Date: June 25, 2018

The Honorable Charles Margines  
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court  
700 Civic Center Drive West  
Santa Ana, CA 92701

RE: 2017-2018 Orange County Grand Jury Report  
Safer Schools - What Can We Do?  
Response of the La Habra City School District

To the Honorable Charles Margines:

In accordance with California Penal Code section 933.05, the Orange County Grand Jury has requested that La Habra City School District respond to findings and recommendations in the 2017-2018 Orange County Grand Jury report entitled: "Safer Schools – What Can We Do?"

FINDINGS

F.1. School safety and security are priorities in every school district in the Orange County public school system.

Response to F.1.: The La Habra City School District agrees with this finding. School safety and security are a priority in the La Habra City School District.

F.2. The implementation of security measures for schools, in many cases, is limited by funding.

Response to F.2.: The La Habra City School District agrees with this finding. The extent to which our school can implement the type and extent of security measures is often dependent on funding.

F.3. Many Orange County school campuses were constructed to reflect an "open and inviting" atmosphere but are now faced with physical and philosophical security issues that challenge this thinking.

Response to F.3.: The La Habra City School District agrees with this finding. Of the nine schools within our district, nine can be considered to reflect an "open and inviting" atmosphere.

F.4. While every Orange County school district reported the use of a campus visitor sign-in process, there is a lack of procedural consistency among school campuses.

Response to F.4.: La Habra City School District agrees with this finding as it pertains to its schools.
F.5.: Many districts or school campuses do not require all teachers, staff, and volunteers to wear ID badges while on campus, making identification of authorized personnel difficult for substitute teachers, student teachers, visitors, volunteers, and first responders.

**Response to F.5.** La Habra City School District agrees with this finding, as it pertains to our schools, we require identification.

F.6.: Currently, student ID badges, which could easily distinguish students from non-students of similar age, are not required to be worn by Orange County middle and high school students.

**Response to F.6** La Habra City School District agrees with this finding as it pertains to its schools.

F.7.: Campus personnel and volunteers, while on duty outside the classroom, have an inconsistent usage or availability of communication devices for emergency situations.

**Response to F.7.** La Habra City School District agrees with this finding as it pertains to its schools.

F.8.: There is no documentation or reporting protocol within the districts of individual security incidents, making it difficult to track, analyze, and summarize such incidents.

**Response to F.8.** The La Habra City School District disagrees with this finding as it pertains to our schools, the District requires all incidents be reported.

F.9.: While every Orange County school develops a school safety plan, few schools have used an individual school security assessment to identify deficiencies or to develop the required plan.

**Response to F.9.** The La Habra City School District agrees with this finding. As it pertains to our schools, the District does have individual site threat assessments

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

R.1.: School districts should explore all possible funding resources that may be available in order to implement desired security measures. (F.2.)

**Response to R.1.** The recommendation requires further analysis. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

R.2.: School districts should re-evaluate the lack of secure fencing on all school campuses and present a report to their respective boards by December 31, 2018, outlining their plans to make campuses more secure. (F.2, F.3)
Response to R.2.: The recommendation requires further analysis. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

R.3.: School districts should implement procedures to ensure that all campuses maintain a complete, daily log (electronic or manual) of every visitor and volunteer entering and exiting the campus, excluding program events such as awards ceremonies or stage or musical productions. (F.4.)

Response to R.3.: The recommendation has been implemented; each school is required to document all visitors.

R.4.: School districts should implement procedures to ensure that photo identification is required of all campus visitors and volunteers before a visitor's badge is issued. (F.4, F.5.)

Response to R.4.: The recommendation requires further analysis. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

R.5.: School districts should implement procedures to ensure that all faculty and staff are required to wear visible photo ID badges while on campus. (F.5.)

Response to R.5.: The recommendation has been implemented.

R.6.: All school districts with middle or high school campuses should consider using student ID cards in a format to be worn as student ID badges while on campus. (F.6.)

Response to R.6.: The recommendation requires further analysis. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

R.7.: School districts should evaluate available communication devices and ensure that custodial and supervisory personnel, as well as safety resource officers, playground supervisors and coaches, have two-way radios or equivalent communication devices with them at all times, enabling instant two-way communication with the office. (F.7.)

Response to R.7.: The recommendation requires further analysis. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

R.8.: School districts should consider requiring that all campus incidents of unauthorized access be recorded, tracked, and reported to the district office on a quarterly basis. All districts should share these reports with the Orange County Department of Education. (F.8.)

Response to R.8.: The recommendation requires further analysis. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.
R.9.: School districts should evaluate requiring each school to perform a school security assessment to evaluate their current school safety plan. (F.9)

Response to R.9.: The recommendation requires further analysis. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report

Sincerely,

Christeen Betz, Chief Business Official

cc: Orange County Grand Jury
700 Civic Center Drive West
Santa Ana, CA 92701