Violence in schools and the question of how to keep schools safe has preoccupied the country, especially since the Columbine tragedy over twenty years ago and after recent events over the last few years. Research has progressed considerably over the twenty year span, leading us to understand notably that “quick fixes” in the form of simple solutions are not effective. This paper explains why simple solutions do not work and presents strategies that are supported by research in the hopes that legislators may create policies to support them.

**Key Nevada Facts and Statistics**
- There were two shootings on school grounds in 2018 with one non-fatal injury and one death, but only one was in K-12 schools (Education Week, 2018).
- Nevada accounts for 2.2 percent of the total school shootings in the US for 2018.
- There were 11,187 incidents of student violence, 876 incidents of violence towards staff, and 1,040 possessions of weapons reported to date (Nevada Report Card, 2018).
- The rates of carrying a weapon on school property significantly increased from 2015 to 2017 (Lensch et al., 2017).
- The two largest school safety concerns for Nevada during the 2017-2018 school year were bullying incidents that occurred at a rate of 2.6 percent and violence to other students at a rate of 2.3 percent.

**Key U.S. Facts and Statistics**
- The vast majority of school shootings (97.8 percent) occurred in other states outside of Nevada.
- Data show that severe violence in schools, such as school shootings, are actually not as common as milder forms of violence in schools; however, milder forms of violence are also very harmful to student learning.
- The national Youth Risk Behavior Survey showed that 19 percent of students were bullied on school property (CDC, 2017)
- Nationwide, 2.9 percent of students experienced victimization in 2017 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018)

**Recent Actions in Nevada**
- Nevada has coordinated school safety teams in both the northern and southern regions, specifically Washoe County and Clark County.
- Clark County also has in place a 24/7 Tip Line that can be used to report information or potential threats.
- Clark County School District also requires that all staff watch a safety training video annually, while schools are required to report on monthly training drills and have an Emergency Response Plan in place.
- Washoe County has implemented an initiative to improve school safety in the future.
- The My Brother’s Keeper Alliance of Las Vegas has been working on equity issues in schools related to school safety, discipline, and collaboration with law enforcement.
- The Clark County School-Justice Partnership (SJP) initiative has an MOU adopted in August 2018 by the Board of Trustees “to minimize interrupted educational opportunities.” The MOU requires schools to use Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), which is a much-needed support for schools in the fight for safer schools including addressing racial disparities in discipline.
- The state of Nevada has also been working on school safety by the creation of the Nevada Statewide School Safety Task Force that has outlined helpful recommendations.
- In January 2019, Superintendent Jara introduced CCSD Strategic Plan 2024, with the goal of reducing disproportionality of discipline.
- UNLV’s Implicit Bias Training (IBT) team, comprised of researchers and practitioners in the field of school discipline disproportionality and implicit bias, is conducting trainings (over 300 schools) to increase awareness of the gaps in school discipline practices and to increase awareness of the role implicit bias may play in those decisions.
• Nevada Governor Steve Sisolak, has declared during his State of the State Address that “a portion of the 10 percent marijuana tax will go towards preventing violence in our schools” (Sisolak, 2019). According to data made available by the Nevada Department of Taxation (2019), approximately $69.8 million was taken in as marijuana tax revenue from the 2018 fiscal year.

Considerations for Future Actions
• Use security measures thoughtfully. Policy should be developed to require the thoughtful use of security measures and that armed guards are well trained.
• Support adequate staffing of SBMH professionals. Policy should be developed to increase the ratios of SBMH professionals in schools.
• Support individual school safety teams. Policy should be developed to support individual school safety teams.
• Stop using zero tolerance policies or “get tough” approaches in schools. Policy should be developed to implement a phased, cessation on zero tolerance policies (and automatic suspension and expulsion) beginning with elementary schools. Data on exclusionary discipline (suspensions and expulsions) by race and disability status should be made available to the public.
• Implement culturally responsive, comprehensive prevention programming in schools. Policy should be developed to require that schools implement Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) that is culturally responsive to their particular school community. The innovative work done in Clark County with the School Justice Partnership is an excellent example that should be emulated at the state level.
• Support increased professional development for teachers and administrators. Policy should be developed that provides the needed financial resources necessary for preservice training in these areas of school safety for administrators and teachers, so that they are equipped to address school safety when entering the workforce. Additionally, funding should support professional development for existing teachers and administrators in these areas. Increasing SBMH professionals and community collaboration is essential in this regard as they can support much of this professional development in schools.
• Fund high-quality research to develop models and strategies that work specifically for Nevada.
• Support Nevada Community Partnerships who are doing innovative and critical work.

Implications of Maintaining Status Quo
While Nevada is in the process of making schools safe with innovative community partnerships, the rate of change will be slow, and they could potentially fail, without supportive policies that ensure evidence-based practices are implemented in schools well. Schools need more support to create learning environments in which students feel safe, supported and engaged. It is the role of the school district and educational policy makers to make sure that happens.

Introduction
Leaders across the country are faced with the urgency to “solve” the problem of school safety once and for all—and quickly—because of recent horrific events in the media. Indeed, it may seem like there is a tragic event nearly every month (if not weekly!). As a result of this media coverage, there is often an outpouring of solutions to school violence and safety that are, in actuality, embellishments and “quick fixes” that are not supported by research or experts in the field. This type of response to such a devastating problem is understandable and predictable, as the plague of tragic school events has been longstanding in this country. The Columbine tragedy of 1999, in particular, was the impetus for more specific changes in policy, law, and research. Importantly, Columbine brought attention to the insidious effects of milder forms of school violence such as bullying and hostile school climate, and their linkages to extreme violence in schools (Leary, Kowalski, Smith & Phillips, 2003). The purpose of this paper is to clarify strategies that are supported by research in hopes that leaders may use it to inform their own work in the area of school safety.

School Safety in Nevada
There were two shootings on school grounds in 2018 with one non-fatal injury and one death, but
only one was in K-12 schools (i.e., high school), while the other was in college (Education Week, 2018). Compared nationally, Nevada accounts for 2.2 percent of the total school shootings in the US for 2018.

Data show that severe violence in schools such as school shootings are actually not as common as milder forms of violence in schools. According to the most recent Nevada Report Card, in 2018, there were 11,187 incidents of student violence, 876 incidents of violence towards staff, and 1,040 possessions of weapons reported to date (see Figure 1, Table 1). Rates of carrying a weapon on school property significantly increased from 2015 to 2017 (Lensch et al., 2017). The largest school safety concerns for Nevada during the 2017-18 school year were bullying incidents that occurred at a rate of 2.6 percent and violence to other students at a rate of 2.3 percent. Compared nationally, the national Youth Risk Behavior Survey showed that, in 2017, 19 percent of students were bullied on school property (CDC, 2017) and the Indicators of School Crime and Safety Report: 2017 reported 2.9 percent of students experienced victimization (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). These incidents create unsafe schools that result in school environments that are unhealthy for students’ development and linked with increased bullying, increased delinquent behavior, and a host of academic challenges.

Figure 1. School Safety-Related Incidents in Nevada by County (Nevada Report Card, 2018)
Nevada has several policies in place at the state level that promote school safety and are in line with best practices:

- **NRS 388.132, NRS 388.1322**
  Safe and respectful learning environment is essential for students (in both public and private schools).

- **NRS 388.13121**
  Administrators, teachers, and members of governing body have a duty to create and provide a safe and respectful learning environment for all pupils.

- **NRS 388.1323**
  Creation of an Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment.

- **NRS 388.1325**
  Bullying Prevention Account.

- **NRS 388.133**
  Implement a policy for all school districts and schools to provide a safe and respectful learning environment that is free of bullying and cyber-bullying.

- **NRS 388.134, NRS 388.1342**
  Provide appropriate training of members of the governing body and all administrators, teachers, and all other personnel employed by the governing body.

- **NRS 388.1343**
  School Safety Team (established by the administrator of each school).

- **NRS 388.135**
  Bullying and cyber-bullying prohibited.

- **NRS 388.1351, NRS 388.1352**
  Reporting requirements regarding bullying and cyber-bullying.

- **NRS 388.139, NRS 388.1395**
  Week of Respect.

- **NRS 388.1454, NRS 388.1455**
  Safe-to-Tell Program.

- **NRS 388.241, NRS 388.243**
  Response to crisis, emergency, or suicide plan.

- **NRS 388.264**
  Consultation with certain person regarding safety in schools before taking certain actions relating to buildings for schools or related facilities or acquiring sites for such buildings or facilities.

- **NRS 388.265**
  Annual conference regarding safety in public schools.

- **Executive Order 2018-5**
  Statewide School Safety Task Force.

### Table 1. Nevada 2017-2018 Safety Data (Nevada Report Card, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disciplinary Incident</th>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence to Other Students</td>
<td>11,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence to Other Staff</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Weapons</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Controlled Substances</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession or Use of Controlled Substances</td>
<td>2,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession or Use of Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Disciplinary Problems (Expulsion Only)</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Truants (No suspension or expulsion)</td>
<td>3,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying Incidents Reported</td>
<td>12,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying Incidents Determined to be so after an Investigation</td>
<td>5,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying Incidents Suspension/Expulsion</td>
<td>3,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Bullying Incidents Reported</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Bullying Incidents Determined to be so after an Investigation</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Bullying Incidents Suspension/Expulsion</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nevada approaches school safety on multiple levels. Policies are implemented at a state level through legislation. At the district level, decisions are made on how to best implement these policies. Individually, schools are responsible for following through on district-wide initiatives that support the state. Significant examples of this are as follows: Nevada has coordinated school safety teams in both the northern and southern regions, specifically Washoe County and Clark County. Clark County also has in place a 24/7 Tip Line that can be used to report information or potential threats (Clark County School district, 2018a). Clark County School District also requires that all staff must watch a safety training video annually, while schools are required to report on monthly training drills and have an Emergency Response Plan in place (Clark County School District, 2018b). Washoe County has implemented an initiative to improve school safety in the future (Washoe County School District, n.d.).

**Recent Nevada initiatives.** Nevada has recently begun several exciting community initiatives to address school safety further. The My Brother’s Keeper Alliance of Las Vegas has been working on equity issues in schools related to school safety, discipline, and collaboration with law enforcement. In particular, the Clark County School Justice Partnership (SJP) initiative focuses on creating diversions away from the criminal court system by a commitment to school safety, enhancing educational opportunities, and providing alternatives to punitive disciplinary practices. The SJP has an MOU adopted in August 2018 by the Board of Trustees “to minimize interrupted educational opportunities.” The MOU requires schools to use Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), which is a much-needed support for schools in the fight for safer schools including addressing racial disparities in discipline (Clark County, 2018c).

The state of Nevada has also been working on school safety by the creation of the Nevada Statewide School Safety Task Force (see Reference list for policy recommendations). Additionally, CCSD determined as a part of the Superintendent’s Equality of Opportunity Advisory Committee (SEOAC) that training about bias and discipline gaps was essential to reducing the differential impact of discipline and increasing school safety for all. In Jan 2019, Superintendent Jara introduced CCSD Strategic Plan 2024, with the goal of reducing disproportionality of discipline. To that end, UNLV’s Implicit Bias Training (IBT) team of researchers and practitioners in the field of school discipline disproportionality and implicit bias is conducting trainings to increase awareness of the gaps in school discipline practices and to increase awareness of the role implicit bias may play in those decisions. Currently, the UNLV-IBT team is training administrative teams from over 300 schools, with the goal of reducing the impact of implicit bias in day-to-day discipline practices. This training is a product of the Board of Trustees’ policy per SEOAC, SJP, and CCSD Strategic Plan 2024.

To help support these initiatives, Nevada’s Governor, Steve Sisolak, has declared during his State of the State Address that “a portion of the 10 percent marijuana tax will go towards preventing violence in our schools” (Sisolak, 2019). According to data made available by the Nevada Department of Taxation (2019), approximately $69.8 million was taken in as marijuana tax revenue from the 2018 fiscal year.

**Key Issues in School Safety**

The issue of school safety has been brought to the forefront of school leaders’ minds because of the media creating urgency. While urgency is reasonable given the tragedies, grasping onto simple quick fixes that claim to be the solution to school safety is unreasonable and unfounded. School safety is complex and simple solutions do not work. While certain safety measures may be helpful, relying exclusively on them without a comprehensive plan that focuses on prevention is not helpful at best, and harmful at worst. Policy recommendations to enhance school safety—thoughtfully—follow next. There are two key issues that Nevada leaders need to consider for a thoughtful response to school safety.

**Key Issue 1: School Safety is Complex, not Simple.** Because of the urgency to stop violence in schools, simple solutions that focus on only one aspect of the problem such as metal detectors are often suggested in the media. However, school safety is not as simple as it might seem at first glance because it is comprised of multiple factors that, together, create a school climate (see Figure 2). School climate refers to the overall “atmosphere” of a school and one of its key components is physical and emotional safety. School violence includes aggressive acts in all of its forms (physical, verbal,
social, relational, and cyber) and the subtypes of bullying and harassment. Violent acts and the fear of them at school affects student’s safety. Another important part of school climate is engagement and the environment (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Engagement is relationships between and among all groups within school (students, teachers, school personnel) and closely related to school (families and community). Environment includes the physical, academic, and disciplinary environment as well as school-based health supports. There has been a substantial amount of research on school climate and its importance for student learning, school engagement, mental health, and school safety (Gottfredson, Gottfredson, Payne, & Gottfredson, 2005; Espelage, Polanin, & Low, 2014).

Creating a safe school is complex also; because it requires multiple factors to be coordinated toward a single goal of creating a positive school climate for the entire community. These factors are layered within and outside the school and, consequently, influence one another to create a safe school: laws and policies, community, school leadership, culture of school adults, informal practices, family influence, and students (see Figure 3).

Laws and policies provide guidelines and consequences for schools that influences school climate. Community consists of the neighborhood and the local school board. School leadership influences the climate in a school. Leadership influences teachers and staff by setting the agenda for a school that may prioritize certain values over others. Teachers and staff have powerful and authoritative roles over students, as the school adults. Next, informal practices refer to the natural behavioral patterns that develop among school adults as a group. For example, teachers may develop the informal routine of having morning circles with their class, thereby, contributing to a collaborative and trusting climate. Families are an important influence on the school climate, especially in how they engage the school. At the same time, how well the school promotes family involvement is critical. Finally, students also contribute to the school environment through their interactions with others and the school adults.

**Key Issue 2: Simple Solutions Don’t Work.** Because school safety is complex with multiple factors to consider, it should be obvious that simple solutions focused on addressing one factor are not effective. Although it might be argued that “something is better than nothing...” Sometimes that is not the case, which may in fact ultimately decrease school safety. For example, a popular school strategy focuses on the external structure of the school termed “safety measures.” Safety measures are often referred to as the “hardening of schools” or “get tough” approach and includes increasing police presence, cameras, and using metal detectors, to name a few.

However, very little research exists to support the efficacy of physical security measures in preventing school shootings or in increasing school...
safety (Tanner-Smith, Fisher, Addington, & Gardella, 2018). In fact, research has shown that, paradoxically, safety measures actually decrease school safety. Research has also suggested that many schools affected by mass shootings, including Sandy Hook Elementary School in 2012 and Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in 2017, had these types of security measures in place and felt there was nothing more they could have done to improve physical safety in their school. Indeed, the number one thing these schools recommended was to improve the relationships between students and adults to better identify students in need and to make it more likely that students feel comfortable reporting when they have noticed a student in need.

**Increasing armed security guards.** Increasing security guards in schools such as police, armed school safety assistants, or school resource officers (SROs) deserves particular attention due to its popularity. Concerns have been raised with SROs around their skills in working appropriately with discipline decisions, working with students with mental health concerns and other disabilities in general, and safely handling firearms around children. Generally, students associate the presence of school resource offers with discipline, but not necessarily with feelings of safety. Additionally, race modifies the feeling of safety, with white students feeling more safe than other racial groups with the presence of SROs (Pentek & Eisenberg, 2018). Work needs to be done to ensure that SRO’s are comfortable working with and improving feelings of safety for all students.

**Zero Tolerance Policies.** Policies that aim to remove students who are making the school less safe by violating school rules are another example of a “get tough” approach. It has been shown that these policies are ineffective in enhancing school safety and result in pushing students out of school. Exiting students from school decreases students’ opportunities to learn and probability to graduate from high school. More importantly, zero tolerance policies are inequitable, disproportionately impacting students who have been minoritized based on race/ethnicity, disability, and those identified as LBTQ+. A report conducted by the American Psychological Association (2008) found that despite the use of zero tolerance policies in schools for over 20 years, there is little evidence to show that these policies positively impact safety or the reduction in discipline infractions over time.

**Policy Recommendations for Nevada**

While Nevada is commended for having implemented some innovative practices to address school safety, the state could enact legislation to support comprehensive best practices to address the key issues discussed previously. The following recommendations are supported by the research literature and supported by multiple professional associations who are experts on this topic (see Resources and References). School leaders should support these practices to occur in schools through their respective roles.

1. **Use security measures thoughtfully.** Enhancing the physical structure of schools may be used effectively such as ensuring that there is single point of entry into the school. However, other security measures, such as armed guards and metal detectors, should be implemented with the consultation and collaboration of school personnel at each school to address unique issues in a particular school. The use of SROs should include proper training and role definition, especially in discipline and working with diverse students and students with disabilities. The National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) (2018) recommends that SROs serve as teachers, informal counselors, and law enforcement officers and that they should be prohibited from participating in student discipline leaving that to school administrators. Policy should be developed to require the thoughtful use of security measures and that armed guards are well trained.

   Overall, there is no clear research that supports the effectiveness of security measures (or hardening of schools) in enhancing school safety (Tanner-Smith, Fisher, Addington, & Gardella, 2018). On the contrary, these measures have been shown to reduce safety, increase fear, and discourage healthy learning environments. There is concern among experts that enhanced security measures criminalize students by pushing them out of school and into the juvenile justice system. Our nation’s children appear to be going to school with more armed guards than caring school professionals who are trained to meet their mental health needs (ACLU, 2017).

2. **Support adequate staffing of School-Based Mental Health (SBMH) Professionals.** Professionals in school based mental health (SBMH) positions include school psychologists,
school counselors, school social workers, and school nurses due to their specialized training in mental health, student behavior, interventions, and diversity and multiculturalism. These SBMH professionals are critical to school safety because they are able to support school personnel, students, and families in the implementation of the best practice recommendations outlined in this paper and prevention issues of school safety directly and indirectly. However, Nevada schools drastically under employ SBMH professionals and are out of compliance with recommended ratios by experts. Policy should be developed to increase the ratios of SBMH professionals in schools.

The recommended ratios are 1-to-700 for school psychologists, 1-to-250 for school counselors, 1-to-250 for school social workers, and 1-to-750 for school nurses. However, according to the Nevada Association of School Psychologists, the state’s ratios do meet these guidelines. School psychologist ratios in Nevada are estimated to be 1-to-2,200 in Clark County, 1:1800 in Washoe County, 1-to-1,750 in Humboldt County, and 1-to-1,500 in Nye County (Roberts & Dockweiler, n.d.). The school counselor ratio is 1-to-508 (Wood, Lau, & Chen, 2017), school social workers are at a current ratio of 1-to-627 students (NCSSLE, 2017), and school nurses is 1-to-1,814 (NEA, 2019). These deficits inhibit school-based mental health professionals from providing comprehensive services that can promote school safety.

3. **Support individual school safety teams.**

Each school should establish school safety teams that develop crisis plans tailored to their unique school. School safety teams should be multi-disciplinary, that include a school based mental health (SBMH) professional (school psychologist, school counselor, or school social worker) including a school nurse and other relevant stakeholders in the school community (e.g., school personnel, students, and parents/guardians). In addition to crisis plans, threat assessments should be implemented. Policy should be developed to support individual school safety teams.

There is much research supporting the effectiveness of school safety teams (Brock, 2011). The recommendations of the Nevada Statewide School Safety Task Force are excellent in this regard (2018).

4. **Stop using zero tolerance policies, or “get tough” approaches, in schools.**

As discussed previously, these policies are ineffective in enhancing school safety and result in pushing students out of school. Exiting students from school decreases students’ opportunities to learn and probability to graduate from high school. More importantly, zero tolerance policies are inequitable, disproportionately impacting students who have been minoritized based on race/ethnicity and disability. In Nevada, this problem disproportionately affects children and youth of color. Policy should be developed to implement a phased, cessation on zero tolerance policies (and automatic suspension and expulsion) beginning with elementary schools. Data on exclusionary discipline (suspensions and expulsions) by race and disability status should be made available to the public.

5. **Implement culturally responsive, comprehensive prevention programming in schools.**

Alternatives to exclusionary discipline practices need to be implemented in schools. The discipline alternatives should be comprehensive, focusing on prevention. These are best delivered as part of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) that includes three tiers of support for students. Beginning with proactive and preventative strategies to support all students, MTSS builds more support for students as they need it. While there are various types of MTSS discussed next, it is essential that it is responsive to the diverse cultural experiences of the student population. Policy should be developed to require that schools implement MTSS that is culturally responsive to their particular school community. The innovative work done in Clark County with the School Justice Partnership is an excellent example that should be emulated at the state level.

The most well-researched MTSS model is Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS), which focuses on the behavioral support only (Sugai and Horner, 2009). Additional models that should be considered include Social Emotional Learning (SEL) focusing on skills in thinking, managing emotions, and friendships; Restorative Justice (RJ) and Restorative Practices (RP) that focus on creating a school culture of community, addressing harms, and restoring relationships.
(Zehr, 2015); and trauma-sensitive (or -informed) schools that focus on supporting students who may be experiencing symptoms related to chronic or acute trauma. It is important to note that these models may be integrated in schools to access the various advantages of each model such as integrating PBIS and RJ/RP.

Implicit bias is automatic, unconscious associations and stereotypes about groups of people that affect our understanding, actions, and decisions. This topic has been studied extensively and it is now commonly understood that teachers and staff view students’ behaviors differently based on race and sex. School strategies must incorporate implicit bias training and strategies to overcome it. Currently, CCSD is working in partnership with UNLV’s College of Education and Law School to provide training on implicit bias and its impact on school discipline, called UNLV-IBT. However, the program will need continued funding to expand from training administration, to training all staff on best practice to reduce bias and to increase equity in discipline outcomes. The larger issue of cultural responsiveness and competence of school personnel should also be developed and integrated into any MTSS model.

6. **Support increased professional development for teachers and administrators.**

Many of these research-based strategies require additional skills that are not part of current school personnel training programs. Professional development should focus on early identification and appropriate referral processes for student concern, fostering a positive school (and classroom) climate, positive discipline strategies (e.g., reinforcing student self-management skills, restorative justice), district and building emergency drill policy and procedure (including regular practice of drills), fostering family engagement, trauma-informed practices, and recognizing and responding to bullying and harassing behavior. Policy should be developed that provides the needed financial resources necessary for preservice training in these areas of school safety for administrators and teachers, so that they are equipped to address school safety when entering the workforce. Additionally, funding should support professional development for existing teachers and administrators in these areas. Increasing SBMH professionals and community collaboration is essential in this regard as they can support much of this professional development in schools.

There is much research on the effectiveness of professional development on relevant student outcomes and established procedures for accomplishing this effectively (Garbacz et al., 2015 & 2016 and Sheridan et al., 2004)

7. **Fund high-quality research to develop models and strategies that work specifically for Nevada.**

Strategies must be based in research, tailored to meet the unique needs of a particular community, and evaluated and modified to determine their effectiveness and usefulness. Nevada has a diverse population with unique needs requiring innovative programs. The only way to develop effective programs is to research them inclusive of rigorous evaluation.

8. **Support Beneficial Community Partnerships.**

The current community partnerships in Nevada are excellent models of interdisciplinary collaboration and its role in supporting systems change in schools and communities and should be supported financially. This approach has been shown to produce effective and sustainable change for school safety (Shaprio et al. 2010), but more importantly is working in Nevada! The collaborations include the work of The My Brother’s Keeper Alliance of Las Vegas, Clark County School Justice Partnership (SJP) initiative, Nevada Statewide School Safety Task Force, and UNLV – IBT.

**Conclusion**

Success in schools is contingent upon students feeling safe, supported and engaged. It is the role of the school district and educational policy makers to make sure that happens. By identifying evidence-based practices, and supporting those practices through time and funding, we expect a drastic change in violent infractions and an overall improvement in students reports of feeling safe in their school environment.
Helpful Resources

http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/pediatrics/131/3/e1000.full.pdf

CCSD School Justice Partnership
http://ccsd.net/district/school-justice-partnership/

National Education Association - Policy Statement on Discipline and the School-to-Prison Pipeline
https://ra.nea.org/delegate-resources/policy-statement-on-discipline/

National Association of School Psychologists – Joint Statement on Framework for Safe and Successful Schools

National Association of School Resource Officers - To Protect and Educate: The School Resource Officer and the Prevention of Violence in Schools

National Child Traumatic Stress Network - Creating, Supporting, & Sustaining Trauma Informed Schools: A System Framework

National Parent Teacher Association - Position Statement: Positive School Discipline
https://www.pta.org/home/advocacy/ptas-positions/Individual-Position-Statements/Position-Statement-Positive-School-Discipline

My Brother’s Keeper Las Vegas
https://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/Residents/Education/My-Brothers-Keeper

Ohio State University Kirwin Institute: State of the science: Implicit Bias Review

The UCLA Civil Rights Project - Center for Civil Rights Remedies Website
https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/resources/projects/center-for-civil-rights-remedies/front-matter

Supporting Research and Resources


