

The Impact of Video Surveillance in a Select Tribal School

Jessica Hutchison

May 2012

A Paper Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for a

Masters of Science in Education

University of Wisconsin – Superior

The Impact of Video Surveillance in a Select Tribal School

Jessica Hutchison

May 2012

Suzanne C. Griffith

May 22, 2012

Suzanne Griffith, PhD

date

Abstract: Providing for the physical and emotional safety and welfare of children is the highest priority for schools across the country. Districts and administrators face a variety of challenges in developing and implementing school safety plans and policies. It is of importance to implement systems that will be effective at reducing violence and encouraging a positive school climate while also meeting funding and staffing challenges. This proposal seeks to examine the possible effectiveness of high quality video surveillance on reducing instances of violence and other undesirable student behaviors in a select tribal school located on an Ojibwe Reservation in Wisconsin. Additionally, the study seeks to understand the possible impact on the perception of safety among students and staff that high quality video surveillance may have.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Introduction - - - - -	1
Problem Statement - - - - -	2
Purpose of the Study - - - - -	2
Significance of the Study - - - - -	3
Hypotheses - - - - -	4
Assumptions - - - - -	4
Delimitations - - - - -	4
Limitations - - - - -	5
Definition of Terms - - - - -	5
Summary - - - - -	6
Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature	7
School Safety in America - - - - -	7
Measures and Perceptions of School Safety-	10
Safe School Strategies- - - - -	14
Summary - - - - -	18
Chapter 3: Methodology	19
Subjects and Setting - - - - -	19
Data Collection - - - - -	20
Data Analysis - - - - -	21
Chapter 4 Results	22
Behavior Data- - - - -	22
Survey Results - - - - -	23
Chapter 5 Conclusions	27
Overview - - - - -	27
Discussion of Data - - - - -	27
Table 1.1 - - - - -	28
Conclusion - - - - -	32
References - - - - -	34

Appendices								37
Appendix A-Student Survey-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37
Appendix B-Staff Survey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39
Appendix C-Informed Consent Documentation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41
Appendix D-Directions for Survey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43
Appendix E-Approval from the UW Superior IRB	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In the same way that nearly everyone over 30 years old remembers where they were when they first heard of the terrorist attacks of September 11th, nearly every school teacher of the same age can describe in detail how they learned of the school shooting that took place at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado in the spring of 1999.

Columbine was not the first act of school violence to occur in this country, but it was indeed startling in its scope and pathology (Muschert, 2007). Sadly, the events of that April day have been replicated across the country in the years following, and school districts have faced the overwhelming challenge of providing school security in an age when it seems attackers are becoming increasingly intelligent and vicious at the same time. School shootings dominate headlines and stir panic among students, parents, teachers, and communities; however, school safety entails much more than prevention of school shooting attacks. Various undesirable behaviors such as bullying and intimidation, vandalism, and even tardiness can contribute to an overall reduction in school safety.

Each school district tackles the challenge of providing a safe educational setting in its own way whether it is with full time security guards, the installation of metal detectors, the use of high grade video surveillance, or a greater reliance on staff monitoring and involvement. To be sure, a method for eliminating the risk of a 'Columbine like' attack does not exist; nonetheless, every school continues to struggle with the question of how to best provide a safe and secure atmosphere for its school community (Jenson & Fletcher, 2007).

The Question

Does the installation and use of high quality video surveillance have a real (measurable) effect on the overall safety of secondary school students and staff in terms of instances of violent behavior? Furthermore, does the installation and use of such devices contribute to an increase in feelings of safety among students and staff? If perception of safety exists, does it relate to an actual change in student behaviors? In other words, are students less likely to engage in undesirable behaviors because security cameras are in place? Likewise, are students less likely to engage in those same undesirable behaviors if they have a general feeling of safety and security while at school?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to use a real life example in order to explore the possible effectiveness of high quality video surveillance in reducing school violence and undesirable student behaviors in a secondary tribal school setting. A further purpose of the research is to investigate whether a reduction in instances of school violence and other undesirable student behaviors is due to an increase in the overall level of safety felt by students and staff. The results of this study could be used to make decisions regarding the continued use and expansion of existing safety and security measures within the school studied. Information gleaned from this study may also be useful to other Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) secondary schools with similar populations and safety concerns. Additionally, results from the study may be used to help steer the initial efforts of the Positive Behavioral Supports and Intervention (PBIS) team which has recently begun developing a plan for implementation in the fall of 2012 in the school highlighted in the study, specifically in the identification and rates of problem behaviors.

Significance of the Study

Native American teens drop out of high school (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011) and commit suicide (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009) at higher rates than their non-Native counterparts. These same children face higher rates of alcoholism in the home and are exposed to greater risks of violence and abuse in the home and, for those that live there, on the reservation as well (Pevar, 2002). For many of these children, safety is a luxury that they may seldom enjoy. The tribal schools that they attend face an uphill battle of providing a welcoming environment to the students and their entire community in a culturally sensitive manner, while also maintaining the rigorous safety standards that all schools struggle to provide in the 21st century.

The funding provided to BIE schools is constantly scrutinized. For many of these schools, the costs associated with the initial installation of school-wide video surveillance may be too high a price to pay in an era of dwindling education budgets. If a connection can be proven between the reduction in violent and/or undesirable student behaviors and the installation of security cameras, support among BIE schools and the tribal governments, which typically act as local school boards, may increase. Furthermore, funding initiatives at the federal level (BIE) may be influenced.

Hypotheses

The hypothesis is that the installation and use of high grade video surveillance installed in a secondary school setting will result in a decrease in unwanted student behaviors including those that directly pose a threat to student safety. A further hypothesis is that students and staff in such a situation will report an increase in the overall level of safety felt in the school environment due to the installation of security cameras.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, it is assumed that any type violence occurring in a school setting is unwanted and is, furthermore, detrimental to the educational process. It is also assumed that school districts and administrative personnel favor the reduction of or elimination of all possible threats to student and staff safety and will be receptive to efforts to address threats to safety.

Delimitations

There are specific delimitations that exist for this study. The primary delimitation that exists is that the study does not seek to assess the effectiveness of video surveillance in any context other than the setting to be studied. The study will also not be able to account for the possible novelty effect the installation of security cameras may have. The study will not seek to determine the effect that other behavior management strategies such as an increase in staff hall monitoring, the implementation and adjustment of advisor monitored study halls, or the modification of specific rules regarding behavior and attendance, may have. The study will also not seek to factor in the impact that staffing changes or changes in student dynamics from one year to the next may have on behavior referrals or reported feelings of safety.

Limitations

The most significant limitation of this study is that analysis of behaviors will be limited to the school to be studied and will only include a two and a half year span. When the research was conducted the cameras had only been in place for one semester, so long term data regarding the impact of said cameras is impossible to gather. Surveys and questionnaires will only be conducted in one school with a small enrollment (54 middle school students and 60 high school students). The sample is also specific to this reservation and demographics.

The surveys used for this study, while approved by the Human Subjects IRB of the University of Wisconsin at Superior, have not been tested and refined for reliability and validity. While they have some face validity they may not provide a true and firm indication of responder's experience.

Definition of Terms

Secondary setting- The secondary setting for the purpose of this research is the middle school and high school level, including grades 6-12.

To 'feel safe'-The belief among students or staff that they are free from the risk of violent attack within the school setting.

Violent student behaviors-Violent student behaviors are behaviors that involve the use of force, threat, or intimidation against another person or property. Specific behaviors include fighting, harassment and bullying, damage to property, vandalism, and weapons possession (Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School Student Handbook, 2011).

Undesirable student behaviors-Undesirable student behaviors are behaviors that involve non-violent school code violations. Specific examples include tardiness, non-compliance, and skipping class (Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School Student Handbook, 2011).

High grade video surveillance- High grade video surveillance is defined as the installation and use of motion capturing digital cameras as part of an overall video security system. Cameras installed have the ability to pan, zoom, and tilt, and are installed in both interior and exterior locations throughout the school building.

Summary

Through the use of analysis of behavior referral data, self report student surveys, and staff input, this study seeks to investigate whether a relationship exists between the use of high grade video surveillance and the reported instances of negative student behaviors. A further sub problem of the study is to investigate whether a decrease in such behavior can be attributed to an overall increased feeling of safety among students and staff. The study takes place in a secondary tribal school operated within the confines of an Ojibwe reservation in Wisconsin. Findings from the study may be used to plan future extensions of the video monitoring system within the setting of the study. Results may also be useful to other Bureau of Indian Education schools in efforts to meet their own safety needs.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

In spite of popular beliefs to the contrary, secondary school students in the United States are increasingly safer while at school than in most other non-school settings. Nonetheless, school districts across the country face mounting pressure to beef up security measures to ensure an environment free from physical and emotional violence. The question of how to best provide school security is one posed often. The Literature Review provides baseline information regarding the current state of school safety in the United States. In addition the Literature Review examines cases involving the perceived effectiveness of various school safety measures, including the use of surveillance cameras, as well as the implications of those perceptions in terms of student behavior and success. Finally, the Literature Review also discusses a variety of current strategies in place to address the problem of school safety and school climate.

School Safety in America

Prior to attempting to understand which school safety strategies will most effectively reduce or eliminate violent behavior in schools, it is first necessary to understand the level of violence which currently exists in today's schools. This portion of the literature review includes discussion relating to the current levels of violent behaviors present in schools across the country, including variables that contribute to higher or lower levels of safety. Much of the information covered in this section is derived from government driven reports and statistics.

Many factors determine whether or not a school can be classified as having a high rate of violence. According the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2010) a definition of violent behavior can range from student victimization and intimidation, to physical fights, to the presence of drugs, alcohol and weapons, and in the most extreme cases, to instances of homicide and suicide on school grounds. The 2010 Indicators of School Crime and Safety Report, produced by the NCES identifies six areas relating to school crime and safety; Violent Deaths, Nonfatal Student and Teacher Victimization, School Environment, Fights, Weapons, and Illegal Substances, Fear and Avoidance, and Discipline, Safety and Security Measures. According to the NCES report, of the over 55 million children attending grades prek-12th grade from July 1st, 2008 to June 30th, 2009, there were 24 homicides reported as being school related. A more startling statistic is the reported 1.2 million victims of non-fatal crimes among 12 to 18 year olds. Additionally in 2009, 24 percent of respondents reported that they had been in 1 to 3 fights in the past year. Of specific concern to the following research proposal is that when the statistics are broken down by race/ethnicity, Native Americans report the highest levels of being involved in a physical fight, at 42%. From this report it is evident that (non-homicidal) violence in schools is prevalent. As startling as many of the statistics in the NCES report may be, they do offer some hope that violence in schools may be on the downward slide. For example, between the years 1993-2009 students reporting they had been in a physical fight anywhere decreased considerably from 42 percent to 31 percent. The number of students reporting that they had carried a weapon during the past 30 days also decreased by 5 percent from 1993-2009.

According to the Understanding School Violence Fact Sheet for 2010, compiled by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), around 32% of students reported being bullied during the 2007 school year. This statistic is highly relevant to a study on school violence since research show that children who bully are more likely to skip school, vandalize property, get into fights, and drop out of school. In other words violence begets more violence. Another startling fact in the CDC report is that nationwide, high school students reported that 20% were sold, offered, or given an illegal drug by someone on school grounds.

Anderson et al. (2001) focused on a narrower, yet highly publicized, aspect of school violence: violent deaths. The authors of this study examined school-associated violent deaths between 1994-1999 in order to determine the risks, trends, and common features of these crimes. The authors studied 220 events that occurred between 1994 and 1999 which resulted in the deaths of 253 individuals. Data was collected from police reports from the actual events and from interviews conducted with school officials present at the time of the crime.

In terms of the risk of school-associated deaths, Anderson et al. (2001) found that among the 253 deaths, males were more than twice as likely to be victims. Likewise, students in secondary schools were 14 times more likely to have been a victim of a school-associated death. Additionally, students in urban schools were victims at twice the rate of students in rural schools. Other findings demonstrate that the rate of school-associated violent deaths actually decreased over the selected time period, though the rate of multiple-death instances increased. This statistic corresponds with a previous suggestion

that though the instance of violence in schools may be decreasing, the intensity and severity of the violence that is occurring is more severe. Results of the study also indicate that the majority of events followed some type of action that may have provided a warning of a future serious violent action. This study by Anderson et al. provides data consistent with the NCES report on school crime and safety in that the findings indicate a decrease in the overall number of school associated deaths. Important commentary in the study includes the authors making a connection between students that are bullied and otherwise victimized and the eventual perpetration of school-associated deaths.

Measures and Perceptions of School Safety

Studies have been conducted across the country to gauge the effectiveness of school security measures, both in terms of rates of violence and in perceptions of safety among students. This section of the literature discusses the varying degrees of success that schools implementing specific safety measures have experienced. A discussion of the implications, both positive and negative, of such security measures follows.

In a study comparing qualitative responses to focus group questions, and quantitative data collected through law enforcement agencies, Hernandez, Floden, and Bosworth (2010) sought to determine whether measures of school safety correlate to feelings of safety on the part of students and staff. The research was conducted during the 2007-2008 school year and included 16 public and charter secondary schools in the state of Arizona. Participant schools were classified as rural, urban, or suburban, with two schools in the study on Native American Reservations. For this study focus groups of students and staff were asked 20 questions targeting perceptions of student safety while at

school and on the way to and from school. An additional question assessing perceived threats to safety, (such as presence of weapons, physical assaults, or vandalism) was posed. Incident reports from the 2005-2006 school year were retrieved from law enforcement agencies, and were coded depending on the act of violence (such as: weapons, alcohol use, vandalism).

Hernandez et al. (2010) found that the most commonly reported school incidents of violence reported to law enforcement were serious violent attacks, at nearly 20% of all reports, while the lowest reported incident of school violence to law enforcement related to bullying (6.4% of reports), weapons (2.0%), and alcohol (1.5%). These results are interesting when compared to the findings from the student and staff focus groups, which overall reported a much higher perception of the presence of violence than actually was reported to law enforcement through incident reports. Additionally, though law enforcement reports indicate that few incidents of violence involve bullying or intimidation, both student and teacher focus groups reported high levels of bullying and harassment, suggesting that though these behaviors occur in high numbers, they are dealt with by individual teachers and not law enforcement. For the most part, the findings of the Hernandez et al. study suggests that the just because violent incidents are not occurring (or not being accurately recorded), does not mean that students and staff necessarily feel safe at school. Furthermore, the authors point out, staff and students especially may be aware of the presence of alcohol, drugs, and weapons, which would adversely affect perception of safety, without causing or resulting in an actual incidence of violence.

Student perception of high-security environments was the focus of study conducted by Bracy (2001). This study used ethnographic information gathered through interviews and observations of students in two Mid-Atlantic high schools with a high security presence during the 2006-2007 school year. Both schools had similar security measures in place including full-time school resource officers. The two high schools included in the study were separated by only 20 miles in distance, but were composed of vastly different student bodies: one with a majority of students belonging to white middle class families and the other with a larger percentage of students coming from low-income families (41%) and a greater amount of racial diversity, with African Americans composing 50% of the students body. Data was collected through 111 observations which occurred throughout the school year at varying times and in a wide range of settings, and 52 interviews conducted with administrators, school resource officers, staff responsible for discipline, teachers, students, and parents.

The findings of the Bracy (2004) study indicate that students at both schools generally did not object to the presence of a School Resource Officer, though the overwhelming consensus was that students did not feel that the officer's presence had a considerable impact on school safety. Many students also expressed a belief that further security measures, specifically the use of cameras, and an increase in police presence, would also not significantly reduce school violence. These Bracy findings predate but support the findings of Hernandez et al. (2010) in an important way. In the same way that a school that 'looks safe' in terms of incidences of violence requiring law enforcement may actually have a high level of bullying, intimidation, and the presence of drugs, alcohol, and weapons, while a school that has a high level of security and safety measures in place may

have a student body that actually feels more threatened and less safe overall. If students perceive security measures as ineffective they may be more prone to acts of violence in school. Though it is not specifically stated by the authors, the study suggests that if students perceive the presence of violence as greater than it really is or that it is a normal or usual part of school, violent behavior among students may not be deterred.

Brown (2005) conducted a study with a similar aim: to gauge student perceptions of specific school security measures. 230 students from 5 high schools in the Brownsville, Texas area completed a survey focusing on the perceived effectiveness of specific school safety measures. Students were asked to answer 'yes' or 'no' to questions on the effectiveness of police officers, security officers, a policy requiring clear or mesh backpacks, video surveillance, and drug-sniffing dogs. Brown reports that students were also uncertain whether more police and security should be present and whether metal detectors should be used. Students were also allowed to comment on safety and security issues in a space on the survey.

According to Brown (2005), the results of the survey indicate that students feel that the some of the security measures in place in the Brownsville high schools are effective, specifically the presence of police and security officers, as well as the use of drug sniffing dogs. However, the majority of students reported that other policies, specifically the requirement of clear or mesh backpacks, are largely ineffective at reducing the level of crime or the presence of weapons or drugs in schools. There was not a clear consensus on whether the use of security cameras reduced crime in school or whether there should be a greater presence of security/police officers present in school. Additionally, many students

in Brown's study reported that they felt the schools policies regarding crime in school were often unfair, specifically the requirement of clear or mesh backpacks.

Safe School Strategies

Just as there exist thousands of school districts across the country attempting to provide a safe and secure learning environment to students, there seems to exist an equal number of strategies aimed at reducing already violent schools and preventing violence in others. Most school safety plans involve the use of a variety of safety measures including changes to policies, staffing, and technology. This section of the Literature Review looks at specific plans in place across the country aimed at providing safe schools, which include at least the partial use of video surveillance.

Bucher and Manning (2005) detail the level of violence in American schools today with the intention of highlighting specific strategies which have proven effective in providing a safe educational environment. Bucher and Manning reference data presented by the NCES Indicators of School Crime and Safety Survey of 2004 to make the argument referred to previously, that schools are becoming safer overall, in spite of a very small number of extremely violent school-associated killings in the years prior to the article. The bulk of the article underlines the notion that school safety depends upon fostering a positive school climate in which students are allowed to engage in nonthreatening interaction with students and staff alike. Bucher and Manning emphasize the importance of providing what they refer to as a *process-based* concept of safety (student and staff support and collaboration, available counseling resources) rather than a product based policy (use of metal detectors or video surveillance). Another facet of school safety

presented by the authors is the focus on preventative measures designed to educate and intervene rather than reactionary responses intended to punish. Finally, the article highlights the importance of addressing and eliminating peer victimization and bullying as a fundamental step toward fostering a positive and ultimately safe school community.

Bucher and Manning (2005) provide significant support to the argument that a ‘magic wand’ solution to school safety does not exist. A holistic approach to safety which addresses not only the policies and technology of safety and security, but also the fostering of a an emotionally supportive and non-threatening environment in which academic as well as social learning takes place, is fundamental to school safety.

Shelton, Owens, and Song (2009) examined the school safety measures of public schools across various geographic regions of the United States using data reported in the Educational Longitudinal Survey (ELS) of 2002-2004. The ELS is based on data that is self-reported by school administrators. The authors intended to compare and contrast existing trends within and across the geographic regions of the country (Northeast, Midwest, West, and South) and among various community settings (urban, suburban, rural). Data sets in three areas: fire safety measures, facility safety measures, and internal safety measures, were analyzed.

The Shelton et al. (2009) produced a number of relevant findings, though only those related to facility safety measures (metal detectors, surveillance cameras, fencing, and lighting) and internal safety measures (security guards, sign-in policies, uniforms, and student lockers) are discussed here. Though the authors conclude that differences among security and safety measures exist across geographic region, a trend could not be

identified. Variation across community settings, either, rural, urban, or suburban, were not reported as significant, though it was noted that the age of the school buildings themselves may contribute to the presence (suburban) or absence (urban) of specific safety measures. Shelton et al. report that the most commonly reported facility safety measure was the use of exterior lighting and the most commonly reported internal safety measure was the use of sign-in policies.

Heinen, Webb-Dempsey, Moore, McClellan, and Friebal (2007) conducted a study to gauge the effectiveness of The School Action for Emergencies Project (SAFE) implemented in the Harrison County, West Virginia schools through the use of federal funding aimed at providing surveillance in schools. The program links police and emergency response personnel to broadband technology installed within the school which provides video imaging of both interior and exterior facilities. Through the use of PDAs responders have an inside view into emergency situations within the school, and can respond accordingly while in route to the scene. The study was conducted using a voluntary survey submitted to teachers, administrators, and support staff focusing on gathering qualitative data related to perceived safety, awareness of safety protocol, and overall safety policy issues. Data was collected from over 250 participants from 9 different schools. Students were not included.

Heinen et al. concluded that Project SAFE has had a measureable positive impact on the perceptions of safety within Harrison County schools from a teacher-staff standpoint. Some noteworthy findings, however, suggest that the increased perception of safety cannot simply be attributed to an increase in the amount of surveillance cameras or even the increase in response and readiness on behalf of emergency response and police personnel.

According to the qualitative data collected, many respondents felt an increase in safety due to the clarification and repeated references made to the school safety plan. In other words it is possible that practicing the emergency protocol and not necessarily the cameras themselves or the high-tech communication capabilities impacted the overall perception of safety.

In a Chalk Talk discussion published in the Journal of Law & Education, Braggs (2004) posed the question of the overall effectiveness of webcams in the classroom, as well as the legality issues that such surveillance measures pose. The author briefly compares two video technology tools: Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) and webcams. Schools implementing CCTV can monitor activity actively or passively and can record and store information. Webcams on the other hand merely require a personal computer with internet access to periodically upload pictures from the camera to a website. Webcams are inexpensive and can be accessed from any internet connection.

Braggs (2004) referenced previous studies that have noted the success school districts with both types of systems have had in reducing property crime and vandalism. What is most interesting and relevant about his discussion is the possible legal issues that result from the use of cameras that are unmonitored-specifically in situations where students are being attacked or victimized-yet because the cameras are unmonitored a response is not immediate. The author pointed out that unmonitored cameras are not likely to provide a deterrent to extremely violent behavior, noting that Columbine had surveillance cameras in place prior to the school shooting that took place there. Other possible negative consequences of either type of surveillance discussed in the article

include the possible detrimental effect on teacher morale, the vulnerability of such systems to outside attack from hackers, and the possibility that the use and enforcement of other security measures such as hall monitoring and metal detectors may be less vigilant due to a reliance on the cameras.

Summary

Students attending schools across the country face a minuscule risk of violent death while at school. However the potential of violence ranging from physical assaults to intimidation and bullying continues to pose a risk to the safety and security of our nation's school children (NCES, 2010). A variety of strategies (Schneider, 2001) have been implemented to reduce the rates of violence using a combination of measures from staffing to technology to policies targeting specific acts of violence (Jensen and Fletcher, 2007). According to the Literature review, although school administrators have committed time, energy, and considerable funds to implement effective safety measures, the perceived effectiveness of such strategies on the part of students and staff is inconsistent and equivocal.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Violence in schools is an unfortunate yet unavoidable facet of education in American schools today. School districts face the task of providing an environment that fosters not only academic achievement and social growth, but one that actively promotes a physically and emotionally safe and secure facility for both students and staff (Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School Student Handbook, 2011). In spite of initial assumptions to the contrary, current studies and corresponding evidence suggests that video surveillance systems do not have a significant impact on school violence in terms of the deterrence of violent student behaviors (Brown, 2005). In fact, the brief literature review suggests that of the few security measures that have been effective, the presence of teachers and staff in vulnerable locations throughout a school has had the greatest positive impact both in terms of measured instances of violence and reports of student perceptions of safety.

Nevertheless, the hypothesis of this study is that the presence of video surveillance cameras has had an impact on reducing the number of instances of violence and unwanted student behaviors as well as in increasing the overall perception of safety reported by students and staff.

Setting and Subjects

To address the impact and effectiveness of video surveillance systems on the reduction of violent behavior and other undesirable student behaviors, this study was designed to gather both qualitative and quantitative data from one Bureau of Indian

Education tribal secondary school located within the boundaries of an Ojibwe reservation in Wisconsin.

Data Collection

In order to examine the impact of video surveillance on student behavior the researcher gathered quantitative data from the Native American Student Information System (NASIS) reporting system used by all BIE schools to report and monitor all data regarding students. This system stores data relevant to this study including the types of behavior incident, the number of students, the time, date, and location of the incident and the grade of the student involved. In order to determine a baseline of both violent and undesirable behavior, data from the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years was divided by fall and spring semester to compare to data from the fall semester of the 2011-2012 school year, which was the first semester that video cameras were in place in the school. Data was collected from middle school (grades 6-8) and high school (grades 9-12) and was sorted by type as either violent (alcohol, battery, drugs, fighting, harassment/bullying, larceny/theft, physical contact, property damage, sexual offenses, and threat/intimidation, tobacco, vandalism, or weapons) or other undesirable student behavior (non-compliance, skipping class, tardiness). A comparison of the two data sets took place to evaluate whether a reduction of violent and other undesirable behaviors occurred with the introduction of a video surveillance system within the school.

In order to gauge the possible impact that the introduction of video surveillance had on the overall perception of safety among students and staff, a survey was conducted by grade level, after parent notification was sent by mail. Surveys were distributed to

students in their same grade study halls while advisors were present. The purpose of the study and the survey was explained and participation was voluntary and anonymous. Students were asked to identify their grade level and gender. A definition of what it means to 'feel safe' was given and explained. The survey used an ordinal scale for students to identify whether they felt less safe at school this year, more safe at school this year, or if they didn't feel either more or less safe at school this year. Various locations within the school were substituted for the word 'school' in the survey (hallways, bathroom, cafeteria, classrooms, gym, and exterior school grounds). An area for voluntary comments pertaining to school safety was included in the survey. A similar survey was distributed to all 6-12 staff at the monthly staff meeting. Staff members were asked to identify the level they primarily work in or teach (middle school or high school) and their gender. Staff participation was voluntary and anonymous.

Data Analysis

In order to gain an understanding of the degree of effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of high quality video surveillance within a specific school, a comparison of hard numbers over a series of semesters was conducted. A further study of the responses to student and staff surveys took place to determine trends and patterns across age and gender. After the data was collected and analyzed, the results were shared with school administrators and Tribal Governing Board members (which serve as the local school board). Based on these findings, further discussion about whether or not to continue or expand the video surveillance system with the current school may be impacted. Results may also be shared with other tribal schools facing similar questions about safety and security measures.

Chapter 4

Results

The intention of this study was to investigate the possible connection that exists between the presence of video surveillance cameras and violent student behavior. In addition to this objective, the study sought to examine the perception of safety reported by students and staff in a variety of school settings.

Behavior Data

Behavior data reported for grades 6 thru 12 in the NASIS system from the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years was analyzed and compared to data gathered from the first semester of the 2011-2012 school year; 2011-2012 marking the introduction of video surveillance cameras. The numbers of referrals for specific types of behavior were tallied. Behavior types were classified by NASIS as violent: alcohol, battery, drugs, disorderly conduct, fighting, harassment (including bullying), larceny, physical contact, property damage, sex offenses, threat/intimidation, tobacco, vandalism, and weapons, or as non-violent: non-compliance, tardiness, and skipping class. An average was then calculated for the years prior to the introduction of the cameras (2009-2010, 2010-2011). The average was then compared to the number of behavior incidences reported for the 2011-2012 fall semester to show an increase, a decrease, or no change in the rate of violent behaviors. There were no reported cases of alcohol, battery, or sex offenses during the studied time frame.

The analysis of the discipline data reflected an overall increase in the number of behavior referrals for both violent and non-violent events from an average of 694.5

referrals a semester to 775 referrals in the fall semester of 2011-2012, an increase of 11.5%. Increases in instances of violent behaviors occurred in the drugs, disorderly conduct, fighting, harassment, larceny, and vandalism categories, with the greatest increase reflected in the harassment category from an average of 17.5 incidences to 49 incidences in 2011-2012. Of the violent behaviors that reflected an increase, the number of incidents increased from an average of 25 per semester, to 64 in the fall of 2011-2012, an increase of 156%. Decreases in instances of violent behaviors occurred in the physical contact, property damage, threat/intimidation, tobacco, and weapons categories, with a drop from an average of 31 instances a semester, to 25 instances reported in 2011-2012, a 19% reduction. Increases in instances of non-violent behaviors occurred in the tardiness category from an average of 203.25 per semester to 346, an increase of 70%. Decreases in the non-violent behaviors occurred in the non-compliance and skipping class categories, from 286.25 to 251 and 149 to 89.

Survey Results

Students and staff also participated in an anonymous survey asking them to rate the level of safety they felt in certain areas of the school (hall, cafeteria, classroom, gym, bathroom, and outside of the school on school grounds), and in relation to how safe they felt in the previous years, with space provided for additional safety related comments. Student surveys were broken into grade range increments of 6-8, 9-10, and 11-12. Student and staff respondents were asked to identify their gender. Responses were also tallied, and reflected an overall feeling of Not Safe, Somewhat Safe, Safe, Mostly Safe, or Very Safe.

Of the forty-one students surveyed in grades 6 thru 8, 34 students (83%) reported a feeling of Safe, Mostly Safe, or Very Safe, in school, the remaining 7(17%) reporting a feeling of Somewhat Safe, with zero reports of Not Safe in school. In every area of the school identified in the survey, at least 70% of the students reported they felt Safe, Mostly Safe, or Very Safe, with the highest level of safety felt in the classroom (93% either Safe, Mostly Safe, or Very Safe). Students reported feeling the lowest level of safety outside of the school on school grounds, with 29% of students and 38% of female students reporting that they felt either Not Safe or only Somewhat Safe. The results of the data comparing the feelings of safety this year compared to last year demonstrated that at least twice as many students report feeling More Safe, or Neither More or Less Safe, than students who report feeling Less Safe this year compared to last year. These results are consistent across locations within the school, with the greatest discrepancy between those that felt More Safe or Neither More or Less Safe (88%), and those that felt Less Safe (12%) coming in the classroom and gym setting, and the smallest discrepancy coming in the hallway setting (73% More Safe or Neither More or Less Safe, 27% Less Safe).

The results for grades 9-10 reflect a similar pattern to those of the students in grades 6-8; however discrepancies between those feeling Safe, Mostly Safe, or Very Safe, and those feeling Somewhat Safe or Not Safe were more severe. Of the 20 students surveyed (11 boys and 9 girls), 19 students (95%) reported they felt Safe, Mostly Safe, or Very Safe in school, with one student reporting a feeling of Not Safe. These results were consistent across location categories surveyed. When asked how safe they felt in school this year compared to last year, 95% of the students reported feeling More Safe, or Neither More or Less Safe this year compared to last year, and again results were consistent across

locations. The only slight variation in responses came in the hallway category with 3 students (15%) reporting that they felt Less Safe this year compared to last. There were not any significant variations by gender with regard to overall level of safety felt in school or the level of safety felt this year compared to last year.

Twenty six students were surveyed in grades 11 and 12, 13 males and 13 females. Again, the results for this age range were similar to previous patterns, however the discrepancy between those that felt Safe, Mostly Safe, or Very Safe and those that felt only Somewhat Safe or Not Safe, were even more distinct, with all 26 students reporting at least a feeling of Safe and 16 students (61%) reporting a feeling of Very Safe. Students responses regarding the level of safety felt this year compared to last year were also quite lopsided, with 25 students (96%) reporting a feeling of either More Safe or Neither More or Less Safe in school. There was no variation with regard to location in school or gender however it was interesting to note that the number of females reporting a feeling of Less Safe in any area of the school was zero.

A total of 19 teachers and support staff, 9 males and 10 females, were asked to complete a similar survey. A reported feeling of Safe, Mostly Safe, or Very Safe in school was reported from all 19 staff members, with consistent numbers across locations. In fact only one staff member of 19 reported a feeling of Not Safe on the survey (outside of the school on school grounds). A variation, though slight was exhibited in response to the level of safety felt this year compared to last year. In the first five categories listed on the survey (school, hallways, cafeteria, classroom, gym) staff reported an overall feeling of either More Safe or Neither More or Less Safe (95% or more) this year compared to last year. However

3 staff members, or 15% (all male) identified the bathrooms as an area that they felt Less Safe in this year compared to last, and 2 staff members identified outside of the school on school grounds as an area that they felt Less Safe this year compared to last. About half the staff (9 of 19) reported a feeling of Neither More or Less Safe this year compared to last year in every category other than outside of the school on school grounds, where more than half reported a feeling of More Safe.

CHAPTER 5

Overview of the Study

In an attempt to investigate the relationship that may exist between violent student behavior and the presence of video surveillance systems in schools, this study focused on the number of behavior referrals for violent and non-violent student behavior over a two and a half year time frame in a select Tribal School located within the boundaries of a Native American reservation in northern Wisconsin. The school years of 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 were compared to the fall semester of 2011-2012 which marked the introduction of a video surveillance system. A survey designed to reflect the overall level of safety felt by students and staff was also administered in the spring of 2012. The researcher hypothesized that the introduction of the video surveillance cameras would lead to a reduction in violent student behaviors, other undesirable student behaviors, and an increase in the overall level of safety felt by both students and staff.

Discussion of Data

When looking at the overall number of referrals for violent student behavior after the introduction of video surveillance cameras, it would be easy to assume that not only did the cameras not have the intended effect of reducing violent behavior, but the opposite was true, that violent behaviors actually increased after the cameras were introduced. This assumption could be supported by the data; the overall numbers of referrals increased from an average of 694.5 per semester to 775, an 11.5% increase. A jump from an average of 56 referrals per semester for violent behaviors to 89 referrals for 2011-2012, also occurred, an increase of 37%.

Table 1.1

Instance of Behaviors by Semester- Fall 2009-Fall 2011-grades 6-12

	F-2009	S-2010	F-2010	S-2011	Avg/sem	F-2011
Alcohol	0	0	0	0	0	0
Battery	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drugs	2	0	2	3	1.75	2
Disorderly Conduct	1	1	0	1	0.75	3
Fighting	4	3	7	0	3.5	4
Harassment	14	5	32	19	17.5	49
Larceny	1	0	0	0	0.25	2
Physical Contact	16	44	12	5	19.25	19
Property Damage	3	5	2	0	2.5	1
Sex Offenses	0	0	0	0	0	0
Threat/Intimidation	6	4	5	6	5.25	5
Tobacco	3	1	8	2	3.5	0
Vandalism	0	0	4	1	1.25	4
Weapons	2	0	0	0	0.5	0
Non-Compliance	360	335	236	214	286.25	251
Tardiness	182	211	225	195	203.25	346
Skipping Class	88	184	146	178	149	89
Total Events	682	793	679	624	694.5	775

It must be noted that two significant policy changes may account for the jump in rates of referrals for both violent and non-violent behaviors. In the spring of 2011 a team of counselors, administrators, teachers, mental health professionals, and law enforcement worked collaboratively to write a new bullying/harassment policy for the Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School. Once completed extensive efforts were made to educate students, teachers, and parents about what bullying was, how it should be dealt with in terms of reporting, and what the consequences could be for failure to report instances of bullying. Students and staff were asked to sign a pledge to keep LCO “bully free.” The enforcement of

this new and more stringent policy may have resulted in an increase of instances of harassment (including bullying) referrals from an average of 17.5 per semester over the course of the two years prior, to 49 referrals in the fall semester of 2011-2012. The researcher believes that an actual increase in the instances of bullying behavior did not occur; rather a new awareness of the damaging results of unreported and unresolved bullying by both students and staff took place. Without including harassment into a calculation of rate of the referrals for violent behavior, a rate of increase of only 3.8% (from 38.5 per semester to 40 in 2011-2012 semester) occurred.

The other significant policy change is reflected in the number of 'tardies' reported in the fall semester of 2011-2012. Prior to 2011-2012 students were allowed five 'tardies' to class before a behavior referral resulting in a detention was made. Beginning with the 2011-2012 school year the number of 'tardies' was reduced from 5 to 3, which is reflected in the dramatic increase in the number of referrals made for tardiness from an average of 203.25 to 346 in the first half of 2011-2012. When calculating the actual amount of times students were late to class using the old policy, students were late to class an average of 1,016.25 times per semester. Using the new calculation of what qualifies as a 'tardy', students were late to class 1,038 times in the fall of 2011-2012, a much less dramatic increase. When excluding tardiness from the overall calculation of behavior referrals per semester, the number of referrals actually decreased to 429 in 2011-2012, from an average of 491.25. Another variable that may account for significant variation in the data reported between the 2009-2010, and the 2010-2011 school years was the hiring of an Assistant Principal, a new position created to deal specifically with student behaviors.

Without including the previously mentioned variations, there are some interesting findings to report. The average number of Tobacco referrals (students caught smoking in or around school) went from an average of 3.5 with a high of 8 in the fall of 2010, to zero referrals in the fall of 2011, most likely due to the fact that cameras are placed in the normal smoking 'hot spots.' It does not appear that the presence of cameras has any impact on the more impulse related offenses such as fighting or disorderly conduct, as those number stayed relatively the same (3.5 to 4, and .75 to 3). This finding related to the literature regarding surveillance cameras in school. This data supports the notion that cameras alone are not enough to deter unsafe behaviors in school. A universal effort of preventative discipline including increased staff monitoring of common areas (Bucher and Manning, 2005), continued education of safety policies (Heinen et al., 2007), along with other safety measures such as School Resource Officers (Brown, 2005), are more effective at preventing violent behaviors than cameras alone.

A secondary area of investigation to this study was the use of surveys designed to gauge the perceived level of safety of students and staff across various locations in and around school. The overwhelming majority of students and staff reported feeling safe in all areas of school. The highest level of safety was felt within the classroom, and the lowest level of safety were felt in the bathrooms, which suggest that the presence of video surveillance has little to no effect on feelings of safety, since both locations are unmonitored by video cameras. The high feeling of safety felt within the classroom could be attributed to the high level of structure and monitoring by teachers and staff, and conversely the low level of safety felt in the bathroom could be attributed to the absence of any such monitoring or structure.

Another important finding was that the older a student tended to be, the greater level of safety in school was reported. Perhaps the awareness of the routine nature of school and the comfort in understanding school expectations contributes to a reduction in the anxiety that can occur when transitioning from 5th grade to 6th grade or 8th grade to 9th grade, or just with being at the top levels of 11th and 12th grades.

Though few comments were contributed on the part of students, some important safety issues were noted, including the continued presence of bullying behaviors. The identification of a highly trafficked narrow hallway in the high school used by both middle and high school students, without cameras was identified as a problem area by two middle school students. Four middle school students also mentioned instances of bullying that persisted, involving specific students, locations, or classes. Three middle school students expressed their feelings of safety in school and their support of the use of cameras. One student from the high school mentioned his concern about behaviors on the bus, suggesting that drivers “need assistance” to help prevent “little kids from bullying one another.” Eight students wrote that they felt safe in school or that the school was “doing a good job” of addressing safety concerns.

Comments on the staff survey consisted more of suggestions regarding the use of cameras; for example, to show parents the behaviors of students engaged in public displays of affection. A suggestion was also made to remind students of the use and purpose of cameras frequently throughout the year.

The evidence presented in the surveys seems contrary to the literature previously indicating that a school that appears safe on paper may not feel safe (Hernandez et al.,

2010). It appears that students and staff feel safe at LCO in spite of the presence of occasional acts of violence like fights or disorderly behavior. An overwhelming increase in feelings of safety this year compared to last year was also not present, confirming the suggestion that students feel that the presence of security measures such as cameras or SRO's does not have a significant effect of school violence (Bracy, 2001).

Conclusion

National studies of education (CDC, 2010) as well as the local research done in a specific Tribal School confirms the notion that some level of violence exists in nearly every school setting. Reducing the risk of violent student behavior as well as the presence of undesirable student behaviors can contribute to a more positive educational experience for students.

The intention of this study was to investigate the effect that video surveillance cameras may have on such behaviors. The behavior data suggest that the use of cameras is not the magic wand of school safety and should not be relied upon to prevent all types of negative behavior. Video surveillance cameras do provide an additional layer of school safety and security. In the school studied video cameras may have contributed to an overall feeling of safety by students and staff, if not a significant reduction in student behaviors. The picture is clouded, however, by the simultaneous start of a new Anti-bullying policy. This policy led to an increase in the reporting of harassment. At the same time, a change in the Tardiness policy led to an increase in non-violent crime. This analysis has attempted to disaggregate the findings but the timing is such that the three events – installation of cameras and new Anti-bullying and Tardiness policies – make the results more

complicated. Continued research comparing a longer span of time may reveal a greater reduction in student behaviors as younger students, conditioned to the presence of cameras, cycle through the school system.

References

- Anderson, M., Kaufman, J., Simon, T., Barrios, L., Paulozzi, L., Ryan, G., Hammond, R., ... & Potter, L. (2001). School-associated violent deaths in the United States, 1994-1999. *American Medical Association*, 286.21: 2695-2702.
- Bracy, N. (2010). Student perceptions of high-security school environments. *Youth & Society*, 43(365), 365-395.
- Braggs, D. (2004). Webcams in the classroom: How far is too far? *Journal of Law and Education*, 33(2), 275-82.
- Brown, B. (2005). Controlling crime and delinquency in the schools: An exploratory study of student perceptions of school security measures. *Journal of School Violence*, 4(4), 105-125.
- Bucher, K., & Manning, M. (2005). Creating safe schools. *The Clearing House*, 79(1), 59-60. Retrieved September 24, 2011, from the Wilson Web database.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention-National suicide statistics at a glance-suicide rates among persons aged 10 years and older, by race/ethnicity and sex, 2002-2006. N.p., n.d., Web. 11 Oct. 2011.
<http://cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/suicide/statistics/rates02/html>

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention-*Trends in the prevalence of behaviors that contribute to violence on school property; National Youth Risk Behavior Survey 1991-2009*. N.p., n.d., Web. 24 Sept. 2011. <http://cdc.gov/healthyyouth>.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention- Violence Prevention Home Page - Injury. *Understanding school violence fact sheet*. N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Oct. 2011. <http://cdc.gov/violenceprevention>.

Heinen, E., Webb-Dempsey, J., Moore, L., McClellan, C., & Friebel, C. (2007). Safety matters: How one district addressed safety concerns. *Journal of School Violence* 6.3, 113-129.

Hernandez, D., Flooden, L., & Bosworth, K. (2010). How safe is school? An exploratory study comparing measures and perceptions of safety. *Journal of School Violence*, 9, 357-374.

Jensen, R., & Fletcher, G. (2007). Preemption, not reaction. *T.H.E. Journal*, 34(10). Retrieved October 11, 2011 from the Wilson Web Database.

Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School Handbook Revision Committee. (in press). Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School Student Handbook. (2011).

Muschert, G. (2007). Research in school shootings. *Sociology Compass*, 1(1), 60-80.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Home Page, U.S. Department of Education. *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2010 - Executive Summary*. (n.d.). Retrieved October 11, 2011, from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators>

Pevar, S. L. (2004). *Criminal jurisdiction in Indian country: The rights of Indians and tribes*. Toronto: Bantam Books.

Shelton, A., Owens, E., & Song, H. (2009). An examination of public school safety measures across geographic settings. *Journal of School Health, 79*(1), 24-29.

Shneider, T. (2001). Newer technologies for school safety. *Eric Digest, (145)* Retrieved from ERIC Clearinghouse Database on September 24, 2011.

Appendix A
Student School Safety Survey-No Names Please!

Directions: Circle Grade Range and Gender

Grade Range: 6-8 9-10 11-12

Gender: Male Female

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not safe at all, and 5 being very safe for the next 7 questions, circle how safe you feel:

	Not Safe			Very Safe	
1. In school?	1	2	3	4	5
2. In the hallways?	1	2	3	4	5
3. In the cafeteria?	1	2	3	4	5
4. In the classrooms?	1	2	3	4	5
5. In the gym?	1	2	3	4	5
6. In the bathrooms?	1	2	3	4	5
7. On school grounds outside of school?	1	2	3	4	5

Use the following three choices to answer the next 7 questions by circling one letter for each question:

- A. I feel safer this year
- B. I feel less safe this year
- C. I don't feel either more or less safe this year

8. In school...	A	B	C
9. In the hallways...	A	B	C
10. In the cafeteria...	A	B	C
11. In the classrooms...	A	B	C
12. In the gym...	A	B	C
13. In the bathroom...	A	B	C
14. On school grounds outside of school	A	B	C

*Please add any additional comments on school safety on the back when you are done.

Additional Comments related to school safety:

Place the survey in the envelope at the front of the room. Thank you!

Statement of Voluntary Participation

I understand that I am not being asked to sign the informed consent so that there is no record of who did or did not participate in the survey. By participating in the survey I am saying “that I willingly participate, understand the low risk level, and know my answers will be anonymous and confidential.”

Appendix B
Staff School Safety Survey- No Names Please!

Directions: Circle Primary Instruction Level and Gender

Primary Instruction level: 6-8 9-12

Gender: Male Female

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not safe at all, and 5 being very safe for the next 7 questions, circle how safe you feel:

	Not Safe			Very Safe	
1. In school?	1	2	3	4	5
2. In the hallways?	1	2	3	4	5
3. In the cafeteria?	1	2	3	4	5
4. In the classrooms?	1	2	3	4	5
5. In the gym?	1	2	3	4	5
6. In the bathrooms?	1	2	3	4	5
7. On school grounds outside of school?	1	2	3	4	5

Use the following three choices to answer the next 7 questions by circling one letter for each question:

- A. I feel safer this year
- B. I feel less safe this year
- C. I don't feel either more or less safe this year

8. In school...	A	B	C
9. In the hallways...	A	B	C
10. In the cafeteria...	A	B	C
11. In the classrooms...	A	B	C
12. In the gym...	A	B	C
13. In the bathroom...	A	B	C
14. On school grounds outside of school	A	B	C

*Please add any additional comments on school safety on the back when you are done.

Additional Comments related to school safety:

Place the survey in the envelope at the front of the room. Thank you!

Statement of Voluntary Participation

I understand that I am not being asked to sign the informed consent so that there is no record of who did or did not participate in the survey. By participating in the survey I am saying “that I willingly participate, understand the low risk level, and know my answers will be anonymous and confidential.”

Appendix C-

Informed Consent Documentation

As you may know over the summer of 2011 the Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School installed an indoor/outdoor video surveillance system in the K-12 buildings. A research study is being conducted to determine the effectiveness of this equipment in increasing school safety. It is extremely important to hear from students about their views on school safety. Federal law mandates that you be informed of the following details about the study.

Purpose: Your son or daughter is being asked to participate in an anonymous survey to assist in understanding the effectiveness of the video surveillance system. Participation is completely voluntary and in no way will impact academic or behavioral records.

Procedure: The 14 question survey will be conducted in 8th hour study halls and will require about 10 minutes of time. Questions will ask students to rank and record the level of safety (1-5) that they feel in various areas of the school. Students will also be asked to determine whether they feel more or less safe in various areas of the school this year compared to last year. Students will be asked to identify only gender and grade range (6-8, 9-10, 11-12). Students will be given the option of including additional comments involving school safety.

Risk: There is minimal risk in completing the survey. While questions included in the survey are straightforward (Do you feel more/less/same safety in school this year compared to last year), there is a chance that a student may feel uncomfortable completing the survey. School staff will be available to assist with any concerns resulting from completing the survey.

Privacy: All participation or non-participation will be completely confidential. All surveys will be stored in a locked and secure location while the study is conducted and will be shredded when the study is complete. No names are asked for or used.

Contact Information If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact:
Jim Miller
Research Coordinator
University of Wisconsin-Superior
715 394-8396
jmiller@uwsuper.edu

Your son or daughters input is beneficial to the continued effort to provide a safe learning environment for all students. Their safety matters and their voice matters. Participation in this study will help us address safety concerns and meet the goal of providing school safety for everyone here at LCO. Thank you!

Parental consent to participate in the survey is required. Please sign and return the following consent form if you are willing to allow your son or daughter to participate in the study.

Student Name

Parent Signature

Date

Appendix D

Research Study – Direction for Survey

A research study focusing on the possible impact of the recently installed video surveillance system at the Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School is being conducted. Students and staff will be asked to complete a brief 10 minute survey on how safe they feel in various locations throughout the school. The survey is completely confidential, no names are asked for or will be used, and all surveys will be shredded once the study is completed.

Students will be read the following:

You are being asked to complete a survey about the level of safety you feel in various locations throughout the school. You will also be asked to rank how safe you feel this year compared to last year. Your participation is voluntary and confidential. You will not be asked to put your name anywhere on the survey. Students can choose to participate in the survey or not. Students who choose not to participate can take out a book to read quietly.

February 7, 2011

TO: Jessica Hutchison, Student Researcher
Dr. Suzanne Griffith, Project Advisor

FROM: Jim Miller, Coordinator
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
University of Wisconsin - Superior

Re: Institutional Review Board (IRB) Full Board Review Status Determination for Research Involving Human Subjects: IRB #756 Impact of Video Surveillance In a Select Tribal School.

Your research proposal, IRB #756 Impact of Video Surveillance In a Select Tribal School, has been determined to meet the guidelines for full board review and has been approved. The readers were Deborah Augsburger, James Geidner, Andrew Breckenridge, William Simpson and Eleni Pinnow. You may proceed with data collection, which is approved to continue through April 30, 2012. Should collection need to extend beyond that date, you will need to resubmit your protocol to the IRB for an extension.

Your request for a waiver of informed consent is approved. You do not need to use informed consent for either students or parents.

The purpose of the Institutional Review Board is to review research projects conducted by UW-Superior students, faculty, and staff to ensure that ethical practices and protocols with regards to use of human subjects are followed. Retain this memorandum with your research protocols. Please note that you must follow the proposal submitted to and agreed upon by this committee. If you change protocols or practices, or if data collection is expected to extend beyond the approved date, you must return to the committee for review of the modifications or extension.

Good luck in your research endeavor.

Cc: Provost/Vice Chancellor Hensrud
IRB Committee members