

CHAPTER

10

**COMPREHENSIVE APPROACHES TO SCHOOL
SAFETY AND SECURITY:
AN INTERNATIONAL VIEW**

**Margaret
Shaw**

*International Centre
for the Prevention of
Crime, Canada*

Abstract: "Comprehensive" approaches to school safety involve collaboration and partnerships between a wide range of actors inside and outside of schools. Using the results of a review of policies and practice on school safety, this paper describes international trends in school safety, including definitions and incidence of problems, programmes and projects in nine countries and general approaches and policies. In the light of recent trends and challenges in this area, the paper concludes by defining the characteristics of comprehensive and non-comprehensive approaches to school safety.

Two Hurt in Teenage Shootout

New Orleans: Two teenage boys shot and wounded each other with the same gun during a fight at their middle school yesterday after a 13-year-old expelled student slipped a weapon to one of them through a fence...Witnesses said the 8th graders had argued before the shootings at the school where students must pass through a metal detector to enter...The boy accused of providing the handgun was arrested...at his home in a nearby housing project...The school recently expelled the boy for fighting. (Associated Press, September, 2000)

Introduction

- In 1997, a secondary school located in an economically depressed area in London, United Kingdom, was beset by problems of racism and violence between ethnic and white students. The area had experienced waves of immigration and the exodus of some of the existing population ("white flight"). Students at the school came from 85 different countries, and there were high levels of learning and behavioural difficulties, absenteeism, truancy and staff turnover. Racial fighting and intimidation occurred in the surrounding streets, with students calling up reinforcements on their cell phones as rival groups met (Shaw, 2001).
- In South Africa in 2001, a reported 30% of rape cases among girls aged 15 to 19 involved a school teacher (Human Rights Watch, 2001). Schools generally experience serious problems of violence, guns and gangs, in a society with historically high levels of violence.¹
- In the early 1990s in East Hartford High School, Connecticut, United States – with students from 70 countries speaking 40 languages – problems of violence, drug abuse, racial tensions and gangs had overloaded the capacity of the school staff and local social services to respond.
- In 1992, a primary school located in a low socio-economic area of Ontario, Canada, was experiencing high unemployment and population turnover, and increasing problems of crime and family violence. Local businesses were a target of vandalism and crime by students. The school had the lowest academic performance in the region and was proposed for closure.

Safety in school is a microcosm of safety in society: in the surrounding streets, community and neighbourhood, in the home, in other social institutions, and beyond. Comprehensive approaches to school safety involve collaboration and partnerships between a wide range

of actors inside and outside the school. In each of the cases described above, in the face of overwhelming challenges, these schools have worked collaboratively with local partners and communities to develop a strategy and range of programmes to effectively address their problems: they have used a comprehensive approach.

Review by the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime

The International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC) is a non-governmental organisation based in Montreal, Canada. The centre was established in 1994 to promote crime prevention and community safety. It is supported by governments, international and national organisations, and cities (www.crime-prevention-intl.org).

From 2000 to 2001, the ICPC – at the request of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, United States Department of Justice – carried out an international comparative review of policies and practice on school safety (Shaw, 2001).² An international approach, as compared to a national or regional one, permitted a fresh perspective. It provided an opportunity to observe patterns of activity, practice and policy development in other, unfamiliar contexts. Since the publication of the report, the ICPC has undertaken further work on the role of the police in schools, and in November 2002 it organised an international colloquium in Brussels, Belgium, on schools and crime prevention (International Observer, 2003).

Since the completion of the review, much has occurred in the area of school safety in terms of local and international events, and policy and project development. There have been further tragic events in schools in such countries as Australia, Germany, Japan and the United States. Population movements from rural to urban settings, legal and illegal migration, deteriorating social and economic conditions, and transnational organised crime are continuing to create pressures and challenges for national governments, local authorities, and schools and their communities (e.g. Ferola, 2002; Kromhout and van San, 2003). These factors can impede the social integration of families, children and youth, and exacerbate crime and victimisation.

In response to heightened feelings of insecurity and risk, some countries have renewed calls for reaction and deterrence, exclusion and suspension, and policies of zero tolerance. In some cases, these reactions derived from teaching organisations, which have called for greater staff protection from violent parents (Hayden, 2003). In other cases, responses have been more extreme.³ Strategies that address the threat of terrorism have been developed and debated in several countries. In the United States, for example, 98% of school resource officers (police working in schools) surveyed in 2002 reported that their schools were vulnerable to terrorist attacks, and 90% reported that students were at greater risk if the school resource officers did not carry guns (NASRO, 2002).

Yet over the same period, knowledge about effective school safety practices has expanded considerably. New collections of exemplary, good or promising practices have been published (e.g. Smith, 2003); data have been collected and tools developed that support effective practice (e.g. USDOJ, 2003); observatories on school violence have been

established, such as the European Observatory on School Violence in Bordeaux, France; manuals, guides and training materials have been written (e.g. USDOE, 2002); and a number of national, regional and international meetings have been organised by bodies such as the Council of Europe, the European Forum for Urban Security and the Australian Institute of Criminology. Each of these developments has reinforced the need to work in more collaborative, comprehensive ways.⁴

International trends

Increasing attention to school safety

Results of the ICPC review (Shaw, 2001) suggested that while incidents of violence in schools have always occurred, they have only recently received the attention of governments and the public. There are three principal reasons for this heightened awareness.

First, publicity surrounding violent school-related events in a number of countries has led to both increased awareness of problems and to over-reaction by the media, public and governments. Although these events are by no means typical – even in the United States, data collected since 1992 indicate that school-related deaths account for less than 1% of total youths killed – they have highlighted the fact that school violence can take place inside or outside the school, in primary, secondary or tertiary schools, and in urban, suburban or rural settings; and that violence may involve students, teachers, support staff as victims or perpetrators, as well as known intruders or complete strangers. In many countries, these highly publicised events have led to new legislation, protocols and directives. Over time, they have also resulted in greater awareness of the problems and their causes. Nevertheless, the media spotlight also distorts the reality of the problems, and has often led to over-reactive and “event-driven” government action.

Second, there has been a general change in attitude towards and increased awareness of the impacts of violent behaviour and victimisation among children and young people, especially bullying, fighting and intimidation. A youth survey in England and Wales, for example, found that 51% of 11- to 16-year-olds had been assaulted, 30% bullied and 29% experienced racism in school (International Observer, 2003). In most countries, these issues were almost totally ignored before the late 1980s. International research over the past ten years has demonstrated the serious short- and long-term effects of victimisation among children and adolescents in school. Dan Olweus’s pioneering Norwegian project in the 1980s, for example, demonstrated a 50% reduction in bullying using a “whole-school” approach – i.e. using a range of integrated initiatives involving all sectors of the school community. This approach is now being applied in countries outside Europe, including Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand and the United States (e.g. Rigby, 2002). Taxing, *bullismo*, and *le raquet*, are now well-researched terms in France, Italy and Scandinavia (Smith, 2003).

Third, there has been a consolidation of research and knowledge about the risk and protective factors for offending and victimisation, including school violence, and about effective practices. An increasing number of longitudinal studies in different countries

have shown the range of risk factors that predict future offending and victimisation, and those that protect children and young people from such involvement (ICPC, 1999; NCP, 1999). These include factors associated with the family, the environment, the individual and the school. Although in the past, few would have contested the important role of the school in mitigating behaviours such as offending, victimisation, truancy and exclusion, and in creating a positive climate and ethos to retain and nurture students, there is now a greater understanding of exactly how schools can decrease risk factors and increase protective factors for their students (Gottfredson *et al.*, 2000).

Given the *range* of social, environmental, familial and personal risk factors involved in offending and victimisation, there is a real need for cross-sectoral preventive programmes to tackle them. A growing body of evidence indicates that carefully targeted and implemented practices, including whole-school bullying programmes, *do* reduce the risks of violence and crime among young people. They are also likely to be cost effective. Many early intervention studies such as "Head Start" yield impressive results in terms of improved life circumstances, as well as providing cost benefits (Debarbieux and Blaya, 2001). In one United States study, for example, the cost of reducing crime by 10% was calculated as USD 228 per household if heavier prison sentences were used, compared with USD 32 per household using incentive programmes for youth to complete school (ICPC, 1999).⁵ Preventing young people from entering gangs is far more cost effective than working with gang members. Such knowledge about effective practice has driven much of the current work on school safety and bullying prevention.

The definition and incidence of problems

While these trends explain interest in school safety issues, the review concluded that there was an obvious lack of consensus about what constitutes "school safety" (Shaw, 2001). In fact, it is difficult to compare patterns and trends internationally as few countries – with the exception of the United States (USDOD, 2003) – regularly collect data.⁶ Definitions of terms such as "violence" also vary widely across countries, as do political and historical circumstances. In addition, much of the information, policies and projects on school safety are related to bullying, vandalism and theft in schools, not to serious violence or attacks from outside.

Nevertheless, many countries expressed similar concerns about increasing school violence, especially bullying and aggression. Schools want to be safe from the following:

- Accidents and injury.
- Theft.
- Bullying and intimidation.
- Intrusion.
- Sexual and racial harassment and intimidation.
- Fear of victimisation.

- Student violence and aggression against students/staff.
- Vandalism and arson.
- Group mobbing, extortion, taxing, drug/gang activities.
- Violence by teachers/staff.
- Violence by parents against students/staff.

Some of these concerns reflect the change in attitudes towards bullying and the increasing use of formal exclusion and various types of zero tolerance policies. Other concerns arise as a result of changing reporting practices. A Swedish study (Estrada, 2001), which compared school records in Sweden from the 1980s and 1990s, showed clearly how changing reporting practices have accounted for apparent increases in school-based aggression. Until the mid-1980s in Sweden, only serious incidents were reported to the police; schools dealt with minor incidents internally. When all incidents were required to be reported to the police, violent incidents increased by 300% since 1993; this increase could be accounted for by acts of minor aggression and not serious patterns of violence. Overall, patterns in several countries suggest that:

- Most countries report problems of aggression, minor assaults and bullying in all types of schools.
- Some countries believe that school violence has increased in recent years; others attribute recorded increases to changing attitudes towards violence, changing reporting systems and greater awareness of its existence.
- Frequent and persistent problem behaviours are restricted to a minority of students, or are widespread in schools in areas with serious social and economic problems.
- A few countries have serious problems of youth violence, with group extortion, racial attacks and harassment, sexual assault, gang activity and weapons and drug use affecting schools located in many cases in heavily deprived inner city or suburban areas.
- Most aggressive and violent behaviours are inflicted by students against their peers, much less often against teachers, and rarely by teachers against students.
- In many countries, reported levels of insecurity about school safety appear to be higher than in the past.

International programmes and projects

In response to these trends, a number of pro-active and preventive school-based programmes and projects have been initiated in recent years. As a national study of delinquency prevention in the United States observed (Gottfredson *et al.*, 2000):

Schools currently employ an astonishingly large number and variety of programmes and activities to reduce or prevent problem behaviour.

There is a recognised need for a long-term strategy. For example, while zero tolerance policies, expulsion and suspension may bring short-term relief to school staff, they increase the risk of subsequent failure and re-offending. Such policies also serve to transfer the cost of responding to those students to another sector, namely the police and health and social services. However, a number of countries have developed cross-sectoral national, regional or local strategies on school safety, some of which are implemented within the broader context of national crime prevention policies. These strategies recognise the multi-dimensional causes of school safety problems, and the need for preventive, long-term plans that encourage partnerships between schools (teachers, students and support staff), parents, youth, health and social services, housing, employment and the police. They may provide funding for project development and implementation, including training and technical assistance. A number of country examples are provided below.

Australia

In Australia, both Commonwealth and state initiatives have addressed school safety issues (www.aic.gov.au/conferences/schools/). National Crime Prevention, in co-operation with other Commonwealth and state partners, is working to develop a consistent approach to school safety across all states, and is investing in long-term projects (*i.e.* eight to ten years) that aim to strengthen the capacity of schools, their staff and communities. The state of South Australia has undertaken a comprehensive review of school-based prevention projects and future policy. Innovative restorative approaches that deal with conflict in schools are being piloted in the states of Queensland and Australian Capital Territory (*e.g.* Morrison, 2002). Work is also being completed on school strategies to deal with gangs (White, 2002).

Belgium

Belgium has developed a series of action plans targeting school drop-out, provision of employment training and the needs of the immigrant community. It is also working to develop stronger links between police and schools.

Canada

Since 1998, the federal government's National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS) has conducted considerable research on "whole-school" bullying approaches (NCPS, 2004). It has also funded the implementation and evaluation of a number of innovative school-based programmes. The model comprehensive primary school project "Together We Light the Way" (www.togetherwelighttheway.com), for example, is being replicated in a number

of sites across the country. The programme aims to create a safe, respectful and caring community, and foster a sense of ownership that connects the school with its community. The project has resulted in significant reductions in school problem behaviours, such as bullying, and improvements in educational and other outcomes (see Dean, Leithwood and Leonard in this publication).

A number of provinces including Alberta, British Columbia, Quebec and Nova Scotia have also developed school mediation and anti-bullying initiatives.

Denmark

Denmark was the first country to develop a national crime prevention capacity; an integrated system of councils (SSP) has existed in almost all municipal areas in the country for the past 25 years. These councils bring together schools, police and social workers to reduce problems of crime and victimisation. School-based programmes focus on social education and conflict resolution. A series of pilot studies have also been initiated to provide special teacher training with the goal of improving school climate, conflict resolution and mediation skills.

Europe

The European Union has actively supported the CONNECT project, which reports on research, practice and networking on violence in schools in 17 European countries (Smith, 2003; Smith in this publication). The "Sécurités City and School" programme, supported by the European Forum for Urban Security, involves seven European cities exchanging their experience and thinking together about different means of optimising collaborative action on school violence (Vanhove and Raynal, 2004). Recently, the Council of Europe urged member states to take steps to promote local-level school partnerships to prevent school violence (COE, 2002).

France

In 1997, the French Government launched a national plan to combat violence in schools, and facilitated the establishment of school observatories that collect data on a range of indicators concerned with the health and safety of schools and their communities. The European Observatory on School Violence at the University of Bordeaux, for example, is now part of an international network of research. It presided over the Second International Conference on School Violence in Quebec in May 2003. As part of the national plan, 7 000 young people, many from areas of high unemployment, were trained to work as social mediators and school assistants; medical and social work staffing was increased in schools in areas of high risk; innovative intervention projects and project evaluation were promoted in the 26 regions most at risk of violence and delinquency; and victim support, citizenship and anti-violence education programmes were initiated in schools. As a result, the incidence of violence and delinquency in a number of regions has reduced.

Netherlands

School safety-related work in the Netherlands has focused on bullying, improved incidence response, safety of premises, social competence training and school capacity

building. The Amsterdam School Safety Project (VIOS, www.vios-amsterdam.nl) is a five-year regional project involving some 40 secondary schools. It uses school safety plans, physical improvements to the school, and curriculum and social supports to promote an integrative, preventative approach to school safety in participating schools (Soomeren, Steinmetz and Ruijsendaal, 2002).

South Africa

In South Africa, levels of school violence are extremely high; there are regular reports of serious violence, gang activity, and rape and sexual assault of girls in schools (Human Rights Watch, 2001). The 1999 report *Youth Violence in Schools* established the underlying causes of violence and advocated improvements in school support and care, and student self-esteem, identity, moral grounding and problem-solving skills. It also highlighted the importance of fostering the confidence and involvement of the community. Current approaches focus on targeting schools with the greatest need, using comprehensive safe school programmes. Exemplary projects such as Tiisa Thuto, CRISP and CASS are supported by schools, school authorities, national and local governments, and non-governmental organisations such as the Independent Project Trust (ITP) and Business Against Crime.

- *Tiisa Thuto*. This project involves developing partnerships between schools, parents, local businesses and community organisations, and implementing module programmes that address the needs of the individual school (e.g. victim support, life skills). Following a positive evaluation of this project, it will be implemented in schools across the entire province of Gauteng.
- *CRISP*. This programme facilitates the establishment of family resource centres outside schools to help strengthen families. It also organises school safety teams to link parents, schools, local organisations and the police.
- *CASS*. In the 1990s, ITP developed the SMART programme, which provided conflict resolution training to students, teachers and school governing bodies. However, continued violence and gang activity led to the realisation that a more fundamental approach was required. Thus, in 1997, CASS was initiated, which is a comprehensive model involving local community partners. National government developed guidelines and support materials for school managers, educators and safety committees. One innovative approach to school capacity building involved clustering local schools to facilitate sharing experiences, providing support and reducing programme development costs (Roper, 2002).

United Kingdom

In England and Wales, concern about social exclusion and youth crime has led to a number of initiatives to reduce school exclusion, truancy and crime, as well as increased investment in early education and support programmes. Project funding has targeted schools with serious problems, and high-risk groups or areas. In 1998, the Home Office allocated GBP 12 million to the Crime Reduction in Secondary Schools Project (CRISS). In this project, which included local and national evaluation, 103 schools set targets to

reduce bullying, truancy and crime over a two-year period.

In 2002, the Youth Justice Board (www.youth-justice-board.gov.uk), in co-operation with the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and the Association of Chief Police Officers, implemented a Safer School Partnerships project. Police officers were placed in selected schools in high crime areas, and 155 multi-agency youth crime prevention teams were established. All teams have a statutory duty to work with health and education officials, employment and justice agencies, and schools to develop prevention programmes. Mentoring programmes have also been established for elementary school students and for young drop-outs in need of training or employment. Home-school support projects were initiated for 11- to 17-year-olds with the aim of preventing school exclusion; in-school support workers provide student and parent support. A series of nine pilot projects using family group conferencing and mediation were also initiated to reduce social exclusion. A number of anti-bullying programmes and handbooks have been developed and evaluated.

In 1988, the Scottish Office sponsored the first government-sponsored research into bullying in the United Kingdom. The project was carried out in ten secondary schools in 1989 using a sample of 942 12- to 16-year-olds. In the 1990s, anti-bullying educational materials were developed for schools, and a number of initiatives started that addressed bullying issues (Mellor, 1997). In 1999, the Scottish Executive established the Anti-Bullying Network at the University of Edinburgh (www.antibullying.net).

United States

In the United States, the federal government has funded several major projects that address issues of school safety. The Hamilton Fish Institute in Washington, for example, co-ordinates the development and evaluation of school-based prevention strategies, and provides detailed guidelines on developing comprehensive approaches to school safety (www.hamfish.org). The Safe Schools Healthy Students initiative funds local education authorities, which work in partnership with public health officials, police, schools, and students and parents to develop violence prevention programmes (www.mentalhealth.org/safeschools). The United States Department of Education's Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, which recently published a compendium of exemplary and promising programmes (USDOE, 2002), has supported much of this work (www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osdfs). Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) have also developed a series of major school-based initiatives.

A number of states have initiated similar projects. The Safe Communities, Safe Schools project, which is co-ordinated by the Centre for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado, provides technical assistance and support to local schools and their communities. A Student Assistance Centre that was set up in East Hartford School, Connecticut, has reduced the number of school exclusions, suspensions and drop-outs by combining conflict resolution and peer mediation with a range of external agency supports, ranging from mental health and substance abuse to job training and police support (Meggie, Edwards and Gwozdz, 2001).

General approaches and policies

In summary, *specific programmes and initiatives* have focused on "whole-school" bullying approaches; early intervention with parent support and training; youth mentoring and support; school-based mediation and conflict resolution; anti-violence and gang education; anti-racism, substance abuse and healthy living programmes; and a range of police-school initiatives. The use of peer mediation and mentoring illustrate the importance of including young people in addressing problems and developing solutions. *Specific structures* – such as school resource centres, school safety committees, local multi-agency teams and school community liaison officers – have also been established to drive, co-ordinate and take responsibility for school safety policies.

On the basis of these country experiences, several characteristics of good, effective school safety programmes can be defined. Such programmes:

- Respond to events pro-actively, not reactively.
- Are socially inclusive, providing support and integration, not creating isolation or exclusion.
- Use school-community partnerships to plan and develop strategies and projects.
- Develop programmes suited to the general school population and to the needs of individual students at risk and their families.
- Target at-risk schools with evaluated, good-practice programmes.
- Involve young people themselves in developing, designing and carrying out projects.
- Use mediation and conflict resolution, and focus on the importance of the school climate.

A comprehensive approach to school safety

These initiatives are pro-active and preventive, but not all of them are fully comprehensive in their approach. Individual programmes may form a part of but not constitute an overall comprehensive strategy.

A comprehensive approach can be defined as including:

- A comprehensive range of short and longer-term programmes and initiatives targeting the specific needs and problems.
- A comprehensive range of objectives, targeting a range of issues and problems according to the local context.
- A comprehensive strategic planning approach that incorporates wide-ranging data collection and analysis, a plan of action, implementation and evaluation.

- A comprehensive range of individuals, groups, institutions and organisations inside and outside the school.

The critical elements of a comprehensive approach to school safety are:

- Identifying and mobilising key partners in the school community, including staff and students, parents, local agencies, community organisations and the private sector.
- Undertaking, in partnership, a careful analysis of local school-related problems.
- Developing local action plans.
- Implementing and evaluating short- and long-term outcomes.
- Revising and developing projects to meet changing needs.

Table 10.1 presents some of the differences between comprehensive and non-comprehensive approaches to school safety in terms of their overall characteristics, objectives, partnerships, process, targeted areas and programmes, and theoretical basis.⁷

Recent trends and challenges

As with most areas of prevention, developing school safety strategies is not easy, especially in the current political climate; it requires leadership, energy, experience and finances. What are some of the most positive recent trends and challenges in comprehensive approaches to school safety?

- While schools in many countries have managed to develop good comprehensive policies, at the broader urban level there may still be a tendency for them to be treated "apart" from integrated urban renewal or crime prevention plans. There is a need to move beyond the school in its neighbourhood, and locate safety within the wider city/local government structure, as in the Amsterdam model.
- Networking and clustering schools, taking into consideration local contexts, can help build capacity.
- More community debate is being stimulated on the value of long-term preventive action.
- A model programme does not ensure successful implementation. Work must continue on training and support, since it is people who make programmes work.
- Policy must be viewed in terms of process, not just in terms of outcomes (Casella, 2002).
- The increasing use of restorative, peacemaking and reconciliatory life-skills approaches must be matched by a school culture that is not punitive or retaliatory.

- Increasing attention must be given to issues of cultural and ethnic differences and unequal treatment.
- Although time consuming, monitoring comprehensive initiatives is not difficult. Evaluating their effectiveness, however, is more complex.
- It is important to maintain a balance between legislative approaches or requirements imposed from "above" and stimulating and facilitating initiatives from "below" (see Hayden, 2003).

Good programme implementation cannot be rushed. Programmes sponsors and policy-makers need to focus more on developing and implementing strategies, in specific contexts, and less on demonstrating short-term effectiveness. The local community also needs to understand that achieving positive and sustained results depends on the time and the efforts invested in the project by the entire community. It is also important to have modest expectations: model projects can over-estimate the effectiveness of an intervention because they are *models*.

In the opinion of the author, the question posed by Eric Debarbieux in the mid-1990s still has a firm and clear answer.

Should we cut the school off from its environment, protect it from external aggressions? Or should a genuine partnership with the inhabitants of the area be the solution? Should the school be deeply involved in the outside community life or just be a school in a neighbourhood? (Debarbieux, 1996)

The answer is "no". The school should not be cut off, closed down or fenced in for protection. It should work in a genuine partnership and be deeply involved in the life of the community.

Table 10.1. Characteristics of comprehensive and non-comprehensive approaches to school safety

	Comprehensive approach	Non-comprehensive approach
Overall characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Broad partnerships between school and wider community - Strategic plan - Inclusive, clear policies and guidelines but flexible approach - Short- and long-term goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited, within-school partnerships only, or one or two external services - Programmes are imposed from "above", without partnership or consultation
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific objectives, e.g. prevent victimisation, offending, truancy, school drop out, vandalism and substance abuse; develop good conflict resolution; inculcate respectful attitudes and behaviours; improve overall health, and school ethos and attainment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One or two objectives, e.g. reduce violence and vandalism; substance abuse; truancy
Partnerships	Teaching staff; administrative staff; students; parents; school board; local residents and business community; local authority services (police, youth, family, and health and social services)	School-based only; no involvement of parents or community, some links with external institutions or services
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assess extent of issues - Develop plan of action - Implement plan - Establish on-going monitoring and evaluate action - Modify and develop plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Apply a programme, collect data, monitor and evaluate to respond to an identified problem, but not as part of a broader long-term strategic plan
Targeted areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inside and outside school, and to and from school and surrounding area - During and after school hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School premises only, or to and from school - Only during school hours
Targeted programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. School resource centre - Conflict resolution procedures and curriculum - Victim support services - Parent support programme - Teacher support and training - Safety plans and situational improvements - Neighbourhood links 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target selected students or general curriculum - Focus on physical security and surveillance and situational responses
Theoretical basis	See school and its ethos, students and families as part of wider social/ economic patterns of local environment, be aware of root causes; structural model is central, but rational choice and social learning are also used	Tendency to focus mainly on individual behaviour, using a social learning model, or on rational choice as basis for situational modification

Notes

1. The murder rate in South Africa in 2001/02 was 48 per 100 000, compared with 7 per 100 000 in the United States (Leggatt, 2003).
2. Due to restrictions caused by language and by availability and accessibility of publications and other materials, the scope of work focused on developing countries, or on translations and secondary reviews describing work in other regions and countries.
3. For example, a school in Detroit, United States, requires all students to wear transponders around their necks; and following the murder of two school girls, a mother in the United Kingdom inserted an electronic chip in her daughter's arm to "ensure" her safety.
4. Council of Europe conference "Local Partnerships for Preventing and Combating Violence at School", Strasbourg, December 2002; European Forum for Urban Security seminar on "Sécurité City and School" programme, Paris, February 2003; and Australian Institute of Criminology conference on "Schools and Crime Prevention", Melbourne, September 2002.
5. The original study was undertaken by the RAND Corporation (see Greenwood, *et. al.*, 1995).
6. For example, the United States Department of Justice (2003) publish indicators of school crime and safety annually. However, the accuracy of these data has been disputed (NASRO, 2002).
7. See Casella (2002) for a discussion on policy implications of different theoretical explanations of school violence.

References

- Casella, R. (2002), "Where Policy Meets the Pavement: Stages of Public Involvement in the Prevention of School Violence", *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Volume 15, No. 3, pp. 349-372.
- Council of Europe (COE) (2002), *Local Partnerships for Preventing and Combating Violence at School*, Final Conference Declaration, 2-4 December 2002, Strasbourg.
- Debarbieux, E. (1996), *La violence en milieu scolaire : état des lieux*, Éditions sociales françaises, Paris.
- Debarbieux, E. and C. Blaya (eds.) (2001), *Violence à l'école et politiques publiques*, Éditions sociales françaises, Paris.
- Estrada, F. (2001), "Juvenile Violence as a Social Problem: Trends, Media Attention and Societal Response", *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 639-655.
- Ferola, L. (2002), *Juvenile Crime in the EU Applicant Countries: Trends and Prevention Policies*, Censis, Rome.

Gottfredson, G., et al. (2000), *National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools*, Final Report to National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Washington, D.C., www.gottfredson.com.

Greenwood, P.W., et al. (1995), *Diverting Children from a Life of Crime: Measuring Costs and Benefits*, Santa Monica, California.

Harber, C. (2001), "Schooling and Violence in South Africa: Creating a Safer School", *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 263-271.

Hayden, C. (2003), *Exclusion from School in England: The Evolving Policy Agenda*, paper presented at the "Second International Conference on School Violence", Quebec, May 2003.

Human Rights Watch (2001), *Scared at School: Sexual Violence against Girls in South African Schools*, www.hrw.org/report/2001/safrica.

International Center for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC) (1999), *Crime Prevention Digest II: Comparative Analysis of Successful Community Safety*, ICPC, Montreal.

International Observer (2003), "ICPC's Second Annual Colloquium on Crime Prevention – Brussels, November 2002", No. 12, 24 January 2003, www.crime-prevention-intl.org/io_old/english/index_12_2003.htm.

Kromhout, M. and M. van San (2003), "Crime among Juveniles and Young Adults in New Ethnic Groups", *Serienaaam: Onderzoek en Beleid 206*, Boom Juridische Uitgevers, WODC Den Haag.

Leggatt, T. (2003), "Save Our Cops. Preventing Police Killings", *SA Crime Quarterly*, No. 4, Institute of Security Studies, Pretoria.

Meggie, M., S.E. Edwards and K. Gwozdz (2001), *Conflict Resolution. A Blueprint for Preventing School Violence*, The Solomon Press, New York.

Mellor, A. (1997), *Bullying at School: Advice for Families*, Scottish Council for Educational Research, Edinburgh.

Morrison, B. (2002), "Bullying and Victimisations in Schools: A Restorative Justice Approach", *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, No. 219, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) (2002), *2002 School Resource Officer Survey*, NASRO, Cleveland, Ohio.

National Crime Prevention (NCP) (1999), *Pathways to Prevention*, National Crime Prevention, Commonwealth Attorney General's Department, Canberra.

National Crime Prevention Strategy Canada (NCPS) (2004), "Fact Sheet. Bullying in Canada: National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention", www.prevention.gc.ca/en/library/publications/fact_sheets/bullying/.

Rigby, K. (2002), *A Meta-Analysis of Methods and Approaches to Reducing Bullying in Pre-Schools and Early Primary Schools in Australia*, National Crime Prevention, Commonwealth Attorney General's Department, Canberra.

Roper, M. (2002), "Kids First: Approaching School Safety", in E. Pelsler (ed.), *Crime Prevention Partnerships. Lessons from Practice*, Institute of Security Studies, Pretoria.

Smith, P.E. (ed.) (2003), *Violence in Schools: The Response in Europe*, RoutledgeFalmer, London and New York, www.scre.ac.uk/bully.

Shaw, M. (2001), *Promoting Safety in Schools. International Experience and Action*, Crime Prevention Series No. 3, Bureau of Justice Assistance Monograph, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/bja/186937.pdf.

Soomeren, P., C.H.D. van Steinmetz and W. Ruijsendaal (2002), *Prevention of Crime in and around High Schools. Lessons in Implementation*, paper presented at the conference on the "Role of Schools in Crime Prevention", 30 September - 1 October 2002, Melbourne, Australia.

United States Department of Education (USDOE) (2002), *Exemplary and Promising Programmes 2001, Safe, Disciplined and Drug-Free Schools Expert Panel*, Washington, D.C.

United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) (2003), *Indicators of School Crime and Safety 2003*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, D.C.

Vanhove, A. and Raynal, M. (2004), *Sécucités Cities and Schools*, Daphne Programme, Centre National de Documentation Pédagogique, Paris, www.fesu.org/fesu/upload/pdf/Publi_VillesetEcoles_2004_VA2.pdf.

White, R. (2002), "School Strategies to Deal with Gangs", *Trends and Issues*, No. 240, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.