August 16, 2023

Honorable Judge Michael D. Coughlan
Presiding Judge of the San Joaquin County Superior Court
180 E. Weber Avenue, Suite 1306J
Stockton, CA 95202

Grand Jury Report: "School Safety in San Joaquin County: Developing a Culture of Safety": Case No. 0322

Dear Judge Coughlan:

The Jefferson Union School District ("District") has reviewed the Facts, Findings and Recommendations in the Grand Jury Report ***"School Safety in San Joaquin County: Developing a Culture of Safety"*** filed on June 13, 2023. Pursuant to California Penal Code section 933(c), the following constitutes the response of the District and its Governing Board ("Board") to the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the District.

RESPONSE TO FINDINGS 2.0: COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SAFETY PLAN

F2.1 A review of CSSPs demonstrated many districts have failed to create a CSSP that addresses safety issues unique to the individual school sites, and rather use a template and/or boilerplate language, leaving the school site unprepared in an emergency.

Response: Jefferson Elementary School District (JESD) disagrees with this finding as it applies to District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: The JESD cannot speak to other districts' CSSP documents. As it pertains to the JESD school sites, we disagree with the finding. Although our CSSPs may use a consistent format that appears to be a template, each site has unique information pertaining to the sites various safety needs. It is important that templates are used to ensure that all the necessary required components are met, they are easy to implement from site to site, and to provide ease in review for emergency service personal, administration, and the board of education. We do not believe the use of templates leaves a school site unprepared in an emergency. Further, language in the plans is often consistent because it is a best practice for schools to respond to like incidents in a like manner.

F2.2 Many districts have not involved teachers, support staff, students, and parents/guardians when updating each school site's CSSP, missing an opportunity to create a culture of school safety.

Response: JESD disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, §933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: The process of CSSP approval in the District includes the following; the

plan is reviewed by each school campus administration, classified and certificated staff, various parent groups, and law enforcement. The plans are reviewed with each school staff at the beginning of the school year. It is reviewed and approved by each school site council which serves as each school's safety committee. District office staff reviews each school campus plan in preparation for the plans to be reviewed by Jefferson Elementary Board of Trustees at a regular board meeting.

F2.3 Many districts have not collaborated with local law enforcement and other first responders during the annual process to update the CSSP, which could result in a prolonged and inefficient emergency response.

Response: The JESD partially disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the practices of other districts regarding the finding. We disagree with the finding as it pertains to the JESD because we engage in annual collaboration with first responder agencies, such as law enforcement and fire, regarding the CSSP. Law enforcement and first responder agencies are invited to school site council meetings to discuss the draft CSSP and are provided a copy of the CSSPs for review. While there is collaboration, we believe it could be improved with more interagency collaboration with all of the school districts within the City of Tracy. This would increase efficiency for first responders.

F2.4 Many district CSSPs show a lack of meaningful collaboration between districts and local law enforcement agencies, causing confusion and chaos during an emergency.

Response: The JESD partially disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the practices of other districts regarding the finding. We disagree with the finding as it pertains to the JESD because we engage in annual collaboration with first responder agencies, such as law enforcement and fire, regarding the CSSP. Law enforcement and first responder agencies are invited to school site council meetings to discuss the draft CSSP and are provided a copy of the CSSPs for review. While there is collaboration, we believe it could be improved with more interagency collaboration with all of the school districts within the City of Tracy. This would increase efficiency for first responders. Further, the JESD is unaware of any specific incidents impacting its sites when there was chaos and confusion caused by a lack of collaboration between JESD and local law enforcement agencies.

F2.5 Many districts do not offer an opportunity for public input during the drafting or approval stages of the annual CSSP, which renders the districts out of compliance with State law.

Response: The JESD disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the practices of other districts regarding the finding. We disagree with the finding as it pertains to the JESD because we provide parents and community members with opportunities to comment on the draft CSSP through School Site Council meetings. These meetings are public meetings and advertised on district calendars. In addition, the final approval stage of the process is done in a public board meeting where all of the school's CSSPs (minus tactical information) are presented and reviewed for approval. Parents and community members have the opportunity to comment on the plans before final approval by the board of trustees.

F2.6 Most districts do not include an assessment of the status of crime at the school and school-related functions in their CSSPs, which renders the districts out of compliance with State law and causes potential harm and liability.

Response: JESD agrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Our District's CSSPs require that sites review and place an assessment of the status of crime at their school site. In reviewing the 2022-23 CSSPs it appears that sites did not include this information.

F2.7 Many districts do not adequately address the unique needs of students with disabilities during emergencies. The lack of planning for the most vulnerable students can cause harm during a time of confusion and crisis.

Response: JESD partially disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the practices of other districts regarding this finding. As it pertains to the JESD, we partially disagree with the finding because while the unique needs of students with disabilities may not be addressed in every CSSP, JESD ensures their safety in other ways. For instance, planning for the safety of students with disabilities is done on an individual basis.

F2.8 A few districts do not make any part of the CSSPs available to the public, withholding important information about steps taken by the district to reduce the probability and impact of safety risks. Other districts post the CSSPs in their entirety, failing to keep confidential information about tactical responses, potentially revealing sensitive information to the public.

Response: JESD disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the practices of other districts regarding this finding. As it pertains to JESD, we partially disagree with the finding because the public has the opportunity to review the sites' CSSPs at the school site council meetings. Additionally, the plans minus tactical information are presented to the board of trustees and placed in the board meeting packet. These packets are posted on the district website. Parents may

contact their school principals for specific questions regarding safety measures unique per campus and to see the CSSP document (minus any confidential tactical information).

F2.9 Many districts have CSSPs that fail to identify incident command roles and the individuals who are to perform those roles in case of an emergency, exposing students and staff to the potential for confusion and increased risks during an emergency.

Response: JESD disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the practices of other districts regarding the finding. As the finding pertains to the JESD, we disagree because we assign incident command roles as applicable to the site and identify them in the CSSPs.

F2.10 Many districts have CSSPs that fail to describe the system to reunite parents/guardians with their children in the event of a campus-wide evacuation, creating confusion and additional anxiety in the event of a safety emergency.

Response: JESD disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the practices of other districts regarding this finding. As it pertains to the JESD, we disagree with the finding that the CSSPs for JESD school sites do not describe the system to reunite parents/guardians with their children in the event of a campus-wide evacuation. Each plan clearly states the plan for reunification and an annual letter detailing the process is sent home at the beginning of the school year.

F2.11 Many schoolsite CSSPs do not account for specific dangers unique to the school site (e.g., train tracks, flooding, freeways).

Response: JESD agrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the practices of other districts regarding this finding. As the finding pertains to the JESD, we agree with the finding. While there are specific plans for many possible scenarios, they were created for the entire district and not site by site. School sites could provide more detailed actions and responses based upon their geographic locations. Each school site has more detailed flipchart containing information pertaining to specific threats.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS 2.0: COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SAFETY PLAN

R2.1 By March 1, 2024, the annual updates for each school site's CSSP address safety issues unique to the site.

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented by March 1, 2024.

Explanation: The District will utilize its detailed process that engages partners in the development of each school site CSSP, so that each school's unique individual safety needs are met. As the District and school site administrators review the CSSPs with our partners (including emergency responders), we will continue to refine the details of each plan specifically to meet the unique needs of the staff and students at each campus.

R2.2 By December 15, 2023, while updating the school's CSSP, each school site collaborates and receives input from representatives of teachers, support staff, students, and parents/guardians.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: JESD will continue to advertise opportunities for parents and the community to be involved in the CSSP process. All community partners will be included in the development of the CSSP through public school site council meetings.

R2.3 By December 15, 2023, while updating the school's CSSP, each school site collaborates and receives input from the appropriate emergency response agencies.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: JESD will continue to engage in regular collaboration from first responder agencies regarding JESD sites. To improve efficiency, the District will work on scheduling more regular collaboration with all school sites and emergency response agencies at one time.

R2.5 By February 1, 2024, each school site council or safety planning committee hold an advertised public meeting at the school site to allow members of the community an opportunity to express an opinion about the school's proposed CSSP as required by California Education Code Sections 32288(b)(1) and (2).

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: JESD will continue to post agendas and advertise school site council meetings with the topic of school safety.

R2.6 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSP includes the State mandated assessment of the status of crime at the school and school-related functions.

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented by March 1, 2024.

Explanation: District leadership teams will review all site CSSPs annually to ensure that an assessment of the status of crime at the school and school-related functions is included.

R2.7 By March 1, 2024, each school site consult with the appropriate professionals to address the unique needs of students with disabilities when updating the CSSP.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: JESD will continue to utilized the expertise of its school principals to address the unique need of students with disabilities when updating the CSSP. School administration participate in every Individual Education Plan and address the unique needs of students in the event of an emergency.

R2.8 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSP be available to the public with the exception of confidential information about tactical responses.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Currently the JESD CSSPs are available to the public with the exception of the tactical/confidential information.

R2.9 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSP identify the incident command roles and the individuals who are to perform those roles and their alternate in cases of an emergency.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Currently JESD CSSPs identify the incident command roles and the individuals who are to perform those roles and alternates in cases of emergency. The District will make available to the sites and public the incident command roles and individuals responsible for the district's incident command center.

R2.10 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSP describe the system to reunify parents/guardians with their student in the event of a campus-wide evacuation, including how parents/guardians are informed of reunification details.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: JESD will continue to describe the system to reunify parents/guardians with their student in the event of a campus-wide evacuation, including how parents/guardians are informed of reunification details.

R2.11 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSPs account for dangers unique to the specific school site (e.g., train tracks, flooding, freeways).

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented by March 1, 2024.

Explanation: JESD conducts site safety assessments at each site bi-annually. Findings are recorded and discussed with program and site administrators and are addressed as needed. Site specific safety concerns will be reviewed and incorporated in the CSSPs as appropriate.

RESPONSE TO FINDINGS 3.0: TRAINING

F3.1 Feedback forms completed by attendees of the San Joaquin County Office of Education School Safety Summit and reviewed by the Grand Jury demonstrate the value and necessity of a Countywide School Safety Summit.

Response: JESD agrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the attendance of other districts at the SJCEO School Safety Summit. A District team from JESD attended the 2022 School Safety Summit. The District looks forward to sending a team to attend the upcoming San Joaquin County School Safety Summit again this coming school year.

F3.2 Some of the districts failed to send representatives to the 2022 School Safety Summit, thereby missing an opportunity to work together to make schools safer.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the attendance of other districts at the SJCEO School Safety Summit. A District team from JESD attended the 2022 School Safety Summit. The District looks forward to sending a team to attend the upcoming San Joaquin County School Safety Summit again this coming school year.

F3.3 The Grand Jury learned through interviews, surveys, and site tours that many districts fail to include safety topics during regular meetings with teachers and support staff throughout the school year, minimizing the importance of safety.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to what other districts do or don't discuss at regular staff meetings. As for Jefferson School District the first staff meeting of the year is dedicated to school safety and school safety is a regular topic on staff meeting agendas. After each safety exercise sites review the strengths and areas that need to be improved.

F3.4 The Grand Jury learned through interviews, surveys, and site tours that many school sites fail to assure substitute staff receive the information they will need in the case of a school safety emergency, leaving the substitute staff ill-prepared for an emergency.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to other school district processes and procedures in regard to substitute training. As far as this applies to JESD all substitute teachers receive annual safety training and are taught were the safety flipcharts are in the event of an emergency.

F3.5 Many districts fail to include the utilization of communication and incident command protocols (ICS-100) during safety drills throughout the school year, causing miscommunication in an emergency.

Response: JESD disagrees with this finding as it applies to JESD. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to the practices of other districts regarding this finding. We agree that the JESD does not execute incident command protocols during safety drills because we do not believe it is appropriate to do so. Drills typically last only a few moments and are designed for practicing immediate responses to incidents. We believe practicing incident command systems and protocols is appropriate for more prolonged events or exercises. We also do not believe that the process we use has caused miscommunication in an emergency at the JESD.

F3.6 Many district cabinet-level positions (e.g., Superintendent, Chief Business Officer) are not trained in ICS protocols (ICS-402), causing a lack of unified response to districtwide emergencies.

Response: JESD agrees with this finding as it applies to JESD. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: While some of the cabinet-level positions have been trained in ICS-402, not all have as positions have turned over.

F3.7 Many school sites do not vary the time of day when routine safety drills are conducted or when students are not in classrooms, making drills predictable and leaving students unprepared for emergencies that may occur at any time.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Principals will continue to schedule varied types of routine safety drills throughout the year. These drills are conducted at different days, times and locations as well as when students are in classrooms and other locations on campus. Details of safety

drills including variety of times conducted are maintained and reported by each site to district office personnel.

F3.8 Many school sites fail to include support staff (classified personnel) in probable real-life roles during safety drills, leaving them unprepared to assist students in emergencies.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: All school site personnel are included in each safety drill and serve various important roles. All staff are thoroughly prepared to assist students in emergencies.

F3.9 Most school sites fail to conduct a post-incident report after drills analyzing what went well, what went wrong, and what needs to be changed in the future to improve plans and drills, undermining the effectiveness of drills.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: While JESD school sites don't write formal post-incident reports, they do conduct post incident analysis of what went well and what needs to be done to improve response. The drills and analysis support the effectiveness of the drills.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS 3.0: TRAINING

R3.2 By December 1, 2023, each school district send one or more representatives to the annual School Safety Summit hosted by the San Joaquin County Office of Education.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: The District looks forward to sending a team to attend the upcoming San Joaquin County School Safety Summit in this coming school year similar to this last school year.

R3.3 By September 1, 2023, safety topics be an agenda item at all school site staff meetings with teachers and support staff throughout the school year.

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(4).)

Explanation: The time available for school site staff meetings is limited and has many other issues and topics requiring coverage to ensure the efficient and proper functioning of the school. The District commits to providing safety topics throughout the year at various school sites at differing times to be determined.

R3.4 By September 1, 2023, districts develop, adopt, and implement written procedures for school sites to provide substitute staff with the information they will need in case of a school emergency.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: The District's school sites provide substitutes with the pertinent information regarding the emergency procedures including where the safety flipcharts are located with class lists and emergency evacuation routes.

R3.5 By October 1, 2023, personnel identified in the school CSSP for incident command roles be trained and certified in ICS-100 protocols.

Response: This recommendation requires further analysis (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(3).)

Explanation: We have been unsuccessful in locating and scheduling training to be completed by October 1, 2023. The District's trainings are traditionally coordinated and scheduled through our liability insurer, but we have been informed by our insurer that Level 100 ICS trainings are not being offered anywhere right now, so the District will work on locating and securing ICS-100 training by December 13, 2023.

R3.6 By October 1, 2023, ICS-402 training be completed for all district-level executive leadership.

Response: This recommendation requires further analysis (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(3).)

Explanation: We have been unsuccessful in locating and scheduling training to be completed October 1, 2023. The District's trainings are traditionally coordinated and scheduled through our liability insurer, but we have been informed by our insurer that Level 400 ICS trainings are not being offered anywhere right now, so the District will work on locating and securing ICS-402 training by December 13, 2023.

R3.7 By October 1, 2023, scheduled safety drills be conducted on different days throughout the school year and at various times throughout the school day, including when students are not normally in their classrooms.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Principals will continue to schedule varied types of routine safety drills throughout the year. These drills are conducted at different days, times and locations as well as when students are in classrooms and other locations on campus.

R3.8 By October 1, 2023, scheduled safety drills include support staff (classified) in probable emergency roles during the year and document their participation.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Principals will continue to schedule varied types of routine safety drills throughout the year. These drills will include all staff in roles that they would play in an emergency situation.

R3.9 By October 1, 2023, administrators create a post-incident report after all safety drills.

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(2).)

Explanation: JESD will implement post-incident report procedures for drills by the recommended date at those sites that do not already have procedures in place.

RESPONSE TO FINDINGS 4.0: SCHOOL SITE VISITS

F4.1 Not all school sites have check-in procedures in place that were followed consistently, posing serious security threats.

Response: JESD disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Each school in the District has a designated access point for entry to the school where visitors are required to identify themselves with a state identification card, sign-in and receive a visitor badge. When the visitor signs in the Ident-A-Kid Systems runs the state identification card against the Megan's Law Database. Any possible matches alert the school secretary, site and district administration. Upon leaving the school, visitors are required to sign out and return their visitor badge.

F4.2 Perimeter fencing or an "open" campus each pose security challenges and require careful consideration to mitigate security shortcomings.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Each school in the District has a designated access point for entry to the school campus for students that is monitored at drop off and dismissal. The rest of the school site has perimeter fencing and none of the sites are "open" campuses for students or parents.

F4.3 Evacuation maps that are posted inconsistently or do not adequately illustrate evacuation routes cause confusion and prolonged evacuation times, making staff and students vulnerable to harm in both classrooms and common areas.

Response: JESD partially disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: Every classroom and most common areas have a copy of the Emergency flipchart and evacuation maps. This information is posted on the wall next to the door, or in the vicinity of the entrance and/or exit utilized during drills with updated information pertaining to each class/area.

F4.4 **Inconsistent door-locking policies and failure to follow policies create opportunities for perpetrators to enter classrooms and common areas.**

Response: JESD disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: The district agrees that door-locking policies are important and should consider the unique layout of campuses. JESD school sites lock all exterior doors to classroom and common spaces throughout the school day. Due to the unique design of each school site, door-locking policies for interior doors will vary from site to site.

F4.5 Most school sites utilized flip charts that identify steps to be taken in case of emergencies, however, none of the sites posted them in all rooms used by students, staff, parents/guardians, and the general public.

Response: JESD agrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to flip chart use as it pertains to other districts. Updated flip charts are being delivered to JESD sites during the site safety assessments taking place throughout the summer and fall. We agree that the flipcharts are not in all rooms used by students, staff, parents/guardians, and the general public. Placement of flip charts will vary by site.

F4.6 Insufficient window coverings give perpetrators a clear line of sight, creating risk for students and staff.

Response: JESD disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to insufficient window coverings as it pertains to other districts. The District agrees that insufficient window coverings give perpetrators a clear line of sight, creating risk for students and staff. Our goal is to provide a safe environment for students and staff, therefore by limiting the risks to all. This is a balance as schools also need to provide supervision for students and staff in all locations on campus. To this end all exterior windows have window coverings, while some interior

windows are not covered. To mitigate this risk in a lockdown, large magnets are one exterior doors that can be put in place to cover the exterior windows in the event of a lockdown.

F4.7 Most school sites, regardless of age, were well maintained and showed school pride. One school site demonstrated multiple maintenance shortcomings, which can negatively impact safety.

Response: JESD agrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to school site maintenance as it pertains to other districts. The District takes great pride in all of the facilities throughout the district. Our school and district leaders meet and discuss facility needs bi-monthly and site and district leaders walk the sites bi-monthly to assess areas that need maintenance.

F4.8 Good relationships among administrators, certificated and classified staff, parents, and students are vital to promptly identify and address areas of concern, particularly regarding student behavior. Relationships varied greatly from campus to campus.

Response: JESD agrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: JESD cannot speak to relationships as it pertains to other districts. The District takes great pride in the relationships formed between staff, students, and parents. JESD agrees that students and parents play a vital role in keep our campuses safe. Students often hold key information on safety concerns on campus and they must feel comfortable sharing that information with staff on campus.

F4.9 The culture of safety is best developed by public transparency and involvement by all parties. Few of the school sites visited by the Grand Jury demonstrated meaningful public engagement in safety planning.

Response: JESD agrees and disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: JESD agrees that the culture of safety is best developed by public transparency and involvement by all parties, but disagrees with the implication that the JESD does not demonstrate meaningful public engagement in safety planning. All JESD sites involve the public in planning through open school site council meetings as well as public board meetings where the CSPPs are discussed and approved.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS 4.0: SCHOOL SITE VISITS

R4.1 By October 1, 2023, each school site implements an access control program that consistently includes verifying visitors' identity and collection of any issued badge before the visitor leaves the school site.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Each school in the District has a designated access point for entry to the school where visitors are required to identify themselves with a state identification card, sign-in and receive a visitor badge. When the visitor signs in the Ident-A-Kid Systems runs the state identification card against the Megan's Law Database. Any possible matches alert the school secretary, site and district administration. Upon leaving the school, visitors are required to sign out and return their visitor badge.

R4.2 By March 1, 2024, districts develop, adopt, and implement a plan for effective perimeter control of access at all school sites.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Each school in the District has a designated access point for entry to the school campus for students that is monitored at drop off and dismissal. The rest of the school site has perimeter fencing and none of the sites are "open" campuses for students or parents.

R4.3 By September 1, 2023, all school sites post evacuation maps clearly showing routes from the "You Are Here" perspective be prominently posted at each entry or exit door location in both classrooms and common areas.

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(2).)

Explanation: JESD will implement the recommendation by the recommended timeframe. Site safety assessments for JESD sites are underway throughout summer and fall. At this time evacuation map placement and completeness will be evaluated and addressed/updated as needed.

R4.4 By March 1, 2024, districts develop, adopt, and implement a plan for door-locking policies to secure classroom and common area doors.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: The District follows a policy of locking classroom doors when school is in session.

R4.5 By March 1, 2024, all school sites post flip charts or similar summaries of emergency procedures be posted in all classrooms and common areas.

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(2).)

Explanation: Updated flip charts are being delivered to JESD sites during the site safety assessments taking place throughout the summer and fall. We agree that the flipcharts are not in all rooms used by students, staff, parents/guardians, and the general public. Placement of flip charts will vary by site.

R4.6 By March 1, 2024, all school sites ensure window coverings are provided for all windows, thereby not allowing a perpetrator a clear line of sight into a classroom or common area.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Our goal is to provide a safe environment for students and staff, therefore by limiting the risks to all. This is a balance as schools also need to provide supervision for students and staff in all locations on campus. To this end all exterior windows have window coverings, while some interior windows are not covered. To mitigate this risk in a lockdown, large magnets are one exterior doors that can be put in place to cover the exterior windows in the event of a lockdown.

R4.7 By October 1, 2023, the Board of Trustees, during a public meeting, review and discuss the findings and recommendations of the 2022-2023 San Joaquin County Civil Grand Jury report, Case #0322 – School Safety in San Joaquin County: Developing a Culture of Safety.

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(2).)

Explanation: The Board of Trustees will review and discuss the findings and recommendations of the 2022-2023 San Joaquin County Civil Grand Jury report, Case #0322 – School Safety in San Joaquin County: Developing a Culture of Safety at the first public meeting after the District has filed its response to this Report.

CONCLUSION

On behalf of the Board of Education of the Jefferson Union School District, we appreciate your concern for our District.

Sincerely,

James W. Bridges
Superintendent