



## ***SCHOOL SAFETY INFRASTRUCTURE COUNCIL***

### **MEETING MINUTES**

---

Meeting Date: 10/17/2013

Meeting Location: SDE – State Education Resource Center

Approval: DRAFT

Recorded By: Jason Crisco

---

## 1 ATTENDANCE

Name	Title	Department/Location	Present
Donald J. DeFronzo	Commissioner	DAS	Y
Stefan Pryor	Commissioner	SDE	N
Pasquale J. Salemi	Deputy Commissioner	DCS	N
William Shea	Deputy Commissioner	DESPP	Y
John Woodmansee	Education Consultant		Y
Richard E. Morris	Dir. Public Safety & Emergency		N
Frank J. Costello	Structural Engineer		Y
Ronald Jakubowski	Former Asst. Superintendent of Schools for Operations and Facilities		Y
Steven Waznia	Firefighter		Y
Adam Byington	Police Officer		Y
Irene Roman	Public School teacher		Y

## 2 MEETING LOCATION

Building: State Education Resource Center

Room: SERC Classroom

## 3 MEETING START

Meeting Schedule Start: 5:30pm

Meeting Actual Start: 5:40pm

## 4 AGENDA

- Opening Remarks by Chair
  - Chairman DeFronzo began the meeting by welcoming all Council members and giving a brief overview of the agenda.
- Approval of October 17<sup>th</sup> Minutes
  - Chairman DeFronzo asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Steve Waznia seconded by Ron Jakubowski. The minutes were approved with no corrections.
- Legislative Charge
  - SSIC staff gave a brief overview of the SSIC's legislative charge and mission.
- Review of IRVS for Schools - Concepts
  - Staff gave an overview of the three major components that make up IRVS assessment tool: Undesirable Events, School Security Level and Level of

Protection. In addition, staff introduced a fourth concept, compliance. Compliance includes the process of meeting established baselines and how best to respond to the critical vulnerabilities of the school identified by the assessment tool. Technical references and supporting documents will aid in this process. Compliance is separate from the tool itself, but based upon its results.

- Link to Presentation - <http://das.ct.gov/cr1.aspx?page=424>
  
- Establishing Guidelines for Standards
  - SSIC staff gave a presentation on guidelines for standards to help develop a framework.
  - Link to Guidelines for Establishing Standards - <http://das.ct.gov/cr1.aspx?page=424>
  - Specifics were given on Entry Ways, Building Entry, Window/Glass, Entrance Doors, Locking Systems, CCTV, Classroom Security, other security instruction and design features.
  - Chairman DeFronzo asked, with regard to controlled access, if any were more preferable than others. Staff answered that it's typically up to school discretion, but based upon what has been presented to the SSIC, CCTVs and buzz in system seem to be the most preferred.
  - A discussion of various control access technologies, cost and reliability occurred. Topics of discussion included badge readers, electronic key access, magnetic doors, buzz in systems and others.
  - Ms. Roman gave a brief explanation of "Power School", which is a digital attendance system used by many schools in CT. It allows a school to have a constant record of a student's attendance.
  - Classroom door windows were discussed at length. Solid doors could present safety issues if opened into a busy hallway. The SSIC discussed various sizes of windows for classroom doors and which designs were best for preventing unwanted access, but also allow for some visibility.
  
- Testing of an Undesirable Event & LOP Analyses Example
  - SSIC staff gave a presentation on a report of Undesirable Events generated by the Integrated Rapid Visual Screening Assessment Tool and examples of vulnerabilities under the Level of Protection concept within the IRVS for Schools. Main entrances were the primary example used. SSIC staff walked the SSIC through the process of compliance and how best to meet certain standards.
  - Suggestions provided by staff are a collection of guidelines from various states and federal documents.
  
- General Discussion
  - Mr. Waznia stated that the SSIC should be careful when using the words "shall" and "should" in their standards. "Should" is used in determining performance based guidelines, while "shall" is interoperated as a prescriptive standard
  - The SSIC then discussed the difference between guidelines and standards.
    1. Certain standards are in place now, but we need to develop new standards beyond those in certain areas

2. Difference between material standards and human behavior. Human behavior is not something that can necessarily be controlled.
  3. Value added to a building is only as good as the human element that follows those directives.
- The SSIC discussed prescriptive standards regarding new construction versus retrofitting of existing schools. It was agreed that more prescriptive standards should be held for new construction.
    1. Main entrances should be placed accordingly to best protect a school
    2. Changes to existing buildings that are older could be difficult. Schools budgets and the ability to upgrade technologies may not be cost effective.
    3. Schools in lower income areas may have a difficult time meeting standards that are too prescriptive.
  - Building and fire code prescribe certain safety standards for school facilities, but the SSIC is charged with developing higher standards for security in designated areas which may include, but is not limited to entryways, glass, doors, locking systems, CCTV, classroom security and other security instruction and design features.
  - Chairman DeFronzo mentioned that under the current School Security Grant Program, replacement of items is not an eligible expense. It was suggested that the Council recommend that the legislature create a separate funding mechanism for security purposes for schools looking to be reimbursed for replacement security infrastructure items. Alternatively, the School Security Grant Program itself could be amended to make such expenses eligible costs.
    1. It was discussed that numerous security upgrades will involve the swapping out of older hardware for new.
  - Meeting more prescriptive standards should be easier for new construction over renovations or retrofitting.
  - Chairman DeFronzo asked for Council and staff to develop a list of more prescriptive items.
    1. It was suggested that the SSIC infrastructure standards be broken down into 3 major components.
      - Critical Infrastructure.
      - Other areas of concern. These have yet to be identified.
      - Natural hazards (hurricanes, earthquakes etc), which are already included in state building codes.
    2. The Council was asked to first concentrate on 7-8 critical areas of impact.
    3. Ron Jakubowski asked that windows in doors be one of the specific items addressed.
    4. 7 critical items were identified based upon public comment, expert advice, staff, council members and statute.
      - Entryways
      - Windows/Glass
      - Entrance Doors
      - Locking Systems
      - CCTV

- Classroom security
  - Other Security Infrastructure and Design Strategies
  - 5. Staff was then asked to start developing more specific standards in the 7 areas identified.
  - 6. Guidelines for less critical areas would also be established. This remains an ongoing discussion.
  - 7. A waiver for schools that are simply unable to meet standards based on certain circumstances was discussed.
  - 8. Reasonable renovations and costs for projects were also discussed.
- The Next SSIC meeting, scheduled for October 24<sup>th</sup>, may include a presentation by the U.S. Department of Home Land Security. Staff will be following up with this.
  - Time, Date & Location of Next Meeting
    - Thursday October 24<sup>th</sup>
    - 5:30pm to 7:30pm
    - State Education Resource Facility
  - Adjournment

## 5 MEETING END

Meeting Schedule End: 7:30pm

Meeting Actual End: 7:32pm