

ANTI-BULLYING PROGRAMS IN ORANGE COUNTY SCHOOLS

“...if we share a sense of community and the courage to seek justice, we can make our schools better places to learn and our community’s better places to live.” Raymond W. Rast, Ph.D—Assistant Professor, Department of History, CSUF

SUMMARY:

The 2011-2012 Orange County Grand Jury has investigated bullying in Orange County schools. There has been an increased awareness in recent years (of the issue) of bullying. The Grand Jury believes bullying to be a serious issue. This study began with no formal definition of bullying. School children, display through behavior, an innate sense of injustice when typical bullying experiences are encountered. Some cry, some withdraw and others fight back appropriately or inappropriately. As the study developed it became clear that a uniform definition of bullying was needed throughout the school system. By defining bullying for statistical purposes, a baseline could be established from which to measure progress. New legislation contained in Assembly Bill 1156, Assembly Bill 746 and Assembly Bill 9 assists in clarifying the definition of bullying. The 2011-2012 Grand Jury is in agreement with the legal definitions of bullying. At the present time each school district is free to define bullying in its own terms. Thus, it is difficult to track trends in bullying in Orange County.

In examining Orange County elementary, intermediate and high schools, it was apparent that bullying was an issue that the schools were taking steps to address. Bullying incidents occur at all grade levels. Schools have implemented anti-bullying programs both commercially made and school site developed. How effective these programs are remains unclear. One reason is the lack of a definition of bullying to benchmark the results against. Data and observations from school visits conclude and recommend that schools should consider the following:

- Post anti-bullying school policy for students
- Establish a procedure for tracking bullying incidents and studying trends
- Utilize the expanded definition of bullying established in the new State legislation AB 1156, AB 9, AB 746
- Establish clear communication with students/staff regarding confidentiality in reporting bullying.

This report concludes with additional recommendations to all Orange County Schools and the Orange County Superintendent of Schools. New legislation effective July 1, 2012 will give additional direction to schools regarding the development and implementation of policies and procedures addressing bullying.

REASON FOR STUDY:

All students have the right to attend campuses that are safe. One of our highest priorities is to protect Orange County students from violence and prevent it whenever possible.

Enacted Assembly Bill 537 (Sec. 1) states that educators observe how violence affects youth every day. Educators know firsthand that the learning process is materially impeded when a student is concerned about his or her safety. Every school district in Orange County has statutory responsibility for implementing its own programs as well as teacher/administration training to address this issue. It is important to benchmark the implementation of anti-bullying programs and training in schools. This study surveyed these programs and, received testimony regarding bullying incidents. In addition, the study looked at school anti-bullying policy and procedures.

The primary purposes of the study are:

- All District Superintendents were contacted regarding anti-bullying programs and administration/teacher training provided by Orange County schools.
- To understand the personal effects and ramifications of being a bully victim and the role of the school concerning bullying incidents.
- To recommend a standard definition of bullying be used by all schools in Orange County in order to facilitate the tracking of incidents of bullying at the county level.

METHODOLOGY:

There are 27 individual school districts in Orange County. The 2011-2012 Grand Jury began its investigation by requesting from each of the district superintendents, information about anti-bullying/anti-harassment and teacher training programs they currently recommend to their schools. All superintendents responded they had anti-bullying programs in place for both administration/teachers and students. The next step was to examine district program involvement at elementary, intermediate and high school levels in Orange County.

Additionally, this study examined anti-bullying programs implemented in Orange County schools. This was researched by creating a more refined survey to interview school principals. The five Supervisorial District boundaries were used. From each of the five Supervisorial Districts, three schools with the largest student population were selected for study: one elementary, one intermediate and one high school. Each of these schools was selected from different school districts within each Supervisorial District. Fifteen schools and their principals were then visited and interviewed by the 2011-2012 Grand Jury.

The 2011-2012 Grand Jury was given the opportunity to interview parents of bullied victims. The interviews uncovered the victims' experiences and revealed how the school handled each

situation. These interviews were used as background information. In addition, one Orange County student explained to this Grand Jury their experience of being a bully victim. This is included in the report.

Interviewed Lee Hirsch, director of the documentary film, 'Bully.'

Examined the AERIES software program contracted by most Orange County school districts to, among other things, enter student incident reports into computer filed codes. Aeries incident reports may include bullying/harassment or other forms of behavioral issues. The California Healthy Kids Survey is given to many Orange County students grades 5, 7, 9, and 11 annually. The Module A section of this survey inquires of students, among other things, their bullying experiences.

Analyzed Assembly Bill 1156, Assembly Bill 746 and Assembly Bill 9, newly passed legislation addressing Bullying/Harassment.

Background/Facts

Posting of Anti-discrimination/ Anti-harassment Policy

Education Code 234.1 states that antidiscrimination and antiharassment policies be posted in all schools and offices, including staff lounges and pupil government meeting areas. During the interview process, all five elementary, five intermediate and five high schools were asked if policies were posted. At no educational level (elementary, intermediate, high school) was the policy posted in all locations. The staff lounge and student handbook were cited as the most frequent locations.

California Healthy Kids Survey:

The California Healthy Kids Survey authorized by the California Department of Education is administered to students in most Orange County schools. The 2011-2012 Grand Jury was interested in intermediate and high school student responses to this survey's bullying questions. Therefore, the Module A section of the Healthy Kids Survey was analyzed.

When reviewing the Healthy Kids Survey, all Module A questions that referred to different bullying/harassment scenarios were analyzed. Results from most of these questions indicated 7th grade students demonstrated a higher level of involvement in these bullying scenarios.

Additional Module A questions indicated 9th grade students feel the least safe in their schools. This grade level experienced being threatened with a weapon more than any other grade level.

The appendix contains questions and a summary of responses contained in the California Healthy Kids Survey.

Definition of Bullying

A commonly accepted definition of bullying is as follows: bullying is defined as aggressive behavior that is intentional, repeated over time and involves an imbalance of power or strength. Bullying can take many forms, such as hitting or punching, teasing or name-calling, intimidation through gestures, social exclusion and sending or posting insulting messages or pictures by cell phone or online (also known as cyber-bullying). This definition comes from the San Mateo County Times, USA Weekend Magazine, February 4-6, 2011, Pg. 6-7.

Professor Dan Olweus, an internationally renowned Norwegian researcher has provided common examples of school type bullying, which are seen at all grade levels. They include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Saying hurtful and unpleasant things
- Making fun of others
- Using mean and hurtful nicknames
- Completely overlooking someone
- Deliberately excluding someone from a group of friends
- Hitting, kicking, pulling hair, pushing etc.
- Telling lies
- Spreading false rumors
- Sending mean notes
- Trying to get other students to dislike another person

The 2011-2012 Grand Jury found that the definition of “bullying” evolves over time, and no concise definition of bullying is readily available in one document. The legal definition is found in various codes, sections, as well as in legislative bills. Three new bills have recently been signed into law that imposes new requirements on schools in preventing and responding to bullying and cyber bullying incidents. These three bills will redefine “bullying,” require districts to implement new policies, and revise their current policies concerning bullying, complaint procedures and student discipline. This will help standardize the meaning of bullying and make it easier to identify and track bullying incidents in the future. The 2011-2012 Grand Jury suggests that all school districts agree on one definition of bullying in the school setting. This will assist school communities in recognizing, understanding, defining, and responding to bullying behaviors.

- Assembly Bill 1156 (AB 1156) effective July 1, 2012 broadens the definition of “bullying” to mean any severe or pervasive physical or verbal act or conduct, including communications made in writing or by means of an electronic act, and including one or more acts committed by a pupil or group of pupils. This bill also provides pupils who are

victims of bullying to be given priority for interdistrict attendance at the request of the person having legal custody of the pupil. AB 1156 encourages districts to include bullying policies and procedures in their comprehensive school safety plan and provide training to school personnel to recognize bullying.

- Assembly Bill 9 (AB 9) effective July 1, 2012 (Seth's Law) will require school districts to adopt a policy that prohibits discrimination, harassment, intimidation and bullying, be responsive to complaints about bullying, train personnel how to recognize and intervene in bullying and make resources available to victims of bullying. The policy that is adopted must be posted in all schools and offices, including staff lounges and pupil government meeting rooms.
- Assembly Bill 746 (AB746) effective January 1, 2012, amends the definition of "cyberbullying" although it will be subsumed by AB 1156 as of July 1, 2012. This bill defines an "electronic act" as "transmission of a communication, including but not necessarily limited to, a message, text, sound, or image, or a post on a social network internet web site by means of an electronic device, including but not necessarily limited to, a telephone, wireless telephone or other wireless communication device, computer, or pager." This bill is an update of earlier legislation.

Standardized Information Systems

In order to standardize the accumulation of data throughout the schools in Orange County a standardized information system is needed. Aeries is a computer software program that offers a "Student Information System" to schools and school districts that addresses this need.

The Aeries system is presently used by most Orange County schools and school districts. Unfortunately, this system has ninety-two (92) codes listed under "Assertive Discipline." Instances of bullying are typically filed under "Assertive Discipline." Due to the flexibility and wide range of available codes, schools and districts can vary greatly in which codes they use to record bullying instances. This results in a lack of uniformity in recording bullying incidents and prevents meaningful statistics from being compiled.

By limiting the number of codes to be used and agreement by all schools to utilize the same system to track bullying, a more comprehensive analysis will be possible. Trends will become apparent over time. Because of this knowledge, programs that are more effective can be developed to remediate bullying and harassment.

In 2007, the National Center for School Engagement conducted a study that was funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Researchers found "bullying in a box" curriculums that are pre-fabricated and generic to be ineffective compared to effective intentional, student focused engagement strategies. In the future standardized data might shed a light on the most effective approach to address anti-bullying programs for Orange County students.

A Case Study in Bullying

While investigating the issue of bullying the 2011-2012 Orange County Grand Jury interviewed parents of bullied victims. In one case, they interviewed both the parent and the child. The following case study is included in this report to illustrate the serious consequences bullying has on the victim.

The following is a true story. It reflects the importance of maintaining confidentiality when investigating violations of school policy. The story illustrates the consequences of an inadvertent breach of confidentiality. Identifying data including names, gender, age, and grade level, have been changed to protect the identity of the students.

This incident takes place in an Orange County intermediate school and begins with “Rita” an older friend of “Laurie’s.” Laurie noticed that Rita had brought a prohibited item to school, and was attempting to show other students. Although Laurie was alarmed, she was hesitant to report this incident because, among other things, Rita was a very popular student.

After discussing this with her parents, Laurie decided to report this incident to the school principal who asked her to complete a statement form. Laurie was hesitant and expressed her concern that the school maintains her confidentiality. However, within one week of the incident report, Laurie began to notice students at her school pointing fingers at her, talking behind her back, and accusing her of “ratting” on Rita. Although she denied it, the accusations continued. Unfortunately, because her name was not redacted from the incident report, other students were able to identify her. The bullying incidents at school increased in number and soon expanded into cyber bullying.

Ultimately, this resulted in Laurie’s parents placing her in a private school at considerable expense to the family. Laurie, along with her family, experienced great emotional stress. She lost her peer group at a sensitive time in her development. Fortunately, for Laurie she came from a nurturing and supportive family and did not feel isolated and alone. Less fortunate students who face harassment and bullying have been known to consider suicide.

The school must exercise great caution that confidentiality be maintained. Unfortunately in Laurie’s case a serious breakdown in the system occurred. Laurie was a strong academic student and able to maintain her grades. However, in many cases of bullying and harassment, the student is no longer able to concentrate on their studies, and they drop out of school or turn to other escape avenues. Bullying/harassment are serious behaviors that often results in long-term suffering and damage to the victim.

Interview with Lee Hirsch who directed the documentary entitled ‘Bully’

Lee Hirsch’s film, “Bully,” is a portrait of the way children interact and how some teachers react when bullying incidents occur. When asked what his advice would be to best address schools that still struggle with bullying incidents, Hirsch responded, “Dealing with bullying needs to be a

school by school project. Programs are great, but they do not by themselves create a better school climate. Programs aside, there needs to be good leadership...parent to school to child. Ultimately, principals and vice principals set the climate on school campuses. Long term, we need social and emotional learning throughout Kindergarten through 12th grade rather than one exceptional assembly given at school.”¹

Hirsch himself was a victim of bullying. Hirsch believes the problem has become worse with the rise of social media. After hearing about several cases of bullied kids that reached a breaking point, Hirsch decided to make the documentary. Acknowledging the movie is a starting point, Hirsch feels the film, sends messages to young people to stand up to bullies.

Members of the Orange County Grand Jury were given the opportunity to view a special showing of “Bully.” The documentary presented several examples of students being victims of bullying. The movie confirms that bullying is a problem that is ongoing and prevalent which needs to be addressed.

Conclusions

This Grand Jury found evidence that all school districts are aware of bullying and taking steps to address the issue. By focusing on communication and coordination among the districts, positive steps can be taken to increase effectiveness in addressing bullying. The Aeries System or any standardized reporting system that bring uniformity to the recording of bullying incidents will aid Orange County in determining the scope of the problem. The code mandates that the school districts review their bullying procedures in light of the new legislation contained in AB1156, AB746 and AB9 and establish a common definition of bullying to be used by all districts. Consistency of data will be increased through standardization of definitions. Data leads to the recognition of trends that highlight areas of need. Limited resources can be focused on the most needed areas in addressing the problem of bullying.

FINDINGS/Conclusions

In accordance with California Penal Code 933 and 933.05 the 2011-2012 Orange County Grand Jury requires responses from each agency affected by the Findings/Conclusions presented in this section. The responses are to be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.

Based on its study of bullying in Orange County, the 2011-2012 Orange County Grand Jury makes the following Findings/Conclusions:

¹ Interview of film director Lee Hirsch, March 8, 2012

F1. Not all Orange County schools use the same technology, procedures and codes to record bullying or harassment incidents.

F2. New legislation AB1156 takes effect July 1, 2012, and broadens the definition of “Bullying.

F3. Education Code 234.1 requiring posting of anti-bullying/anti-harassment policies in prescribed areas was not evident in all schools visited.

F4. Based on witness testimony, confidentiality was not maintained in a bullying incident as prescribed in California Education Code section 234.1.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

In accordance with California Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05, the 2011-2012 Grand Jury requires responses from each agency affected by the recommendations presented in this section. The responses are to be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.

Based on its investigation of bullying in Orange County, the 2011-2012 Orange County Grand Jury makes the following recommendations:

R1. Recommend a county wide compatible information system for reporting incidents of bullying be explored by all school districts.

R2. Recommend all countywide schools agree upon the same definition of bullying.

R3. Each district review standardized procedures to protect a bully victim and bystanders’ confidentiality as stated in Education Code 234.1

R4. By January 2013, Orange County Superintendent of Schools creates an oversight committee to monitor the mandates and implementation contained in Assembly Bills, AB1156, AB9, and AB746.

R5. Recommend Orange County Superintendent of Schools create a committee for the purpose of standardizing a definition of bullying to be used by all schools county wide when recording a bullying incident.

R6. Recommend each district explore the development of a county wide standard information system for recording incidents of bullying.

R7. All schools post anti-bullying/anti-harassment policy in offices, staff lounges and student government meeting areas as prescribed in Education Code 234.1.

REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS:

In accordance with California Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05, the 2011-2012 Grand Jury requires responses from each agency affected by the recommendations presented in this section.

The responses are to be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.

The California Penal Code Section 933(c) requires any public agency which the Grand Jury has reviewed, and about which it has issued a final report, to comment to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the agency. Such comment shall be made no later than 90 days after the Grand Jury publishes its report (filed with the clerk of the Court); except that in the case of a report containing findings and re commendations pertaining to a department or agency headed by an elected County official (e.g. District Attorney, Sheriff, etc.), such comment shall be made within 60 days to the Presiding Judge with an information copy sent to the Board of Supervisors.

Furthermore, California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a), (b), (c), details, as follows, the manners in which such comment(s) are to be made:

(a) As to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:

(1) The respondent agrees with the finding

(2) The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefore.

(b) As to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

(1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.

(2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.

(3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This time frame shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

(4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefore.

(c) If a finding or recommendation of the grand jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or department headed by an elected officer, both the agency or department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the grand jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision making authority. The response of the elected agency or department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency or department.

Comments to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court in compliance with the Penal Code Section 933.05 are required from the:

<u>Responding Agency</u>	<u>Findings</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
Orange County School Districts	F1, F2, F3, F4,	R1, R2, R3, R6, R7
Orange County Superintendent of Schools		R4, R5,

Appendix: A **School Programs:**

The 2011-2012 Grand Jury completed interviews at elementary, middle and high school level with administration officials. From those interviews, it became apparent that various programs/clubs are in place to help students deal with bullying situations and to support student growth in problem solving behavior issues. The following are brief summaries of programs that were brought to the attention of this Grand Jury. This is a sampling of programs and not a complete list.

Rachel’s Challenge: “Start a Chain Reaction” In memory of Rachel Scott—a victim of the Columbine High School Shootings

Rachel’s Challenge is a program that is designed to inspire, equip and empower students K-12 to make a positive difference in their world. A powerful partnership can replace bullying and violent behavior on a school campus with kindness and compassion so students can learn in a safer, more respectful environment. Rachel’s Challenge objectives for schools are:

- Create a safe learning environment for all students by re-establishing civility and delivering proactive antidotes to school violence and bullying.
- Improve academic achievement by engaging students’ hearts, heads and hands in the learning process.
- Provide students with social/emotional education that is both colorblind and culturally relevant.
- Train adults to inspire, equip and empower students to affect permanent positive change.

Cyber Saavy Safety Week:

High school students participate in a school-wide program to encourage safe use of the internet. Each grade level takes part in a specific lesson facilitated by their teacher. Lessons included in the program are as follows:

- 9th grade—Social Networks and Cyber Bullying
- 10th grade—Social Networks and On line Predators
- 11th grade—Passwords and Phishing
- 12th grade—Digital Footprint and Online Reputation

Too Good For Violence/Drugs:

“Too Good For Drugs/Violence” is a supplemental curriculum taught to 4th-8th graders. The program consists of 10 lessons teaching strategies for dealing with peer pressure and how to make good decisions. The four focus strands are: (1) conflict resolution, (2) anger management, (3) respect for self and others and (4) effective communication. Parents are invited to participate in completing lessons at home.

Web Days-Welcome Everybody:

WEB “Welcome Every Body” is a middle school program designed to help incoming students succeed socially and academically as they transition from elementary school. Setting foot for the first time in a middle school can be intimidating. WEB is built on the belief that students can help students succeed. WEB leaders are positive role models motivating leading and teaching incoming students about the school. Activities include orientation, picnics, scavenger hunts, movie afternoons and WEB focus days.

Pal-Peer Assistance Leadership:

The PAL “Peer Assistance Leadership Program” is a school-based peer-to-peer youth development program for students in grades 4-12 built upon a philosophy of students helping students. Established in 1980 by the Orange County Department of Education, the PAL program addresses the underlying causes of violence, tobacco, alcohol and drug use by youth. The program encourages PAL students and their peers to make healthy life decisions and provides opportunities to create a supportive and safe school environment. PAL supports students healthy lifestyles by building resiliency and assets through youth leadership, mentoring, conflict resolution, cross-age teaching, peer helping, service learning and prevention activities. The PAL program can enhance and support all student leadership programs in schools.

PBIS—Positive Behavior Intervention and Support:

This nationwide program is widely used. PBIS is a system change method that promotes positive student behaviors through strategies incorporated into the classroom. This is a four year training program that works with teachers to increase their behavioral skills to change teacher behavior in order to change student behavior. PBIS is designed to positively affect not only the student behavior but student quality of life.

BRIDGES—Building Bridges To Understanding:

The BRIDGES program has partnered with Orange County schools that have demonstrated a commitment to this mission and to creating a campus that is safe, welcoming and equitable. BRIDGES is a multi-year program designed to improve inter-group relations by partnering with

schools and communities to create, advocate and sustain a safe, inclusive climate that respects society's diversity. BRIDGES trains teams of people to help create a safe environment free of anti-harassment/bullying.

Gay-Straight Alliance:

Gay-straight alliances are student organizations found in high schools that are intended to provide a safe and supportive environment for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth and their straight allies. The goal of gay-straight alliances is to make their school community safe and welcoming to all students regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. They participate in national campaigns to raise awareness such as the Day of Silence, National Coming out Day, and No Name Calling Week.

Appendix: B

Sample of Survey Questions used during interviews with site administrators entitled, 'Anti-Bullying/Anti-Harassment Survey' are as follows:

1. May we see/have redacted bullying/harassment incident reports for 2010-2012 and so far this year?
2. How many bullying or harassment incidents were reported and recorded in your incident reports for school year 2010-2011?
3. How many so far for the current school year?
4. What anti-bullying/anti-harassment student programs and clubs have been made available to your school this year and last?
5. Are you familiar with the programs GLISEN, BRIDGES, and PBIS? If so, please explain your understanding or knowledge of these programs and their implementation, if any, at your school.
6. Does your district or your school decide what anti-bullying/anti-harassment student programs will be offered?
7. Who decides on the implementation of these programs?
8. What is the frequency of the programs?
9. For how many years has your school been offering these programs?
10. Are your students surveyed following these programs? If so, how is this done?
11. How are the results of these surveys used and who reviews them?
12. What training programs have been presented to the administration and teachers each school year?
13. Does your district or your school decide which training programs are recommended for use?
14. Who decides the actual implementation of these training programs?
15. Are teacher training programs assessed or evaluated for appropriateness and effectiveness, and if so, by whom and how are the results used?
16. Did bullying or harassment incidents reports increase or decrease after programs were presented to the students?
17. Have anti-bullying/anti-harassment incident reports increased or decreased after training programs were completed by the administration and teachers?
18. What is your school/district's protocol for student/teacher incident report entries?
19. How does your school and/or district determine if a bullying/harassment incident will be included in the formal incident reports?

20. What additional efforts have the administration and/or teachers implemented on campus or in classrooms to help create an anti-bullying/anti-harassment atmosphere?
21. If your district suggests the use of anti-bullying/anti-harassment programs how, if at all, are the schools tracked or monitored for program implementation?
22. Please indicate the person, and/or committee, and/or department that would monitor program implementation.
23. Mandatory Postings (AB354, Ed Code 234.1 (D) Do you have any anti-bullying/anti-harassment policies posted and where are they? (Office, staff lounge, student gov't room, etc.)
24. Please provide copies of any materials available for students and staff regarding anti-bullying programs.

Appendix: C

Following is a list of O.C. districts surveyed by mail requesting all anti-bullying/anti-harassment programs/clubs recommended to schools in the district.

1. Anaheim School District
2. Anaheim Union High School District
3. Brea Olinda Unified School District
4. Buena Park School District
5. Capistrano Unified School District
6. Centralia School District
7. Cypress School District
8. Fountain Valley School District
9. Fullerton Joint Union High School District
10. Fullerton School District
11. Garden Grove Unified School District
12. Huntington Beach City School District
13. Huntington Beach Union High School District
14. Irvine Unified School District
15. La Habra City School District
16. Los Alamitos Unified School District
17. Lowell Joint School District
18. Magnolia School District
19. Newport-Mesa Unified School District

20. Ocean View School District
21. Orange Unified School District
22. Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District
23. Saddleback Valley Unified School District
24. Santa Ana Unified School District
25. Savanna School District
26. Tustin Unified School District
27. Westminster School District

Appendix: D

California Healthy Kids Surveys were obtained from the following schools and in some cases their web sites.

1. Agnes Smith Elementary
2. Horace Mann Elementary
3. La Veta Elementary
4. Peters Elementary
5. Buena Park Jr. High
6. McAuliffe Middle School
7. Pioneer Middle School
8. Thurston Middle School
9. Willis Warner Middle School
10. Trabucco Hills High School
11. Troy High School
12. Valencia High School

Appendix: E

California Healthy Kids Survey Results

Specific questions taken from the California Healthy Kids survey are as follows:

7 th	9 & 11 th	Question:	Results
A14	A15	I feel safe in my school	(Results: 7 th graders felt the safest. 73% 9 th graders felt the least safe 65.50% 11 th graders) 70.50%
A82	A100	Been pushed, shoved, slapped, hit or kicked	(Results: 7 th graders experienced this the most 42.50% 11 th grade the least 19.25% 9 th grade) 29.25%
A83	A101	Been afraid of being beaten up	(Results: 7 th graders were most afraid 22.20% 11 th grade the least 11.50% 9 th grade) 15.50%
A84	A102	Been in a physical fight	(Results: 7 th graders were most often 22.00% 11 th grade the least 12.75% 9 th grade) 18.50%
A85	A103	Had mean rumors or lies spread about you	(Results: 7 th graders experienced the most 48.40% 11 th grade the least 33.50% 9 th grade) 35.75%
A86	A104	Had sexual jokes, comments, or gestures made to you	(Results: 7 th and 9 th were virtually the same 44.40% 11 th graders experienced the least but only by 3% points) 41.50%
A87	A105	Been made fun of because of looks or the way you talk.	(Results: 7 th graders experienced the most 41.75% 11 th graders the least) 29.25% 9 th grade) 35%
A93	A111	Been threatened with a weapon	(Results: Although the numbers are relatively small and close together, the 9 th graders experienced this the most—8.50% The 11 th graders the least —5.00% The 7 th graders were at 7.20%)
A 95	A113	Your race, ethnicity, or national origin	(Results: 7 th graders experienced this the most 17.80% 11 th grader the least 12.50% 9 th grade) 16.00%
A96	A114	Your religion	(Results: 7 th graders experienced this the most 12.00% 11 th graders the least 8.25% 9 th grade) 9.00%
A97	A115	Your gender (being male or female)	(Results: 7 th graders experienced this the most 8.00% 11 th graders the least 5.75% 9 th grade) 7.00%
A98	A116	Because you are gay or lesbian or someone thinks you are	(Results: 7 th grade the most 12/00% 11 th graders the least 6.75% 9 th grade) 8.25%
A99	A117	A physical or mental disability	(Results: The most—7 th and 9 th grades—virtually the same 5.55% The least grade 11 th 4.00%
A10 1	A119	How safe do you feel when you are at school?	(Results: 7 th graders Safe or very safe 73.30% 9 th graders 69.25% 11 th graders) 74.50% Unsafe or very unsafe 5.90% 5.75% 4.00%
A10 3	A120	How many times did other students spread mean rumors or lies about you on the internet (Facebook, My Space, e-mail?)	(Results:-- 7 th grade –the least 20.00% 9 th grade—the most 22.50% 11 th grade) 21.00%

Appendix: F

California Education Code Section 234.1

The following has been paraphrased and is not intended to be a complete analysis of California Education Code Section 234.1.

Local educational agencies, are responsible for the following: (a) Adopting a policy that prohibits discrimination, harassment, intimidation, and bullying based on the actual or perceived characteristics set forth in Section 422.5 of the Penal Code and Section 220, and disability, gender, gender identification, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or association with a person, or group with one or more of these perceived characteristics. The policy shall include a statement that the policy applies to all acts related to school activity or school attendance occurring within a school under the jurisdiction of the superintendent of the school district. (b) Adopt a process for receiving and investigating complaints of discrimination, harassment, intimidation, and bullying based on any of the actual or perceived characteristics set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code and Section 220, and disability, gender identification, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or association or a person or group with one or more of these perceived characteristics. The complaint process shall include, but not limited to, all of the following:

(1) A requirement that, if school personnel witness an act of discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying, he or she shall take immediate steps to intervene when safe to do so.

(2) A timeline to investigate and resolve complaints of discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying that shall be followed by all schools under the jurisdiction of the school district.

(3) An appeal process afforded to the complainant should he or she disagree with the resolution of a complaint filed pursuant to this section.

(4) All forms developed pursuant to this process shall be translated pursuant to Section 48985.

(c) Publicized antidiscrimination, antiharassment, anti-intimidation, and antibullying policies adopted pursuant to subdivision (a), including information about the manner in which to file a complaint, to pupils, parents, employees, agents of the governing board, and the public. The information shall be translated pursuant to Section 48985.

(d) Posted the policy established pursuant to subdivision (a) in all schools and offices, including staff lounges and pupil government meeting rooms.

(e) Maintain documentation of complaints and their resolution for a minimum of one review cycle.

(f) Ensured that complainants are protected from retaliation and that the identity of a complainant alleging discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying remains confidential, as appropriate.

(g) Identified a responsible local educational agency officer for ensuring school district or county office of education compliance with the requirements of Chapter 5.3 (commencing with Section 4900) of Division 1 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 200) .