. ICS standardizes the types of facilities used in an incident response with the preferred location of each.
- Comprehensive resource management. Allows for resources, both equipment and personnel, to be categorized according to common terms.
- Integrated communications. Requires a communications plan to be developed and interoperable systems to be in place.
- Establishment and transfer of command. Provides for the initial command assignment and the provision for that command to be transferred to another.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid. 2-10.

⁶¹ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *National Incident Management System*. December 2008. 45.

⁶² Ibid. 46.

- Chain of command and unity of command. Provides for clear lines of authority and reporting structure.
- Unified command. Provides for a command structure when various jurisdictional, legal or geographic entities are responding to the same incident.
- Accountability. Provides for accountability at both the individual and jurisdictional level.
- Dispatch/Deployment. Ensures personnel and equipment is only sent where it's needed and when it's requested.
- Information and intelligence management. Provides for obtaining the information needed to respond to the incident.⁶³

School Specific Training

There are a number of resources, many available at no cost on-line, to Texas Catholic school personnel on a wide variety of emergency planning and response topics.

IS-100.SCA: Introduction to the Incident Command System for Schools is an on-line course that is intended to introduce school personnel to ICS and prepare school personnel to interact with first responder during an incident.⁶⁴ Additionally, the course is designed to assist schools in interacting with other agencies or entities.⁶⁵ The course also includes a downloadable job-aid as well as a self-assessment tool for the user to take to assess the preparedness level of their school.⁶⁶

Other training that would be beneficial in the use and integration of ICS into the schools structure would be:

⁶³ Ibid. 46-49.

⁶⁴ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-100.SCA: Introduction to the Incident Command System for Schools*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-100.SCa> Accessed: 29 March 2014.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

- IS-200.B: ICS for Single Resources and Initial Action Incidents. This on-line course is designed to help the student “operate efficiently during an incident or event within the Incident Command System (ICS).”⁶⁷
- IS-201: Forms Used for the Development of the Incident Action Plan. This course will introduce the student to the development of an Incident Action Plan (IAP), the planning document used in the response to an incident.⁶⁸
- IS-700.A: National Incident Management System (NIMS) An Introduction. This course provides information on NIMS as the intended template to respond to all incidents by organizations at all levels.⁶⁹

The following four courses would be beneficial to personnel serving as members of the schools planning team:

- IS-235.B: Emergency Planning. Although this course is not specifically designed for schools it offers a good foundation in the overall emergency planning process and general concepts.⁷⁰
- IS-360: Preparing for Mass Casualty Incidents: A Guide for Schools, Higher Education, and Houses of Worship. This course is designed for schools and houses of worship which makes it especially relevant to Texas Catholic schools.⁷¹
- IS-362.A: Multi-Hazard Emergency Planning for Schools. This school specific course addresses issues focused on school emergency response plans involving a wide range of hazards.⁷²

⁶⁷ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-200.B: ICS for Single Resources and Initial Action Incidents*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-200.b>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

⁶⁸ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-201: Forms Used for the Development of the Incident Action Plan*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-201>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

⁶⁹ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-700.A: National Incident Management System (NIMS) An Introduction*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-700.a>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

⁷⁰ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-235.B: Emergency Planning*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-235.b>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

⁷¹ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-360: Preparing for Mass Casualty Incidents: A Guide for Schools, Higher Education, and Houses of Worship*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-360>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

⁷² U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-362.A: Multi-Hazard Emergency Planning for Schools*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-362.a>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

- IS-366: Planning for the Needs of Children in Disasters. This course is not necessarily school specific but it covers the specific needs of children in a disaster and may provide helpful insights to the planning team.⁷³

As the planning team becomes more familiar and comfortable with their planning responsibilities overall, the following courses will provide hazard specific information that may be useful in the development of the elements of the schools plan if any of these hazards have been determined to be a specific risk to the school. While these courses are not designed specifically for schools, they will provide a good overview of the individual hazard identified. Courses IS-319 through IS-323 are designed for FEMA mitigation staff while courses IS-325, IS-906 and IS-907 are all designed for general audiences. Unless otherwise indicated all of the courses listed below are available on the FEMA Independent Study website.

- IS-319: Tornado Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff.
- IS-320: Wildfire Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff.
- IS-321: Hurricane Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff.
- IS-322: Flood Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff.
- IS-323: Earthquake Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff.
- IS-324.A: Community Hurricane Preparedness. NOTE: This course may be accessed through the FEMA Independent Study program but it is offered by Cooperative Program for Operational Meteorology, Education, and Training (COMET) and a separate registration is required.⁷⁴
- IS-325: Earthquake Basics: Science, Risk, and Mitigation.
- IS-906: Workplace Security Awareness.
- IS-907: Active Shooter: What You Can Do.

⁷³ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-366: Planning for the Needs of Children in Disasters*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-366>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

⁷⁴ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-324.A: Community Hurricane Preparedness*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-324.a>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

In order to be able to respond to an incident, responders need to be prepared personally. The following two courses would be beneficial not only for school personnel but for students and their families as well:

- IS-22: *Are You Ready? An In-depth Guide to Citizen Preparedness.*⁷⁵
- IS-909: *Community Preparedness: Implementing Simple Activities for Everyone.*⁷⁶

Communications is always a critical part of any effective response action and FEMA offers the following two courses on their Independent Study site which provide a broad overview of the functions of a Public Information Officer (PIO) during an incident. As Catholic schools obtain the personnel and resources necessary they should consider additional training in this area.

- IS-29: Public Information Officer Awareness.
- IS-42: Social Media in Emergency Management.

Since the exercise of emergency response plans is critical in order to determine not only that a plan is accurate but also that personnel are familiar with the plan, the following three courses are available on the FEMA Independent Study site. These three courses provide an overview of exercises and their design and just as with communications this is another area Catholic schools should consider growing over time.

- IS-120.A: An Introduction to Exercises.
- IS-130: Exercise Evaluation and Improvement Planning.
- IS-139: Exercise Design.

⁷⁵ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-22: Are You Ready? An In-depth Guide to Citizen Preparedness.* <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-22>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

⁷⁶ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-909: Community Preparedness: Implementing Simple Activities for Everyone.* <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-909>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

The following two courses from the FEMA Independent Study site, although not directed to schools, provide information that can be extrapolated and applied to school based events:

- IS-15.B: Special Events Contingency Planning for Public Safety Agencies. Although this course is directed towards public safety agencies schools can use the information contained in this course for developing elements of their plans specific to school sporting events or other off campus activities.⁷⁷
- IS-36: Multihazard Planning for Childcare. While this course is intended for childcare providers it contains some information schools may find helpful in their planning efforts.⁷⁸

Finally, all FEMA Independent Study courses conclude with an on-line exam of the material covered in the course. Upon successful completion of the exam, the student is e-mailed a certificate of completion. This certificate could be an additional source of documentation to be used or reviewed in the accreditation process for Texas Catholic schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As stated in the introduction to this chapter, it is assumed that Texas Catholic schools do not have the funding or personnel available to devote additional full time efforts to emergency planning and response. As was also noted in chapter two of this professional report it is also assumed that in spite of this deficiency in funding and

⁷⁷ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-15.B: Special Events Contingency Planning for Public Safety Agencies*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-15.b>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

⁷⁸ U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Emergency Management Institute. *IS-36: Multihazard Planning for Childcare*. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/courseOverview.aspx?code=IS-36>. Accessed: 29 March 2014.

personnel Texas Catholic schools still place a high value on having response plans and personnel in place to provide for the safety of students and personnel.

This professional report has advocated for all schools within a Diocese to have emergency plans in place that follow a standard template. Appendix 1 of this report provides a suggested template. While the content of each plan should be unique to each individual school by following a standard format, personnel from another school should be able to quickly review and understand the information specific to the other schools response.

Likewise, by having personnel in all the schools in a Diocese take the same training they will be familiar with the concepts and organizational structure, such as ICS, that first responder organizations throughout the state will use in responding to an event at a school.

In the beginning of this chapter there was a discussion of a planning committee whose members also serve as a schools emergency response team. Assume that there were a total of five members on this committee including a mixture of school personnel, parish staff and parents. This would be the group primarily charged with the management of an incident at the school. Additionally, assume that the routine planning and response activities only account for a limited percentage of each members time. In the event of a particularly large or pro-longed incident those five individuals would become overwhelmed in a relatively short period of time.

However, if personnel from nearby schools in the Diocese had plans that followed similar formats and were trained in a common operating process they could inject themselves in the response at the affected school. This would not only relieve overworked/overwhelmed staff members responding to an incident but also likely aid in speeding up the recovery from the incident.

In total, the benefits from the standardization of planning and training efforts for Catholic school personnel in Texas include, but are not limited to:

1. The integration of school to school personnel and resources within a Diocese in the event of an incident. If an incident occurred at one school in the Diocese then assistance could be provided to the impacted school by other schools who would share in the assistance equally or to their best ability.

2. The ability of personnel from another Diocese in Texas to assist elsewhere in Texas if a large scale incident occurred that impacted multiple schools in a Diocese. That is, if the event were so large that schools within a Diocese were not able to share response personnel or equipment between themselves, the school personnel from around the State could assist since they would have had similar training and planning guidance; and,

3. The greater integration of school personnel with first responders through the use of the Incident Command System.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Unfortunately, issues of school violence continue to make headline news. Schools must be prepared to address these issues as well as the multitude of issues that all schools are susceptible to just like the rest of society. Those issues include a wide variety of both man-made and natural events.

While public schools in Texas have specific emergency planning and response efforts that are required by statute, private and parochial schools have no similar statutory requirements.

In spite of this legal requirement, Texas Catholic schools, as evidenced by the survey results in this report and other requirements of the Texas Catholic Conference Accreditation Commission, have a commitment to the safety of their students and staff.

This professional report has analyzed the responses from Diocesan representatives around the state of Texas and determined that all of those responding already have an emergency plan in place and the majority also have personnel identified to serve on response teams in the event of an incident.

Approximately half of the respondents require training of these team members but the training varies by Diocese.

This professional report has recommended a degree of standardization for both emergency response plans as well as the training received by emergency team members. The basis for this recommendation is not to create some sort of 'one size fits all' program. Instead, the recommendation is to allow schools that are often times already operating on limited budgets with barely enough staff available to carry out their educational activities to call on one another, if needed, for assistance during an incident.

By having personnel at the schools throughout a Diocese familiar with a generalized format of a plan and trained to respond to an emergency using the Incident Command System, personnel from schools throughout the Diocese can assist one another should any one school become overwhelmed. Through common planning efforts personnel should be able to quickly become familiar with another schools plan. Additionally, with ICS training school personnel should be able to quickly integrate themselves in the schools response effort and interact more effectively with first responders.

FOR FURTHER STUDY

This professional report has focused primarily on the emergency planning and response efforts for individual schools and a Diocese as a whole. To a lesser extent it has discussed potential benefits that could be achieved Diocese to Diocese.

Specific areas of further study that would be of use to Catholic schools include:

1. Ways to quickly and efficiently integrate personnel and resources between Dioceses in the event any one Diocese experienced an overwhelming event. This study would include the logistical issues of both moving and maintaining the personnel and resources assisting the affected Diocese.

2. The strengthening of personal preparedness efforts of Diocesan staff, school staff and school families. The improved ability of all three of these groups to withstand and recover from an incident will have a direct impact on a schools ability to respond and recover.

3. The development and implementation of a series of on-going, progressively difficult exercises intended to stress school and Diocesan plans and capabilities. Examples of the exercise scenarios that could be implemented include:

A. A series of school based exercises designed to progressively stress the schools ability to respond to the event. The final exercise should focus on a request from the school to the Diocese for assistance from other Diocese schools and the Diocese's ability to communicate and coordinate that assistance.

B. A series of exercises that simulate incidents occurring at multiple schools in a single Diocese with an emphasis on the Diocese's ability to respond to multiple requests for assistance and coordinate that assistance from the remaining schools in the Diocese.

C. A catastrophic incident in a Diocese that quickly overwhelms the resources in the Diocese and requires a request to all Texas Diocese for assistance.

4. The development and implementation of Continuity of Operations (COOP) plans for Catholic schools following an incident that results in a significant impact to a schools ability to deliver its essential services, a Catholic education.

Appendix

APPENDIX 1 – SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Emergency Planning & Response in Catholic Schools in Texas

Q1 Total number of elementary schools in your district:

Q2 Total student enrollment in elementary schools for the most recently completed school year:

_____ Enrollment

_____ Year

Q3 Total number of middle schools/junior high schools in you district:

Q4 Total student enrollment in middle schools/junior high schools for the most recently completed school year:

_____ Enrollment

_____ Year

Q5 Total number of high schools in your district:

Q6 Total student enrollment in high schools for the most recently completed school year:

_____ Enrollment

_____ Year

Q7 Does your district require schools to have Automatic Electronic Defibrillators (AEDs) on each campus?

Yes

No

Q7a If yes, does your district require training on the use of AEDs?

Yes

No

Q7b Who is required to be trained on the use of AED's? Select all that apply:

Faculty

Staff

Students

Parents

Others

Q8 Does your district require schools to have fire extinguishers on each campus?

- Yes
- No

Q8a If yes, does your district require training on the use of fire extinguishers?

- Yes
- No

Q8b Who is required to be trained on the use of extinguishers? Select all that apply:

- Faculty
- Staff
- Students
- Parents
- Others

Q9 Does your district require any faculty or staff to receive any level of first aid training?

- Yes
- No

Q10 Do any of your schools have full time nursing staff available on campus?

- Yes
- No

Q10a If yes, please identify the type of school and the number of schools of each type that have full time nursing staff available on campus:

_____ Elementary
_____ Middle school/Junior High
_____ High School

Q11 Does your district require each school to have an emergency response plan?

- Yes
- No

Q11a <P>If yes, does your district require the independent review of school emergency response plans?

- By school district personnel
- By other independent party
- Other

Q12 Are schools required to review/update their emergency response plans?

- Yes
- No

Q12a If yes, how often?

- Annually
- Every two years
- Every three years
- Other

Q12b Please describe how plans are tracked to ensure they are updated timely.

Q13 Are schools required to exercise or otherwise test their emergency response plans?

- Yes
- No

Q14 Are you aware of any incidents where a school has had to implement all or part its emergency response plan?

- Yes
- No

Q14a If yes, please describe:

Q15 Are school emergency response plans required to address potential issues both on campus as well as events off campus, i.e., field trips, off-site sporting events, etc.?

- Yes
- No

Q16 Does your district require each school to have an emergency response team?

- Yes
- No

Q17 Does your district require training of any personnel in emergency planning?

- Yes
- No

Q17a If yes, please list the personnel, BY POSITION ONLY, required to receive training in emergency planning.

Q17b Please list or describe the training in emergency planning referenced in the above question.

Q18 Does your district, as a whole, have an emergency response plan?

- Yes
- No

Q19 Does your district, as a whole, identify the potential hazards that could impact schools in your district?

- Yes
- No

Q20 Does your district require individual schools to identify the hazards specific to each school?

- Yes
- No

Q21 Does your district have personnel identified as an emergency response team?

- Yes
- No

Q22 If yes, are those individuals required to attend or obtain any training specific to their emergency response roles?

- Yes
- No

Q22a If yes, please describe the training:

Q23 Does your district require individual schools to have personnel identified as an emergency response team?

- Yes
- No

Q23a If yes, are those individuals required to attend any training specific to their emergency response roles?

- Yes
- No

Q23b If yes, please describe the training:

Q24 Does your district have a system to communicate with school personnel in the event of an emergency?

- Yes
- No

Q24a If yes, please explain:

Q25 Does your district require the schools in your district to have a system to communicate with faculty/staff in the event of an emergency?

Yes

No

Q25a If yes, please explain:

Q26 Does your district require the schools in you district to have a system to communicate with parents in the event of an emergency?

Yes

No

Q26a If yes, please explain:

Q27 Does your district require the use of the Incident Command System (ICS) in the planning and response to emergencies?

Yes

No

Q28 How confident are you in the ability of your district to respond to an event (natural or man-made) or other emergency?

Very

Somewhat

Not very much

Not at all

Q29 How confident are you in the ability of your schools in your district, as a whole, to respond to an event (natural or man-made) or other emergency?

Very

Somewhat

Not very much

Not at all

Q30 Are there specific areas you believe your district needs additional assistance as it relates to emergency planning and response capabilities?

- Yes
- No

Q30a If yes, please explain.

Q31 Enter the name of your Diocese/Archdiocese:

Q32 Thank you for taking part in this survey.

APPENDIX 2 – PLANNING CHECKLIST

Planning Checklist

1. Planning Team
 - Administrative Head Creates Planning Team
 - Team Members Appointed. Members Include:
 - Cross-section of school/parish representative
 - External representatives
 - Members Take Appropriate Training
 - Members Confirm Roles & Responsibilities
 - Members Develop Planning Team Schedule
 - Identify Dates For Key Deliverables
2. Conduct Research
 - Governing Documents Obtained and Reviewed
 - External Documents Obtained and Reviewed
 - Threats & Hazards Identified & Analyzed
 - Internal & External Resources Identified
3. Plan Development
 - Review & Discuss Planning Template
 - Assign Individual Sections, As Appropriate
 - Develop Sections With Team, As Appropriate
 - Draft Plan
 - Revise Plan
 - Finalize Plan
 - Obtain Plan Approval
4. Implement Plan
 - Distribute Plan
 - Internal/External Stakeholders
 - Exercise Plan
 - Revise Plan, If Needed
 - Train Stakeholders
 - On Plan
 - On Roles/Positions
 - On Hazards
5. Maintain Plan
 - Conduct Annual Plan Review
 - Make Revisions
 - Based on School Changes
 - Based on Changes to Hazards & Threats
 - Based on Actual Emergencies
 - Based on Exercises/Drills

EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

Insert School Name

***INSERT A GRAPHIC SUCH
AS A PHOTO OF THE SCHOOL
SCHOOL MASCOT, ETC.***

***THIS TEMPLATE IS PROVIDED AS AN EXAMPLE. IF
USED THE BOLD, ITALICIZED LANGUAGE IS INTENDED
TO BE EXPLANATORY ONLY AND SHOULD BE DELETED
FROM THE FINAL PLAN. THIS TEMPLATE IS BASED ON
THE TEMPLATE PROVIDED BY THE TEXAS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY TEXAS DIVISION OF
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, BASIC PLAN SAMPLE.***

RECORD OF CHANGES

SECTION	DATE OF CHANGE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGED BY

EACH TIME THE PLAN IS UPDATED COMPLETE THIS RECORD OF CHANGES. THE CHANGES MAY BE MADE ANNUALLY AFTER A REGULARLY SCHEDULED REVIEW, FOLLOWING ANY INCIDENT THAT REQUIRES THE ACTIVATION AND USE OF THE PLAN OR AS INDIVIDUAL CHANGES OCCUR, I.E., PERSONNEL CHANGES. ADD ROWS TO THE TABLE AS NEEDED.

APPROVAL & IMPLEMENTATION

Insert Name of School

Emergency Response Plan

This emergency response plan is hereby approved. This plan is effective immediately and supersedes all previous versions.

Insert Printed Name, Principal

Date

Insert Printed Name, Pastor

Date

Insert Printed Name, Superintendent

Date

THIS IS THE APPROVAL PAGE AND THE SIGNATURES ON THIS PAGE DEMONSTRATE THAT THIS PLAN HAS BEEN APPROVED AND SHOULD BE REFERRED TO AND USED AS NEEDED. THE EXACT SIGNATURES ON THIS PAGE WILL DEPEND ON THE INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL. FOR EXAMPLE, THOSE NOT DIRECTLY ASSOCIATED WITH A PARISH WOULD NOT NEED TO HAVE A PASTOR SIGN-OFF ON THE PLAN. THE REQUIREMENT TO HAVE THE SUPERINTENDENT SIGN-OFF ON THE PLAN IS ALSO AN ITEM FOR EACH DIOCESE TO DECIDE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NAME OF SCHOOL EMERGENCY PLAN

RECORD OF CHANGES.....
 DESCRIPTION

I. AUTHORITY

II. PURPOSE

III. EXPLANATION OF TERMS.....
 A. Acronyms

 B. Definitions.....

IV. SITUATION AND ASSUMPTIONS.....
 A. Situation

 B. Assumptions.....

V. CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS.....
 A. Objectives.....

 B. Operational Guidance.....

 C. Outside Assistance.....

VI. ORGANIZATION AND ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES.....
 A. Organization

 B. Assignment of Responsibilities

VII. DIRECTION AND CONTROL.....
 A. General.....

 B. Emergency Facilities.....

 C. Line of Succession.....

VIII. READINESS LEVELS

IX. ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

X. PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE

ATTACHMENTS

NAME OF SCHOOL EMERGENCY PLAN

I. AUTHORITY

LIST THE DOCUMENTS OR OTHER GUIDANCE THAT PROVIDE THE BASIS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLAN.

II. PURPOSE

PROVIDE A 'GENERAL STATEMENT' OF WHAT THE PLAN IS INTENDED TO DO.

III. EXPLANATION OF TERMS

A. Acronyms

LIST AND EXPLAIN ANY ACRONYMS USED REGULARLY BY THE SCHOOL IN THIS SECTION. FOR EXAMPLE:

JPC **JOHN PAUL II CAFETERIA**

B. Definitions

DEFINE ANY TERMS, ESPECIALLY THOSE TERMS THAT MAY ONLY BE KNOWN BY THOSE FAMILIAR WITH YOUR SCHOOL, HERE. FOR EXAMPLE:

EAGLES NEST **THE SCHOOL GYMNASIUM**

IV. SITUATION AND ASSUMPTIONS

A. Situation

SHOULD BE A FACTUAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOL AND ITS ENVIRONMENT AS WELL AS THE HAZARDS THE SCHOOL IS SUBJECT TO. A LISTING OF THE MOST COMMON HAZARDS A SCHOOL MAY BE SUBJECT TO ARE LISTED IN THE TABLE BELOW. DELETE HAZARDS THAT MAY NOT POTENTIALLY IMPACT YOUR SCHOOL WHILE ADDING ANY THAT MAY NOT BE LISTED.

HAZARD SUMMARY

Hazard Type:	Likelihood of Occurrence*	Estimated Impact on Public Health & Safety**	Estimated Impact on Property**
	(See below)	(See below)	(See below)
<i>Natural</i>			
Drought			
Extreme Heat			
Earthquake			
Flash Flooding			
Flooding (river or tidal)			
Lightning			
Hurricane			
Severe wind			
Tornado			
Wildfire			
Winter Storm			
Landslides or mudslides			
<i>Technological</i>			
Dam Failure			
Cyber			
Energy/Fuel Shortage			
Hazmat/Oil Spill (fixed site)			
Hazmat/Oil Spill (transport)			
Explosions or releases from industrial plants			
Major Structural Fire			
Nuclear Facility Incident			
Water System Failure			
Power System Failure			
<i>Security</i>			
Civil Disorder			
Enemy Military Attack			
Terrorism			
* Likelihood of Occurrence: Unlikely, Occasional, Likely, or Highly Likely			
* ESTIMATED IMPACT: LIMITED, MODERATE, MAJOR, CATASTROPHIC			

B. Assumptions

LIST THE SPECIFIC ASSUMPTIONS USED BY THE PLANNING TEAM IN THE WRITING OF THE PLAN.

V. CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS

A. Objectives

THIS SHOULD FOCUS ON THE INTENT TO PROTECT LIVES AND PROPERTY.

B. Operational Guidance

INCLUDE A REFERENCE TO HOW RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL WILL BE UTILIZED. THIS SECTION SHOULD ALSO REFER TO THE INTEGRATION OF SCHOOL STAFF WITH FIRST RESPONDERS.

C. Outside Assistance

LIST OTHER ORGANIZATIONS THE PLAN RELIES ON FOR ITS RESPONSE. THIS COULD BE FIRST RESPONDERS, OTHER SCHOOLS, PARENTS, ETC.

VI. ORGANIZATION AND ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Organization

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE: 1) ORGANIZATION OF THE SCHOOL DURING NORMAL OPERATIONS, AND 2) THE INTENDED ORGANIZATION DURING AN INCIDENT.

B. Assignment of Responsibilities

IN THIS SECTION DISCUSS THE SPECIFIC INFORMATION AS IT RELATES TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT DURING AN INCIDENT.

VII. DIRECTION AND CONTROL

A. General

INCLUDE A DESCRIPTION OF WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THE PLAN IS CARRIED OUT.

B. Emergency Facilities

IDENTIFY WHERE AN INCIDENT WILL BE MANAGED FROM KEEPING IN MIND THAT THIS LOCATION MAY NEED TO BE OFF CAMPUS. PRE-IDENTIFY AT LEAST THREE LOCATIONS IF POSSIBLE.

C. Line of Succession

IDENTIFY THE KEY POSITIONS THAT WILL BE RESPONDING TO AN INCIDENT AND A LIST OF SUCCESSORS AT LEAST THREE DEEP.

VIII. READINESS LEVELS

IDENTIFY THE DIFFERENT READINESS LEVELS YOUR SCHOOL WILL OPERATE UNDER FROM NORMAL CONDITIONS TO FULL ACTIVATION AND BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE STEPS THE SCHOOL WILL TAKE AT THE VARIOUS LEVELS.

IX. ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

DESCRIBE THE VARIOUS RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO THE SCHOOL IN RESPONDING TO AN INCIDENT. THE RECORDS TO BE KEPT AND MAINTAINED AS A RESULT OF THE INCIDENT AS WELL AS THE TRAINING TO BE OBTAINED BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL.

X. PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE

IN THIS SECTION IDENTIFY WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THE PLAN IS REGULARLY REVIEWED AND UPDATED, THE SCHEDULE FOR THE UPDATES AND THE REASON FOR UPDATES.

ATTACHMENTS:

LIST HERE, AND ATTACH, ANY ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS DEEMED USEFUL FOR THOSE WHO WILL BE USING THE PLAN IN A RESPONSE.

APPENDIX 4 – TRAINING RESOURCES

<https://www.preparingtexas.org/>

This is the website operated by the Texas Department of Public Safety, Texas Division of Emergency Management. The site contains links to on-line courses as well as a listing of classroom courses that may be offered throughout the State of Texas.

<http://teexweb.tamu.edu/>

This is the website operated by the Texas A&M Engineering Extension Service. The site contains links to on-line courses as well as a listing of classroom courses that may be offered throughout the State of Texas.

<http://training.fema.gov/IS/>

This website is operated by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Emergency Management Institute (EMI) in Emmitsburg, Maryland. This site contains the Independent Study courses referred to in this professional report. Users can also access a list of courses available on the campus of EMI as well as training that EMI offers throughout the United States.

The majority, if not all, of the on-line courses offered by the organizations above are available free of charge. Many of the classroom courses may be available at no cost as well. Interested parties should contact the sponsoring agency directly to ensure their eligibility to attend a classroom based training course.

APPENDIX 5 – TRAINING CURRICULUM

For each category, courses are recommended to be taken in the order listed unless otherwise indicated.

Planning:

Course Title	Target Audience
IS-362.A: Multi-Hazard Emergency Planning for Schools	Planning team members and school leadership.
IS-360: Preparing for Mass Casualty Incidents	Planning team members and school leadership.
IS-235.B: Emergency Planning	Planning team members.
IS-366: Planning for the Needs of Children in Disasters	Planning team members.

Incident Command System (ICS):

Course Title	Target Audience
IS-100.SCA: Introduction to the Incident Command System for Schools	All school personnel.
IS-200.B: ICS for Single Resources and Initial Action Incidents	Primary audience is school personnel who are specifically charged with a response function. All school personnel should ultimately obtain.
IS-700.A: National Incident Management System (NIMS) An Introduction	Primary audience is school personnel who are specifically charged with a response function. Planning team members may benefit. All school personnel should ultimately obtain.
IS-201: Forms Used for the Development of the Incident Action Plan	Primary audience is school personnel who are specifically charged with a response function.

Communications:

Course Title	Target Audience
IS-29: Public Information Officer Awareness	Primary audience is personnel who will serve as the Public Information Officer for the school during an incident. School leadership may also benefit.

Communications: (Cont.)

IS-42: Social Media in Emergency Management	Primary audience is personnel who will serve as the Public Information Officer for the school during an incident.
---	---

Exercises:

Course Title	Target Audience
IS-120.A: An Introduction to Exercises	Personnel responsible for developing and conducting school exercises.
IS-139: Exercise Design	Personnel responsible for developing and conducting school exercises.
IS-130: Exercise Evaluation and Improvement Planning	Personnel responsible for developing and conducting school exercises. Members of the planning team may benefit from this course. Items identified as needing improvement in an exercise may need to be incorporated in the school's plan.

Hazard Specific: (While these courses are groups by hazard, the relevancy of a particular hazard should drive the order these courses are taken.)

Course Title	Target Audience
IS-319: Tornado Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff	Primary audience is planning team members who may need to develop plans specific for this hazard or staff who may have a specific role in the response to this hazard. Additionally, facility staff may benefit from this training.
IS-320: Wildfire Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff	Primary audience is planning team members who may need to develop plans specific for this hazard or staff who may have a specific role in the response to this hazard. Additionally, facility staff may benefit from this training.

Hazard Specific: (cont.)

IS-321: Hurricane Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff	Primary audience is planning team members who may need to develop plans specific for this hazard or staff who may have a specific role in the response to this hazard. Additionally, facility staff may benefit from this training.
IS-324.A: Community Hurricane Preparedness	Primary audience is planning team members who may need to develop plans specific for this hazard or staff who may have a specific role in the response to this hazard.
IS-322: Flood Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff	Primary audience is planning team members who may need to develop plans specific for this hazard or staff who may have a specific role in the response to this hazard. Additionally, facility staff may benefit from this training.
IS-323: Earthquake Mitigation Basics for Mitigation Staff	Primary audience is planning team members who may need to develop plans specific for this hazard or staff who may have a specific role in the response to this hazard. Additionally, facility staff may benefit from this training.
IS-325: Earthquake Basics: Science, Risk, and Mitigation	Primary audience is planning team members who may need to develop plans specific for this hazard or staff who may have a specific role in the response to this hazard. Additionally, facility staff may benefit from this training.
IS-906: Workplace Security Awareness	Primary audience is planning team members who may need to develop plans specific for this hazard or staff who may have a specific role in the response to this hazard. Ultimately all staff may benefit from this training.

Hazard Specific: (cont.)

IS-907: Active Shooter: What You Can Do	Primary audience is planning team members who may need to develop plans specific for this hazard or staff who may have a specific role in the response to this hazard. Ultimately all staff may benefit from this training.
---	---

Special Events:

Course Title	Target Audience
IS-15.B: Special Events Contingency Planning for Public Safety Agencies	Primary audience is personnel responsible for any type of after school or other extra-curricular activities. Planning team members and volunteers serving at extra-curricular activities may benefit.
IS-36: Multihazard Planning for Childcare	Primary audience would be personnel responsible for any after school activities or planning team members. This is an optional, low priority course.

Preparedness:

Course Title	Target Audience
IS-22: Are You Ready? An In-depth Guide to Citizen Preparedness	This course is applicable to a broad audience and can also be offered to families at the school. School personnel should be encouraged to take this course because in addition to preparing their own family they will be better prepared to respond to an event at the school.
IS-909: Community Preparedness: Implementing Simple Activities for Everyone	This course is applicable to a broad audience and can also be offered to families at the school. School personnel should be encouraged to take this course because in addition to preparing their own family they will be better prepared to respond to an event at the school.

Bibliography

- Columbine Review Commission. The Report of Governor Bill Owens. May 2001.
- Council for American Private Education. *Distinguished Practices of Distinguished Schools*. October 2002.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Guide for All-Hazard Emergency Operations Planning. State and Local Guide (SLG) 101*. September 1996.
- Fein, Robert A., Vossekull, Bryan, Pollack, William S., Borum, Randy, Modzeleski, William, Reddy, Marisa. *Threat Assessment in Schools: A Guide to Managing Threatening Situations and to Creating Safe School Climates*. U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC. July 2004.
- Lerner, Mark D., Volpe, Joseph S. and Lindell, Brad. *Acute Traumatic Stress Management: Empowering Educators During Traumatic Events*. The Institute for Traumatic Stress. Fifth Edition. 2008.
- New York City Police Department. *Active Shooter: Recommendations and Analysis for Risk Mitigation*. 2012 Edition.
- Office of the State's Attorney Judicial District of Danbury. *Report of the State's Attorney for the Judicial District of Danbury on the Shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School and 36 Yogananda Street, Newtown, Connecticut on December 14, 2012*. November 25, 2013.
- Pollack, William S., Modzeleski, William, and Rooney, Georgeann. *Prior Knowledge of Potential School-Based Violence: Information Students Learn May Prevent a Targeted Attack*. U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC. May 2008.
- Texas Department of Public Safety. Governor's Division of Emergency Management. *Local Emergency Management Planning Guide*. GDEM-10. Revision 4. January 2008.
- Texas Department of Public Safety. Texas Division of Emergency Management. *Preparing Texas Today For Tomorrow's Challenges. Emergency Planning Course Student Manual*.

- Texas Department of Public Safety. Texas Division of Emergency Management. *Basic Plan. Sample Plan.* v2.0. 05/2005.
<http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/dem/downloadableforms.htm>
- Texas Education Agency. Division of Research and Analysis, Department of Assessment and Accountability. *Enrollment in Texas Public Schools 2012-2013.* March 2014.
- U.S. Department of Education. Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools. *A Guide to School Vulnerability Assessments: Key Principles for Safe Schools,* Washington, DC, 2008.
- U.S. Department of Education. Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools. *Practical Information on Crisis Planning: A Guide for Schools and Communities,* Washington, DC, 2003. Revised 2007.
- U.S. Department of Education. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Safe and Healthy Students. *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans,* Washington, DC, 2013.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement. *State Regulation of Private Schools.* Washington, DC, 2009.
- U.S. Government Accounting Office. *Emergency Management: Status of School Districts' Planning and Preparedness.* May 2007.
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *ICS-100: Introduction to ICS for Schools. Instructor Guide.* September 2007. Revised 2009.
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *National Incident Management System.* December 2008.
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Post-Disaster Reunification of Children: A Nationwide Approach.* November 2013.
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Principles of Emergency Management: Independent Study.* February 2006.
- Vossekull, Bryan, Fein, Robert, Reddy, Marisa, Borum, Randy and Modzeleski, William. *The Final Report and Findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the*

Prevention of School Attacks in the United States. U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC. June 2004.

Vita

William L. Atkins is a native Texan who has resided in Austin for the last thirty years. He has worked in the Texas Legislature for members of both the Texas Senate and the Texas House of Representatives. Atkins also worked at the Texas Lottery Commission for thirteen years. Atkins has been working in the emergency management field for the last seven years. Atkins is currently employed as a Senior Emergency Plans Officer with the City of Austin Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Management. Atkins has received his designation as a Certified Emergency Manager from the International Association of Emergency Managers as well as being certified as a Master Professional Continuity Practitioner by FEMA. Atkins was ordained a Permanent Deacon for the Diocese of Austin on February 6, 2010.

Permanent address: watkins2002@msn.com

This report was typed by the author.