

LYME-OLD LYME SCHOOLS

Regional School District #18

A Private School Experience



in a Public School Setting

Regular Board of Education Meeting

August 3, 2022

Board Present: Steven Wilson, Chair; Martha Shoemaker, Vice Chair; Mary Powell St. Louis, Treasurer; Suzanne Thompson, Secretary; Laura Dean-Frazier; Anna James; Jason Kemp; Jennifer Miller; Christopher Staab

Administration Present: Ian Neviaser, Superintendent of Schools (Remote); Michelle Dean, Director of Curriculum; Kelly Enoch, Principal of Mile Creek School; Allison Hine, Principal of Lyme Consolidated School; Holly McCalla, Business Manager; Jeanne Manfredi, Assistant Principal of Lyme-Old Lyme High School; Ron Turner, Director of Facilities & Technology (Remote); Noah Ventola, Assistant Principal of Lyme-Old Lyme Middle School; James Wygonik, Principal of Lyme-Old Lyme High School

Others Present: Mercedes Alger and Heather Fried, RETA Co-Presidents; Rusty Malik, QA+M Architects; five community members from LOL

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Steven Wilson. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: Mr. Staab made a motion, which was seconded by Mrs. Thompson, to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 1, 2022 as presented.

VOTE: the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

MOTION: Mrs. Shoemaker made a motion, which was seconded by Mrs. Thompson, to approve the minutes of Executive Session of June 1, 2022 as presented.

VOTE: the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

49 Lyme Street, Old Lyme, Connecticut 06371

T: 860-434-7238 F: 860-434-9959 E: neviaseri@region18.org www.region18.org

MOTION: Mr. Staab made a motion, which was seconded by Mrs. Dean-Frazier, to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 15, 2022 as presented.

VOTE: the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

MOTION: Mrs. Dean-Frazier made a motion, which was seconded Mrs. James, to approve the minutes of Executive Session of June 15, 2022 as presented.

VOTE: the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

III. Visitors

1. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

IV. Correspondence

Mr. Wilson reviewed a summary of the correspondence that the Board received over the last month. The correspondence is attached to the minutes for informational purposes. *The opinions expressed in the attached correspondence are solely those of the authors. They do not purport to reflect the position of the Regional School District #18 Board of Education or its employees.*

Correspondence from community member Mona Colwell dated July 22, 2022 was not included in the summary. This email was forwarded to the Board's secretary who will include it with the correspondence report for the September 7 meeting.

V. Administrative Reports

1. Superintendent's Report

Mr. Neviasher reviewed the August personnel report which reflected several new hires for the 2022-2023 school year. The district is still looking to fill vacancies for instructional assistants, a speech and language pathologist, a school psychologist, and two elementary teachers.

Mr. Neviasher updated the Board on the summer facilities projects currently underway or completed including a thorough cleaning of all buildings. Other improvements included the Mile Creek gym floor; outdoor classroom at Lyme School; concrete floor for outdoor LOLMS classroom; floor improvements at LOLHS; and resurfacing of the track. Mr. Neviasher also reported on the various organizations that utilize the district's properties over the summer months.

Mr. Neviasher reported on training and other initiatives that are taking place over the summer including *Critical Friends* training, elementary math program, middle and high school curriculum work, preparations for new teacher orientation including how to do things the "Wildcat Way;" and a K-5 ELA audit. Mr. Neviasher also reported that new laptops have arrived and distributed to teachers.

On the subject of arming the security staff members, Mr. Neviasser reported that firearms have been purchased by the district (district purchases/security staff owns), and fittings for the bullet proof vests have taken place. Mandated training for the specific firearms purchased has occurred with arrangements being made for private instruction. The security staff will attend an August 23 state mandated training. They have passed psychological evaluations and health physicals.

Additional discussion followed on active shooter training and possible collaboration with other school districts on this training. Mr. Neviasser reported that tabletop activities have already occurred with the State police. Mr. Neviasser reported that he does not envision collaboration with other districts as each district's buildings are unique.

2. Business Manager's Report

Mrs. McCalla reviewed the Executive Budget Summary as of July 31, 2022, with nothing of significance to report; spending is on par with last year to date spending.

Year To Date Revenue Report

	2021-2022 Received	2022-2023 Received YTD
Town of Old Lyme	\$27,006,352	\$693,638
Town of Lyme	\$5,996,088	\$149,175

Mrs. McCalla reviewed the Contingency Maintenance Report which reflected new spending in the amount of \$14,418; expenditures of \$6,068 at the middle and high school for pump station inspection/repair and \$8,350 at the high school for chiller repair and pump rebuild. Balance of account is now at \$185,582.

Mrs. McCalla read a detailed report composed by Ron Turner, Director of Facilities and Technology, on the recent oil leak at the middle school as follows: *On Monday, August 1, at approximately 8:00 a.m., we received an alarm that one of the boilers at the middle school would not fire. An inspection of the room revealed that the fuel supply line to boiler #1 was severed at the flair fitting and depositing a steady stream of heating oil onto the floor. As the boilers do not run often in the summer, it is difficult to determine when the break occurred and for how long the fuel was running. Best guess is sometime on Sunday, July 31. We immediately contacted an environmental cleanup company to address the spill and DEEP responded as well. The boiler room has a drain system that is designed to capture such spills in an underground structure; however, the quantity of oil overwhelmed the capacity of the collection system and some fuel oil leaked out of the cover and into the soil. The contaminated soil is being removed and the boiler room was cleaned of all residual oil. Based upon our calculations including last delivery and average fuel consumption, we believe approximately 1,600 gallons of fuel oil was spilled. Six hundred gallons were reclaimed from the boiler room floor and the collection tank. The outdoor soil cleanup is proving to be more extensive than we believed on Monday, and the company will continue to work over the next few days to develop cost and timeline.*

Mrs. McCalla provided information on the insurance coverage and deductible. She reported that an insurance claim has been filed; the deductible for a pollution claim is \$125,000, which is split between CIRMA and the school district.

It was reported that an inspection and service are done on the boilers annually. Follow-up discussion centered on looking into the installation of floor sensors.

On another matter, Mrs. Thompson asked about the possibility of having the crossing guard work 15 minutes more in the morning and afternoon once school begins. Since the crossing guard is not a district employee, Mr. Neviaser stated that he would discuss this with Resident State Trooper Matt Weber. Mrs. Shoemaker will also mention this to First Selectman Tim Griswold.

VI. Educational Presentation

1. Five-Year Curriculum Plan

Michelle Dean, Director of Curriculum, reviewed the five-year curricular renewal plan. Her report included the theory of action; common understandings; state mandated vs. locally controlled curriculum; rigorous and relevant curriculum; curriculum revision cycle; continuous renewal process; and curriculum revision summary. A copy of her presentation is attached for informational purposes.

Mrs. Dean addressed questions and comments in the following areas: sharing of curriculum amongst districts; implementation of new curriculum and academic impact to students; revision to social studies and math curriculum at the high school (past renewal timeline); challenges to curriculum updates; state revision delays; and remediation strategy for getting back on the five-year renewal track and ramifications for delays.

Mr. Staab asked that the minutes reflect that he requested a plan be developed to get the district back on track on the five-year curriculum renewal schedule.

VII. Chairman & Committee Reports:

- a. *Facilities*. No report.
- b. *Finance*. No report.
- c. *Communications*. No report.
- d. *Policy*. No report.
- e. *LEARN*. No report.
- f. *LOL Prevention Coalition*. No report.

Mr. Neviaser reported that he will send out the schedule of committee meetings before the school year begins.

VIII. New Business

1. District Goals for 2022-2023

Mr. Neviasser reported on the areas of focus for the coming year's goals as detailed in a handout to the Board. He explained that the idea is to use these concepts to provide the administration with an idea of the goal areas which the Board would like us to focus. Based on this feedback, the administration will develop a draft set of goals at their upcoming retreat on August 10 and 11.

Curriculum. Use multiple points of data to evaluate academic and social emotional progress over the last 18 months in order to inform instruction, supports, interventions, and, when necessary, development of supplemental programming.

- Second Step implementation.
- Purposeful Play implementation.
- Renewed focus on instructional practices to increase student achievement.
- Focus on instructional strategies to develop executive functioning skills.
- Development and implementation of Math Connections / intervention program (middle school).

Human Resources. Continue to provide ongoing support for staff to ensure existing and new employees have the resources necessary to perform the duties of their jobs at the highest level possible.

- Train new staff in the Wildcat Way.
- Utilize CFG protocols to streamline meetings.

Community. Invite community involvement and feedback in preparation for upcoming renovations and strategic planning.

- Authentic experiences.
- Mentoring.

Facilities. Monitor and evaluate facility, safety, and technology plans to ensure appropriate use, improvements, and maintenance of buildings, grounds, and infrastructure.

- Safety / My Emergency Operation Plan.
- Building project / referendum.

Sustainability. Continue to explore and adopt processes and programs that support the district's vision and mission of sustainability.

- EV vans and chargers
- Cafeteria
- Trex challenge.

Board of Education. Through professional development and training, transition new members into their roles and share processes and procedures that support the high standards and expectations of Lyme-Old Lyme.

- Professional Development.
- Public feedback.

The Board provided feedback on the goals with a focus on deliverable of goals and making them quantifiable. Mr. Neviasher will incorporate the suggestions given which will be discussed at the Board’s retreat on August 11. He asked that the Board email him with additional recommendations by the close of business on August 9.

2. Bond Resolution

Mr. Neviasher explained that in order to meet the goal of a November referendum on the PreK-8 Facilities Plan, the Board must eventually approve a bonding resolution. Mr. Neviasher reviewed the statutory timelines for this process. He also reviewed the bond resolution and an overview of the timelines. He further explained that although the district is not required to hold a referendum on November 8, it must be completed and certified before December 15 as that is the final day for the Office of School Construction Grants and Review (OSGCR) to establish priority projects for state reimbursement.

Schedule of Proceedings for Referendum Adoption

Regular or Special Meeting of the Regional Board of Education	Board of Education meets to set a public hearing date on the Resolution. (See §CGS 7-3)
Notice of Public Hearing	Notice of Public Hearing, signed by the Chairperson, is published and posted in the District at least five (5) days before date set for Public Hearing. (See SCG §§ 10-47, 10-47c and 7-3).
Public Hearing and Special District Meeting	District conducts Public Hearing. (See CGS § 10-47c).
Special Meeting of Board of Education (may be held on same night as Special District Meeting)	Board meets to act on approval of the Resolution and set a date for a referendum. Notice sent to Town Clerks of Lyme and Old Lyme (the “Member Towns”) requesting them to call a referendum on a specified date. (See CGS § 10-47c).
Note re local (Board) action	All local (Board) action taken to submit the Resolution to a vote on November 8, 2022 must be completed by September 8, 2022. Town Clerks must file a certificate regarding the local question to be voted upon with the Connecticut Secretary of the State by September 23, 2022. (See CGS §§ 9-369a and 9-370).

Notice of Referendum	Notice of Referendum is published by the respective Town Clerks in newspaper of general circulation in each of the Member Towns and posted on the Town signposts at least 30 days prior to the date set for referendum (prior to October 9, 2022). (See CGS §§ 10-47c and 9-226).
Referendum held	Referendum held not earlier than thirty (30) days following the date of publication of the Notice of Referendum.
Certification of Results	Town Clerks certify results of Referendum. (See CGS § 10-47c).

Mrs. Shoemaker brought up the fact that there is concern by the poll workers over holding this referendum on election day as some residents would only be able to vote in the election (meeting age requirement) and not the referendum (property owner requirement) which would mean two polling stations with absentee ballots also adding to the concern.

Mr. Staab recommended that they not bring this to referendum at this point in time citing the escalating cost of an additional \$12 million as he did not believe the Board was educated enough on what the project entailed and what cost saving measures should be looked at again. Mr. Neviasser noted that the number had not changed from the previous report – the amount Mr. Staab was referring to did not include state reimbursement. Mrs. Dean Frazier and Mr. Wilson voiced concern over bringing this project to referendum in November citing several factors such as escalating costs, whether to do all the projects simultaneously, needs vs. wants, the 278 pages of details to be read, etc.

To assist the Board in their decision-making, Michael Bouchard, a representative from CES Engineering, presented an executive summary of the PreK-8 building needs as follows:

MEP/FP Existing Conditions

Center School

Heating	Fed from Middle School. No work needed.
Cooling	Minimal existing. Ducted cooling (admin). Window AC's.
Ventilation	20+ year old rooftop units; due for replacement.
Power	Fair condition. Upgrade with air conditioning project.
Lighting	Modern LED throughout; no work needed.
Plumbing	20+ year old water heaters; poor condition. Replace.
Fire Sprinkler	Complete system exists; no work needed.

Middle School

Heating	20 year old oil boilers. Coming due for replacement.
Cooling	Minimal existing. Some ducted cooling. Window AC's.
Ventilation	20+ year old rooftop units; due for replacement.
Power	Fair condition; no work needed.
Lighting	Modern LED throughout; no work needed.
Plumbing	20 year old water heaters. Coming due for replacement.
Fire Sprinkler	Complete system exists; no work needed.

Mile Creek School

Heating	20 year old oil boilers. Coming due for replacement.
Cooling	Minimal existing. Some ducted cooling. Window AC's.
Ventilation	Unit ventilators in classrooms. Replace with next project.
Power	Fair condition. Upgrade with air conditioning project.
Lighting	General dated non-LED. Replace with next project.
Plumbing	20 year old water heaters. Coming due for replacement.
Fire Sprinkler	None existing. Provide with next project.

Lyme Consolidated School

Heating	20 year old oil boilers. Coming due for replacement.
Cooling	Minimal existing. Some ducted cooling. Window AC's.
Ventilation	20+ year old rooftop units; due for replacement.
Power	Fair condition; no work needed.
Lighting	Modern LED throughout; no work needed.
Plumbing	20 year old water heaters. Coming due for replacement.
Fire Sprinkler	None existing. Provide with next project.

Board discussion followed the presentation with much of the subject being whether to do just the bare minimum (boilers) at this time or whether to take advantage of state reimbursement and going forward with a more comprehensive project. The need for a meeting with only this subject on the agenda was discussed. There was Board consensus to hold this meeting on August 31 at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Neviasser noted that they should choose a referendum date at that meeting.

Mr. Neviasser discussed debt service and the timing of this project to coincide with a significant drop in the current debt service next year. The timing is specific to avoiding large highs and lows in the yearly budget.

Mr. Neviasser also discussed the process that occurs when funding for a project is in place and they can make adjustments that can be financially beneficial. He also reported on the approval process at the Building Committee and Board of Ed level for any change orders. Mrs. Miller explained the bond tranche

funding involved in large project financing. Mr. Malik of QA+M Architects added additional information about design development and the length of time involved in documentation.

3. Building Committee

Mr. Neviaser reported that state-funded projects require the establishment of a building committee with the only legal requirements being: *...the municipality or regional board must establish a school building committee with at least one member who has experience in the construction industry (CGS § 10-292v).*

Sec. 10-292v. School building committees to include member with construction industry experience. Any school building committee established by a town or regional school district to undertake a school building project, as defined in section 10-282, shall include at least one member who has experience in the construction industry.

Mr. Neviaser reported that during the construction of LOLHS, the district had 12 members on the building committee, including the BOE chair, as well as the Superintendent, Principal, Director of Facilities and Technology, and Assistant Director of Facilities who all served as ex-officio members. Only two of those members were on the Board of Ed. Mr. Neviaser reviewed how they might establish this committee.

Mr. Neviaser will seek volunteers for the establishment of a building committee. He will also ask several former LOLHS Building Committee members to speak to the Board of Ed about the commitment when serving on this type of committee.

4. Addition of .5 FTE Special Education Teacher and .4 FTE School Psychologist at Mile Creek School (per policy 4113.4)

Mr. Neviaser stated that per Policy 4113.4, he was recommending the addition of a .5 FTE special education teaching position and a .4 FTE School Psychologist position, both at Mile Creek School. This request is based on increased needs of the special education population as well as an increase in the number of special education students currently attending Mile Creek School. As this was not included in the budget, it will be funded completely from three grants, the ARP IDEA Grant, the ESSER II Special Education Recovery Grant, and the ARP ESSER (III) Grant.

MOTION: Mrs. Shoemaker made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Kemp, to approve the hiring of a .5 FTE Special Education Teacher and .4 FTE School Psychologist at Mile Creek School.

VOTE: the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

5. Tuition Student Request for Lyme-Old Lyme Middle School

Mr. Neviaser reviewed a tuition student request (7th grader) for attendance at Lyme-Old Lyme Middle School for the 2022-2023 school year.

In response to Mr. Staab's concern over allowing tuition students when there are enrollment growth concerns, Mr. Neviaser reported that 25% of the students who request tuition status do not end up coming to the district.

MOTION: Mr. Staab made a motion, which was seconded by Mrs. Miller, to approve the tuition student request as presented.

VOTE: the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

IX. Old Business

1. Closing of LOLHS Project

The district is still waiting for the final change order from the State so there is no action required on this agenda item.

Mr. Neviaser reported that they resubmitted all the change orders that the State requested and are still waiting their decision.

X. Executive Session

There was no need for an executive session.

XI. Adjournment

The regular meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m. upon a motion by Mr. Staab and a second by Mrs. Shoemaker.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Thompson, Secretary

The opinions expressed in the attached correspondence are solely those of the authors. They do not purport to reflect the position of the Regional School District #18 Board of Education or its employees.

Hi and thank you all for your work.

I am a friend of the Second Amendment. I believe in the right to self defense, and that we must protect the innocent from harm. However, I think that arming our fine security staff would be a grave mistake, no matter their training.

Our district response to the threat of a school shooting should not be based on our feelings, or on the protective psychology we all share, or on anecdotes, or our intuition. It must be based on the relevant science and on the psychology of potential perpetrators.

The most comprehensive study I was able to find, which was also cited in the online survey, showed a dramatic increase in fatalities for school shootings where there was an armed guard. The deaths almost triple with an armed guard.

Some suggest that arming guards will act as a deterrent. That might be true for a sensible person with a healthy will to live, but that is not who commits school shootings. Most often school shooters are suicidal students. The threat of death or bodily harm DOES NOT deter a suicidal attacker. It does the opposite.

What do the armed guards accomplish then? They may lower response time, but if it comes to response time, really, it's already too late. Prevention, not reaction, must be our watchword. There is very well documented and ample evidence that the presence of weapons increases aggression. The weapons effect it's called. No matter how staff conceal their guns, every single student on campus above the age of six will doubtless know about them by the end of the first week. Many even well adjusted boys will begin gaming out cat and mouse schemes to outsmart and supplant such authority figures. We don't want to go down this road! No matter our good intentions, and that this policy might be enacted for their protection, our students will understand that these guns and the bullets in them, could be for one of them. What does this do to how school feels to them? How do the disaffected respond?

Our security staff will know very well that the first bullet in any premeditated school shooting will be in the back of their head. What does this do to their relations with students? Arming them not only puts an itchy target on their backs, and introduces guns into the school, it completely undermines the trust and camaraderie a truly healthy school environment depends on.

How much arming guards traumatizes and incites kids, undermines a supportive school environment, and increases the chances of a shooting and its potential body count should be at the core of deciding whether to do so. Arming guards must be done with the informed and thoroughly thought through—not knee jerk—approval of the school community. I don't believe that's what is happening here, despite what I'm certain are the best of intentions in a climate of great urgency. The science speaks against arming guards. Developmental psychology and the psychology of violence also speaks against it. And there has not been sufficient community consideration of the consequences. I get wanting to do something and wanting security, but arming security staff will hurt rather than help. I therefore ask you please do NOT do this.

I'd also suggest for similar reasons that you reconsider the practice of involving students in active shooter drills, which I suspect only ups the chances of a shooting, but that's a discussion for another day. Thank you for your consideration.

Olaf Bertram-Nothnagel

Kim Thompson Statement June 15, 2022

- How does arming our security guards fit into the larger security plan?
- Was this identified as a gap in our security plan? When was this gap identified? How was it identified?
- What is the purpose of arming the guards at the schools?
- Is it to prevent a shooting on school property? Is it to minimize casualties? If it is to minimize casualties, in what way would this work to minimize casualties?
- Do you have data to suggest that arming guards at schools decreases casualties in shooting events? If so, please share this data because it would be integral to making this decision.
- Why does this plan need to be put into place for the start of the 22-23 school year? This is a tight timeline, from buying weapons, ammunition, and body armor to creating policies regarding storage, maintenance, job descriptions, insurance and training all staff.
- How do you train someone with a handgun to take on someone with a potentially higher capacity and semi-automatic-style weapon?
- In many school shootings the shooters are also wearing protective body armor, what style, type and what protection level body armor will our guards be wearing?
- Are there established programs for this type of training?
- What is the replacement policy for the District-owned weapons? What is the replacement policy for the District-owned body armor the guards will be wearing, if any? Will the guards be allowed to wear body armor that they themselves own? What kind of emotional impact would having guards in tactical gear on campus cause for children?
- What is the training program for the security guards? Does this training program include mandatory shooting range time? Who will pay for any mandatory shooting range time, both the time of the employee at the range and the cost of the range?
- Who will oversee this entire program and ensure compliance with all training and maintenance? And what are their qualifications?
- If a child brings what looks to be a real gun into a school and the weapon is seen by the armed security guard, what is the guard expected to do? Shoot the child before the child has a chance to potentially shoot anyone or approach the child first and find out if the weapon is real, thereby potentially allowing shots to be taken in those moments? Is there a standard of protocol set by a school-governing authority in this situation?
- Do we have a security consultant that reviews our security plan and our campuses regularly to identify weaknesses and opportunities for improvement? If we do, have they identified the lack of armed security guards or police response time as a weakness? What other weaknesses have been identified? are we also addressing those? are weaknesses prioritized in any way? are we addressing the biggest weaknesses first?

- Are there controls on access to the buildings outside of regular school hours? what about special events (concerts, field day, picnics, town meetings, sports events) on campuses, is additional security needed for events?
- Does every security guard have a radio that is on a channel monitored by our police dispatch or police departments? Do they practice communicating with the local police? Is there a protocol for how often they need to practice communicating with local police?
- In addition to the armed security guards, are there any other measures that have been considered to update our security plan to mitigate the chance that a shooting in our school is committed by a student? Measures such as making changes to our lockdown drill procedures to make sure they are as up to date and robust as possible, ALICE training, hiring more social workers and school psychologists, placing K-9s trained to smell ammunition at our entry doors, or continuing to offer no-cost breakfast and lunch to students? Has any kind of cost-benefit analysis been done on those options to make sure that budget is being spent in the best places?
- How will the emotional impact on our students and staff of arming the security guards be measured? There is potential that this could be an anxiety-inducing decision for some in our school community, will the students and staff be evaluated in some way and/or offered care if needed? Has a cost for this been included in the budget? Have psychologists, social workers, or other non-police experts been involved in developing this plan?
- How long have there been concerns over police response time in a life-threatening situation? Why haven't these concerns been addressed previously?
- Has something changed about our existing security plans that makes the implementation of this change so emergent that it needs to be in place before school starts in the fall?
- What experts outside of law enforcement or retired law enforcement have been consulted in developing this plan?
- What are other districts around us doing?
- Are there recommendations from the state board of education?
- The Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS) is offering a School Safety Conference on June 20 and 21, will our superintendent be participating? Has CAPSS issued any guidance on implementing armed security guards?
- CABA and CAPSS issued a joint statement on school security in 2018 following the shooting in Parkland, FL; this statement mentions investment in mental health services multiple times and supporting common sense gun restrictions, it does not mention arming any school staff, has CABA or CAPSS updated this statement?

Kim Thompson



Presence of Armed School Officials and Fatal and Nonfatal Gunshot Injuries During Mass School Shootings, United States, 1980-2019

Jillian Peterson, PhD; James Densley, DPhil; Gina Erickson, PhD

Introduction

After deadly school shootings at Columbine, Sandy Hook, and Parkland, many states mandated School Resource Officers or provided funding for districts to hire them.¹ Lawmakers also considered arming teachers. Florida now requires a law enforcement officer or trained school guardian in every school.²

By examining every recorded incident where one or more people was intentionally shot in a school building during the school day, or where a perpetrator came to school heavily armed with the intent of firing indiscriminately, we examine the association between the presence of an armed officer on scene and the severity of shootings in K-12 (kindergarten through 12th grade) schools.

Author affiliations and article information are listed at the end of this article.

Table 1. Descriptive and Missing Case Information for All Variables

Variable	Cases, No. (%)	Persons injured, mean (SD), No.	Persons killed, mean (SD), No.	Missing cases, No. (% imputed)
Persons killed per case, mean (SD) [range], No.	NA	NA	1.34 (3.25) [0-27]	NA
Persons injured per case, mean (SD) [range], No.	NA	3.15 (5.06) [0-32]	NA	NA
Weapons per case, mean (SD) [range], No.	1.63 (1.22) [1-8]	NA	NA	3 (2.24)
Armed officer	29 (23.58)	3.86 (5.45)	2.07 (4.16)	11 (8.21)
Lockdown drills	53 (44.92)	2.91 (4.75)	1.77 (4.63)	16 (11.94)
Targeted	57 (47.11)	2.74 (3.54)	1.11 (1.73)	13 (9.70)
No. of shooters				
One	124 (92.54)	2.94 (4.93)	1.29 (3.18)	NA
More than one	10 (7.46)	5.80 (6.12)	2.00 (4.16)	NA
Known weapon type				
Any AR or SMG	14 (10.45)	7.79 (9.69)	5.36 (8.05)	NA
Any handgun	92 (68.66)	3.18 (3.18)	1.45 (3.24)	NA
Any shotgun	29 (21.64)	3.72 (5.20)	1.79 (3.37)	NA
Any rifle	23 (17.16)	3.74 (5.56)	0.87 (1.49)	NA
Region				
South	39 (29.10)	3.36 (4.45)	1.41 (3.17)	NA
Midwest	35 (26.12)	1.60 (1.85)	0.83 (1.69)	NA
Northeast	19 (14.18)	1.37 (1.54)	2.05 (6.16)	NA
West	41 (30.60)	5.10 (7.41)	1.39 (2.38)	NA
Urbanicity				
Urban	34 (25.37)	2.82 (4.46)	0.56 (1.05)	NA
Suburban	58 (43.28)	3.60 (5.73)	1.67 (4.46)	NA
Rural	42 (31.34)	2.79 (4.57)	1.52 (2.24)	NA
School type				
Elementary	17 (12.69)	5.53 (8.44)	2.94 (6.44)	NA
High school	81 (60.45)	3.15 (4.89)	1.21 (2.67)	NA
Middle or combined	36 (26.87)	2.03 (2.86)	0.89 (1.86)	NA
Institution type				
Public	122 (91.04)	3.28 (5.24)	1.42 (3.37)	NA
Private/other	12 (8.96)	1.83 (2.44)	0.58 (1.44)	NA

Abbreviations: AR, assault rifle; NA, not applicable; SMG, submachine gun.

Open Access. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the CC-BY License.

Methods

This cross-sectional study was deemed exempt by the Hamline University institutional review board and granted a waiver of informed consent because it only used publicly available records for coding. This study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guideline.

We examined each identified case where more than one person was intentionally shot in a school building during a school day or a person arrived at school with the intent of firing indiscriminately (133 total cases) from 1980 to 2019 as reported by the public K-12 School Shooting Database.³ We focused on offender motive, an armed guard on scene during the shooting, the number and type of firearms the perpetrator used, and other factors. Following prior work on public mass shootings,⁴ the codebook was piloted on a random sample of cases. Each shooting was investigated twice by separate coders working independently. Data were merged and differences were resolved via consensus. The cases were then divided, independently checked, and sources triangulated.

Negative binomial regression models predicting number injured and killed were used to account for the overdispersion of count data; missing data (<12% on any variable) are reported in **Table 1** and imputed in multivariate models using multiple imputation in Stata software version 16 (StataCorp).⁵ All tests indicate significance at the $P < .05$ level. All tests of significance are model parameters in **Table 2**. Data analyses were performed from November to December 2020.

Results

This study examined a total of 133 cases of school shootings and attempted school shootings from 1980 to 2019. Perpetrators' ages ranged from 10 to 53; however, only 16 shooters (11%) were aged 22 years or older. Ninety-four perpetrators (70%) were current students, and 21 perpetrators (15%) were former students. Of all perpetrators, 83 (76%) were White and 148 (98%) were male. Of 121 cases with full information, 57 (47.11%) were targeted shootings. There were 134 shootings, 12 with

Table 2. Negative Binomial Regression Results for Number Injured and Number Killed in School Mass Shootings

Variable	Injured		Killed	
	IRR (95% CI)	P value	IRR (95% CI)	P value
Lockdown drills	0.90 (0.55-1.49)	.69	0.70 (0.35-1.40)	.32
Armed officer	1.21 (0.69-2.11)	.51	2.96 (1.43-6.13)	.003
No. of weapons	1.22 (0.97-1.54)	.09	1.34 (1.00-1.79)	.048
Targeted	0.94 (0.58-1.52)	.79	0.91 (0.48-1.73)	.77
More than one shooter	1.62 (0.73-3.59)	.24	1.008 (0.32-3.14)	.99
Weapon type				
Any AR or SMG	2.27 (1.07-4.81)	.03	12.84 (4.88-33.74)	<.001
Any handgun	1.37 (0.73-2.57)	.33	4.85 (2.02-11.63)	<.001
Any shotgun	1.29 (0.66-2.50)	.45	1.448 (0.61-3.41)	.40
Any rifle	1.39 (0.71-2.72)	.34	1.497 (0.58-3.87)	.41
Region				
South	1.84 (0.96-3.52)	.07	1.076 (0.47-2.49)	.86
Northeast	0.80 (0.35-1.81)	.59	1.186 (0.46-3.09)	.73
West	2.20 (1.22-3.96)	.009	0.907 (0.43-1.93)	.80
Urbanicity				
Urban	1.14 (0.64-2.03)	.65	0.628 (0.27-1.46)	.28
Rural	0.99 (0.56-1.75)	.97	2.303 (1.08-4.91)	.03
School type				
Elementary	1.39 (0.70-2.74)	.34	1.328 (0.58-3.05)	.50
Middle/combined	0.76 (0.43-1.34)	.34	0.898 (0.41-1.96)	.79
Institution type				
Private/other	0.48 (0.19-1.20)	.12	0.192 (0.04-0.91)	.04

Abbreviations: AR, assault rifle; IRR, incidence rate ratio; SMG, submachine gun.

more than one shooter. A mean (SD) of 1.34 (3.25) people per case were killed and 3.15 (5.06) per case were injured, with a mean (SD) of 1.63 (1.22) weapons per shooting (primarily handguns; 68.66% [92 of 134]). An armed guard was on scene in 23.58% of shootings (29 of 123) (Table 1).

Based on theory, multivariate models include the presence of an armed guard and control for region, school type (public, nonpublic), and grade level (high school, elementary, other); location (urban, suburban, rural); use of lockdown drills; if the attack was targeted; total number of weapons brought to the scene; number of shooters; and weapon type. Results are presented as incident rate ratios in Table 2 and show armed guards were not associated with significant reduction in rates of injuries; in fact, controlling for the aforementioned factors of location and school characteristics, the rate of deaths was 2.83 times greater in schools with an armed guard present (incidence rate ratio, 2.96; 95% CI = 1.43-6.13; $P = .003$).

Discussion

This study had some limitations. It is limited by its reliance on public data, lack of data on community characteristics, and inability to measure deterred shootings (nonevents). However, the data suggest no association between having an armed officer and deterrence of violence in these cases. An armed officer on the scene was the number one factor associated with increased casualties after the perpetrators' use of assault rifles or submachine guns.

The well-documented weapons effect explains that the presence of a weapon increases aggression.⁶ Whenever firearms are present, there is room for error, and even highly trained officers get split-second decisions wrong. Prior research suggests that many school shooters are actively suicidal, intending to die in the act, so an armed officer may be an incentive rather than a deterrent.⁴ The majority of shooters who target schools are students of the school, calling into question the effectiveness of hardened security and active shooter drills. Instead, schools must invest in resources to prevent shootings before they occur.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Accepted for Publication: December 24, 2020.

Published: February 16, 2021. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.37394

Correction: This article was corrected on April 25, 2022, to fix an error in the wording used to describe the study sample in the Methods section.

Open Access: This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [CC-BY License](#). © 2021 Peterson J et al. *JAMA Network Open*.

Corresponding Author: Jillian Peterson, PhD, Department of Criminal Justice, Hamline University, 1536 Hewitt Ave, St Paul, MN 55104 (jpeterson68@hamline.edu).

Author Affiliations: Department of Criminal Justice, Hamline University, St Paul, Minnesota (Peterson, Erickson); School of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Metropolitan State University, St Paul, Minnesota (Densley).

Author Contributions: Drs Peterson and Densley had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Peterson, Densley.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Peterson, Densley.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

Statistical analysis: Erickson.

Obtained funding: Peterson, Densley.

Supervision: Peterson, Densley.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: None reported.

Funding/Support: This study was supported by the National Institute of Justice under award number 2018-75-CX-0023.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funder had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

REFERENCES

1. Madfis E. *How to Stop School Rampage Killing*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-37181-4
2. Whitaker A, Torres-Guillen S, Morton M, et al. *Cops and No Counselors: How the Lack of School Mental Health Staff is Harming Students*. ACLU; 2020.
3. Naval Postgraduate School Center for Homeland Defense and Security. K-12 School Shooting Database. Accessed October 28, 2020. <https://www.chds.us/ssdb/>
4. Peterson J, Densley J. The Violence Project database of mass shootings in the United States. Accessed October 28, 2020. <https://www.theviolenceproject.org>
5. Osgood DW. Poisson-based regression analysis of aggregate crime rates. *J Quant Criminol*. 2000;16(1):21-43. doi:10.1023/A:1007521427059
6. Bushman BJ. The weapons effect. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2013;167(12):1094-1095. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.3824

Good evening, my name is Trevor Kegley. Old Lyme graduate, class of 2013, U.S. Army combat veteran. I served six years in the 1-102nd Infantry Regiment, including a deployment to Africa.

There, my unit defended a small base in Kenya. Our mission was to befriend the local villagers. These were small, mud-hut villages in the jungle, no electricity, no plumbing, very poor. There were many more kids than there were adults, literally hundreds of kids, all eager to hold our hands and walk with us. Their education may not be the same as Lyme-Old Lyme, but they value it just the same.

The enemy, Al-Shabab, were militant insurgents who would terrorize the villagers. One time when I was there, they burned down a school. The villagers are not allowed to own weapons, but Al-Shabab would go to Somalia and get weapons from Al-Qaeda and ISIS.

Here in Old Lyme, we don't live in a war-torn, third-world country. We reasonably assume that when our kids get picked up by the bus to go to school, they won't get kidnapped, held hostage, or pressed into serving a terrorist network. The kids in Lyme-Old Lyme are just as precious as those kids in the single-room mud-hut schoolhouse in Kenya. Their value is immeasurable. They are truly precious. I ask, what would those villagers do for their children that we wouldn't do for ours?

How is it that our police stations are armed? Our hospitals, airports, bus and train stations, banks, stores, gates, celebrities, and even mail trucks and parades? Is a bus ticket, a Christmas present, or paper dollar bill more precious than a child?

I read a statement to the Board of Education from a political town committee on this matter. The Committee warned of "consequences." I didn't realize that the guaranteed safety of our children was a "consequence" rather than the exact desired result of these proceedings. They wrote that arming guards may "seem" like a good idea. As if arming hospitals, banks and VIPs is somehow "not" a good idea? Finally, they mentioned the possible "emotional impact" of arming guards. The way I see it, I'd rather have a child see a gun on the hip of a guard twice a day (once going in to school, and once going out) than to have that child feeling no emotions at all, lying dead on a floor.

Some here may say that they don't think my testimony, the words of a soldier, is appropriate. They don't want their kids in a war. That is not my point. Our kids are not in a war. And thank God. How blessed we are here, in America, to withhold our children from such horror, and to be able to do it so very easily? I would even do it myself, for free! I ask the Board to take the word of a Lyme-Old Lyme graduate and a combat veteran, and protect the children that parents entrust to you. It is the simplest and most sensible thing you can do.

June 14, 2022

To the District 18 Board of Education and administration,

I do not support the option to arm security guards on our school campuses for the following reasons:

1. In the June 3, 2022 email to the school community, the superintendent stated the reason for arming the security guards is to improve police response time. Arming the security guards does not improve police response time. If the administration is considering the armed security guards to be police and therefore be able to respond more quickly than law enforcement, I still disagree. A single guard armed with a handgun and little to no body armor will not be reliably and effectively able to respond to a gunman in body armor and any semi-automatic weapon as our police force would. Our guard will be without backup and would be outgunned. Instead of arming security guards, the board should consider alternate options to create a safer space that a gunman cannot enter in the first place.
2. A cross-sectional study published in 2021 in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) specifically examined whether there is an association between having an armed guard at school and the prevalence of deaths and injuries during school shootings and attempted shootings. This research specifically concludes that the data suggest no association between having an armed officer and deterrence of violence in these cases. An armed officer on the scene was the number one factor associated with increased casualties after the perpetrators' use of assault rifles or submachine guns. Following this JAMA study, the question of why an armed guard would be associated with increased casualties was asked. Current case review suggests that a person planning to go to a school to commit mass murder is both suffering from mental illness but is also suicidal. Choosing to go to a place with an armed guard who will shoot to kill will accomplish the goal of suicide. Keeping in mind that a person planning this sort of incident is not of sound mind.

Here is a link to the JAMA article, if you have not had the opportunity to read it:

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2776515>

Based on this study, armed security guards will not decrease casualties and will not be a deterrent to a gunman, but just the opposite. This does not support arming our security guards.

3. Arming our security guards would come with a host of requirements for our District, the following are questions for the BOE and administration to take into consideration before voting on this program.
 - a. Has a comprehensive budget been prepared for this program? Does it include an increase in pay for our security guards now that their job descriptions are significantly changing? Where will the money to purchase the weapons and body

armor, the storage, and the maintenance and reporting requirements resulting from arming our guards come from in the coming school year and what will be the cost of the program in subsequent years? Where will the money for the salary increases come from? Have we incurred any expenses this budget year while exploring this option? Consultants? Expert opinions? Security evaluations? How will the emotional impact on our students and staff of arming the security guards be measured? There is potential that this could be an anxiety-inducing decision for some in our school community, will the students and staff be evaluated in some way and/or offered care if needed? Has a cost for this been included in the budget? Who will decide what level of body armor protection we purchase? How will that decision be made? Who will be responsible for the purchase, storage and maintenance of the weapons and body armor? How and how often will this person be trained/retrained? Who will oversee this program and ensure the security of the weapons? Where will the storage and maintenance be, on school grounds? Will the security guards be issued weapons and check them in and out each day or bring them home? What is the replacement policy for the District-owned weapons? What is the replacement policy for the District-owned body armor the guards will be wearing, if any? Will the guards be allowed to wear body armor that they themselves own?

- b. Does our insurance company have any requirements regarding programs like this? What are the insurance costs? Is there a projection of future costs as school shootings continue to occur more frequently? Does the insurance company insure the weapons when they are off school grounds? Does the conclusion stated within the JAMA article referenced above make a difference to the policy of our insurance company?
- c. How and when will our security guards be trained? Will we pay for the training and range time for the security guards? Will we pay for the employees' time while they are being trained? Will they be required to train in the use of their weapons in the same way the CT State Police do and at the same intervals? Is there a standard for school security personnel training? Will the rest of the staff be trained now that loaded weapons will be on school property? Who will oversee the security guard training program and ensure compliance? Are there any state reporting requirements for adding armed security to our schools? What is the cost associated with any reporting requirements and have these been included in the budget? Beyond weapons training, will we be providing active shooter responder training for the security guards? Do we/will we be providing mass-casualty care training to all our staff? If a guard is not at work one day, who will fill that role that day? If more than one guard is not at work one day, who will fill those rolls? Will our security guards work year-round on our campuses? The Connecticut General Statute requires all armed security officers to be retired State or municipal police officers. One of our current security guards is a retired parole officer, although trained in the use of a firearm, that is not specifically a retired State or municipal police officer. Will this employee be allowed to be

armed? Will we need to request special dispensation for them to be armed? If we do, what are the requirements of that employee? Are they different from the other armed security guards?

- d. If a child brings what looks to be a real gun onto school grounds and the weapon is seen by the armed security guard, what is the guard expected to do? Shoot the child before the child has a chance to potentially shoot anyone or approach the child first and find out if the weapon is real, thereby potentially allowing shots to be taken in those moments? Is there a standard of protocol set by a school-governing authority in this situation? Are the guards expected to enter into a classroom or other situation with an active shooter without knowing the weapon being used or the exact location of the shooter? In what situation would the guard hear shots fired but not try to enter the classroom? Are the guards expected to wait for backup before engaging with an active shooter? What is the protocol if a student somehow gets a hold of the weapon carried by the security guard? Who will be developing these protocols? What are the credentials of that person?
- e. Will the guards go through psychiatric evaluations and is there a standard evaluation for this job position or are we creating the evaluation? Who will conduct the evaluation and who will oversee this aspect of the program? How often will the psychiatric evaluation be repeated? What is the cost of ensuring the mental health of our armed security guards? All of our current guards have worked in law enforcement, will we require regular mental health care to identify what may be triggering (in any capacity) to our security personnel?
- f. Does this plan include adding one or two more guards at our main campus on Lyme Street? In an active shooter situation seconds matter and a single guard at this campus could take minutes to arrive on scene if they are at a different school than where the shooting is taking place, and they could potentially arrive later than law enforcement. Does every security guard have a radio that is on a channel monitored by our police dispatch or police departments? Do they practice communicating with the local police? Will there be a guard at the entry door to each building from now on to ensure safety at the entry point?
- g. How does arming the guards at the schools, specifically at Lyme Consolidated, impact police response time? Police response time was cited as the only reason for arming our security personnel in the June 3 email and it is not clear how arming the security guards will impact police response time. Have we consulted with the local and state police, requesting suggestions and options for reducing their response time? Have more than only the Lyme and Old Lyme police/State Police been consulted? Salem, East Haddam and Haddam are all Resident State Trooper (RST) towns and have 6 troopers assigned to their towns, while Lyme does not have a RST and Old Lyme only has one trooper and several town police officers on staff. Are life-threatening situations the only emergent situations where the administration is concerned about law enforcement response time? Is the only concern about police response time or is there also

- concerns about other emergency service response times? How do the armed security guards integrate into the police response plans in each of our towns?
- h. Do we have a security consultant that reviews our security plan and our campuses regularly to identify weaknesses and opportunities for improvement? If we do, have they identified the lack of armed security guards or police response time as a weakness? The June 3 email to the school community stated there have been long standing concerns over police response time in a life-threatening situation. How long has the BOE and administration had these concerns? Why haven't these concerns been addressed previously?
 - i. In addition to the armed security guards, are there any other measures that have been considered for update in our security plan to mitigate the chance that a shooting in our schools is committed by a student? Measures such as making changes to our lockdown drill procedures to make sure they are as up to date and robust as possible, ALICE or other training, hiring more social workers and school psychologists, placing K-9s trained to smell ammunition at our entry doors, or continuing to offer no-cost breakfast and lunch to students?
 - j. In what scenarios do you envision any of our armed security guards would reasonably believe that the imminent use of deadly force is necessary? Will this be clearly stated in the new job descriptions created for our armed security guards? Who will write this job description?
4. Policy choices this significant should not be voted on without an extremely well-thought out, comprehensive plan on the table to be voted on. If the board chooses to vote down or table armed security guards now, that does not mean that it cannot be voted on again or brought up again at a later date, when a plan, supported by data, indicates the need for armed security guards on our school campuses.

Thank you for your sincere consideration. Please do not support arming our security guards at this time.

Anna Reiter
264 Mile Creek Road
Old Lyme, CT 06371

Delaura, Jeanne

From: Neviaser, Ian
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 4:22 PM
To: Delaura, Jeanne
Subject: FW: EXTERNAL: Renovations/HVAC

For the minutes

From: Mona Colwell <monacolwell@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 4:14 PM
To: Staab, Christopher (BOE) <staabc@region18.org>; Powell-St Louis, Mary (BOE) <powellstlouism@region18.org>; Dean-Frazier, Laura (BOE) <deanfrazierl@region18.org>; James, Anna (BOE) <jamesa@region18.org>; Kemp, Jason (BOE) <kempj@region18.org>; Miller, Jennifer (BOE) <millerj@region18.org>; Shoemaker, Martha (BOE) <shoemakerm@region18.org>; Thompson, Suzanne (BOE) <thompsons@region18.org>; Wilson, Steven (BOE) <wilsons@region18.org>
Cc: Gregory Stroud <gregory.stroud@ctexaminer.com>; Nigel Logan <olwenlogan@gmail.com>; Tim Griswold <timothygriswold@yahoo.com>; Neviaser, Ian <neviaseri@region18.org>; Matt Ward <mpward815@gmail.com>
Subject: EXTERNAL: Renovations/HVAC

Hello Region 18 Board of Education,

As I stated this past Wednesday at the Special BOE meeting, I strongly urge you to consider utilizing the open space at Center School before proceeding with a costly and unnecessary addition at Mile Creek.

Our total capacity is approximately 1600 students and our current enrollment is around 1300 children. We have had an increase in students and families over the past two years which is great. There are available classrooms at Center School not currently utilized for Region 18 students that were saved for such a time as now.

Moving three or four kindergarten classes from Mile Creek to Center School is an easy solution to an overcrowding problem. There are classrooms and the school already has the benefit of specials programs being offered.

Ian Neviaser stated on Wednesday night that no one ever considered the option of only moving the Mile Creek kindergarten. Why not? At one time, this school was used for Old Lyme 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students. Lyme children in those grades were at Lyme Consolidated. We currently bus kids from Old Lyme to Lyme Consolidated to keep that school full. Any overcrowding at Lyme could and should be remedied through changing the line in Old Lyme determining who goes to Lyme Consolidated vs. Mile Creek. Excess busses could be eliminated and a stop at Center School, like just a few years ago, could be added to drop off kids at Center School.

The plans presented in January and rejected by the BOE showed all Kindergartners from both Lyme and Old Lyme moving to Center School. Therefore, any decisions to consider Center School should be brought back to the table.

Thank you for carefully considering the best interests of the taxpayers and for your financial prudence. We see state corruption everywhere, we certainly don't need unnecessary construction costs in our own town. Keeping our taxes low is the best way to keep Old Lyme affordable for all.

Thank you,
Mona Colwell

Mona Colwell
401-286-2650
Sent from my iPhone

Delaura, Jeanne

From: Delaura, Jeanne
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 9:04 AM
To: Delaura, Jeanne

Hello again Steve and Ian,

I was driven to pubmed to see what I could find related to this topic and came across this 2021 cross-sectional study looking at 133 school shootings and analyzing risks associated with different factors of those shootings. This is pretty much the best kind of research you'd find for this, there's not a good control group, and it would be impossible (probably unethical) to design a prospective study. We have comparative research between the US and other countries that clearly shows actions that could be taken on a national level to have a profound impact, but finding interventions with meaningful data to support interventions at the local level is hard.

https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/articlepdf/2776515/peterson_2021_id_200232_1650384846.2761.pdf

What worries me is that the only significant finding is that the presence of an armed guard has the opposite of a deterrent effect. Many of these shooters are suicidal and the presence of an armed guard seems to be attractive as a means to that end. That is worrisome, and I take back my preemptive support of arming the guards. I need to do more research. The core of my beliefs has been that more guns to solve the gun problem makes no sense, and guns have no place in schools, but like many, with the shooting in Uvalde I'm feeling lost.

This is a hard topic to research, if I'm remembering from my public health school days, the NRA lobby is so strong that there are no federal grants to support research on gun violence, so robust research is limited to places where private funding can be secured. I can recall there being student interest in writing a systematic review or meta analysis on the topic and the professor not approving it because they knew there wasn't enough published to support that type of analysis.

I'm going to do more research.

Kim

On Thu, Jun 2, 2022 at 12:46 PM Kimberly Thompson <kimberly.dr.thompson@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Steve,

I respect that BOE meetings are not public and this was outside public comment, no offense taken to not deviating from that protocol.

I wanted to say that I support arming these well qualified security officers, I'm a Lyme Parent, and my heart hits my stomach whenever more than one emergency vehicle passes my house headed north on 156 during school hours. I think my opinion on what to do nationally about this problem may be different from some of those on the board, but as far as what can be done quickly to increase safety on a local level, I think this is it.

I was also going to say that I think parents would come out to a forum, even during the summer. People are really worried about this, I can't tell you how much of the informal discussion waiting for meetings to start at work has been around how sad/angry/upset people are. People are really troubled and looking for any action to help them feel like we're working towards solutions.

Ian's points about surveys not being helpful are right. prior to my current job I worked doing qualitative research and good surveys take a long time to develop and you really need to know what you'll do with the answers before you ask the question, they're not great for idea generating. Focus groups on the other hand could be really helpful, I've offered to Ian that I'd be happy to sit down with a group to develop a domain table to guide focus group discussion, most research groups find that you can really saturate discussion on a topic with 3-4 focus groups with 4-6 people in them, after that you really just end up getting duplicate information, as long as a diverse contingent of participants are invited.

Let me know how I can help.

Kim

Kim Thompson | Cell: 860-287-2714

To connect with me as a Clinical Research Professional, please [connect with me on LinkedIn](#)

On Thu, Jun 2, 2022 at 11:50 AM Wilson, Steven (BOE) <wilsons@region18.org> wrote:

Kim,

I wanted you to know that I saw that you had your hand raised during our conversation about arming security officers on our campuses last night and I hope you didn't think I or the Board were being rude by not recognizing you and giving you a chance to speak. As I'm sure you know, our meetings are held in public but are not public meetings and for the sake of time, we are compelled to limit public discussion during our conversations and deliberations.

That said, I am eager to hear your input on the matter and strongly encourage you to send an email to the board sharing your perspective and opinions on the matter. I assure you we will read it and integrate it into our thought process. If doing so is not convenient for you, please attend our next meeting and share your opinion during the public comment section of the agenda.

Thank you for taking the time to sit through the entirety of the meeting last night. It's good to know there are people in the community who care so much about our schools that they are willing to sacrifice precious time to become well-informed.

Regards,

Steven Wilson

Chairman, Region 18 Board of Education

wilsons@region18.org

Delaura, Jeanne

From: Neviaser, Ian
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2022 9:03 AM
To: Delaura, Jeanne
Subject: FW: EXTERNAL: Response to decision on armed security

For the minutes.

From: Kimberly Thompson <kimberly.dr.thompson@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 10:04 PM
To: Dean-Frazier, Laura (BOE) <deanfrazierl@region18.org>; James, Anna (BOE) <jamesa@region18.org>; Kemp, Jason (BOE) <kempj@region18.org>; Miller, Jennifer (BOE) <millerj@region18.org>; Neviaser, Ian <neviaseri@region18.org>; Powell-St Louis, Mary (BOE) <powellstlouism@region18.org>; Shoemaker, Martha (BOE) <shoemakerm@region18.org>; Staab, Christopher (BOE) <staabc@region18.org>; Thompson, Suzanne (BOE) <thompsons@region18.org>; Wilson, Steven (BOE) <wilsons@region18.org>
Subject: EXTERNAL: Response to decision on armed security

All,

I recognize that there is only so much time in a day to devote to reading and searching literature to find the effective ways to improve safety at our schools, which is what all parents ultimately want. While I would have hoped that you might have found the time to research these issues in peer reviewed literature prior to voting, I recognize that you may not all have access and some literature sits behind journal paywalls. Maybe having something to listen to in your car, while you go for a walk, or complete some other task that summarizes current literature on the topic would be easier. I happened to listen to this podcast this afternoon, and found it valuable. The host speaks with an expert with 2 decades of experience in looking at gun violence and the interventions that work, don't work, and those that cause more harm. the podcast is 33 minutes long and I encourage you to listen.

<https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/rethinking-safety-in-the-wake-of-uvalde/id1112190608?i=1000564765346>

Respectfully,
Kim Thompson

--

Kim

Kim Thompson | Cell: 860-287-2714

To connect with me as a Clinical Research Professional, please [connect with me on LinkedIn](#)

Delaura, Jeanne

From: Neviaser, Ian
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2022 12:37 PM
To: Delaura, Jeanne
Subject: FW: EXTERNAL: Respectfully submitted for inclusion in the proceedings of the next meeting of the Region 18 BOE

For the minutes

From: Old Lyme Democrats <oldlymedtc@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2022 12:27 PM
To: Neviaser, Ian <neviaseri@region18.org>; Dean-Frazier, Laura (BOE) <deanfrazierl@region18.org>; James, Anna (BOE) <jamesa@region18.org>; Kemp, Jason (BOE) <kempj@region18.org>; Miller, Jennifer (BOE) <millerj@region18.org>; Powell-St Louis, Mary (BOE) <powellstlouism@region18.org>; Shoemaker, Martha (BOE) <shoemakerm@region18.org>; Staab, Christopher (BOE) <staabc@region18.org>; Thompson, Suzanne (BOE) <thompsons@region18.org>; Wilson, Steven (BOE) <wilsons@region18.org>
Subject: EXTERNAL: Respectfully submitted for inclusion in the proceedings of the next meeting of the Region 18 BOE

June 10, 2022

Dear Superintendent Neviaser, and members of Region 18 Board Of Education,

The Town Of Old Lyme Democratic Town Committee (DTC) understands that the Region 18 Board of Education (BOE) is currently considering a proposal to arm the security guards in our schools and that public comments are being solicited. We also understand that the proposal will be addressed at a BOE meeting to be held on June 15. The DTC fully appreciates the importance and urgency of this issue and the reasons why arming the security guards may seem to be a good idea. However, we are also concerned that doing so might have adverse consequences. Our children's safety is paramount. We therefore strongly urge the BOE not to decide this issue precipitously but only after careful consideration of the existing research on the subject and the opinions of knowledgeable experts, regarding both the physical safety and emotional impacts this action may entail.

Sincerely,

The Town of Old Lyme Democratic Town Committee
<http://www.oldlymedtc.com>

Delaura, Jeanne

From: Neviaser, Ian
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 1:34 PM
To: Delaura, Jeanne
Subject: FW: EXTERNAL: Armed school personnel proposal

For the August minutes.

From: Mary Jo Kelly Nosal <maryjokellynosal@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 2:13 PM
To: Neviaser, Ian <neviaseri@region18.org>
Cc: Dean-Frazier, Laura (BOE) <deanfrazierl@region18.org>; James, Anna (BOE) <jamesa@region18.org>; Kemp, Jason (BOE) <kempj@region18.org>; Miller, Jennifer (BOE) <millerj@region18.org>; Powell-St Louis, Mary (BOE) <powellstlouism@region18.org>; Shoemaker, Martha (BOE) <shoemakerm@region18.org>; Staab, Christopher (BOE) <staabc@region18.org>; Thompson, Suzanne (BOE) <thompsons@region18.org>; Wilson, Steven (BOE) <wilsons@region18.org>
Subject: EXTERNAL: Armed school personnel proposal

Dear Superintendent Neviaser,

The enhanced protection of our children and school staff is no doubt why you have proposed placing armed personnel on our school grounds.

Although you, and the Board of Education, can advance this proposal without the public input we had following Sandy Hook, we think community support for this proposal is valuable and needed.

We urge you to provide the assurance that this proposal has been well researched and is supported by data, and that the safety hazard plan, presumably reviewed by knowledgeable people in this field, agree that this proposal is wise and part of a coordinated approach to school safety.

Sincerely,
Roger and Mary Jo Nosal
12 Swanswood Lane
Old Lyme, CT

June 15, 2022

Dear Mr. Neviaser and Board of Education members,

I am unable to attend tonight's special meeting of the Board of Education but wanted to take this opportunity to share my thoughts. I have 2 children in the district, one in high school and one at Mile Creek Elementary School. We have lived in town for over 20 years. I am always proud to share what my children are experiencing in Region 18 and have felt that the district makes great decisions on behalf of our children. With the initiative to arm the security team, I have been stopped in my tracks. For the first time I am questioning the idea of continued attendance for my children.

I am significantly concerned with the speed at which the plan to move forward with arming the safety and security staff is progressing. I wonder why, only this solution is being pursued. While I am not an expert in the field of threat assessment or policing, I have not read or been made aware of any compelling information that points to arming adults in schools as a solution the tragedies of school shootings.

Adding a gun to the environment seems to send the wrong message in my opinion. Our schools are already locked, have controlled entry, and exit and staff wearing photo identification. Those are measures employed by prison systems. Added armed security will further add to that atmosphere. That is not an atmosphere, I am eager to send my children into each day.

I am an educator and work on a school campus every day. I have participated in lock down drills, tabletop drills, and school safety planning. I understand the desire to feel safe. It is unsettling to come to work after a school shooting has made the news.

But as an educator, I feel a responsibility to act based on evidence-based practices such as crisis teams, threat assessment evaluation, social emotional learning and community building. These are labor-intensive time-consuming processes, but when done well, highly effective. I believe in our school and town community and know that if we chose to follow a path that is about prevention and intervention, we will do an outstanding job.

I understand the desire to "do something" in the wake of a tragedy. I would gently remind the Board that the Uvalde School District employs armed security staff. It did not make a difference.

Please reconsider moving this proposal forward. Give it more time and more study.

Respectfully,

Kimberly Davis

Kimberly Davis
1 Dogwood Drive
Old Lyme

Delaura, Jeanne

From: Neviaser, Ian
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 11:01 AM
To: Delaura, Jeanne
Subject: FW: EXTERNAL: Arming security guards in LOL Schools

For the minutes.

From: Olwen Logan <olwenlogan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 6:20 PM
To: Dean-Frazier, Laura (BOE) <deanfrazierl@region18.org>; James, Anna (BOE) <jamesa@region18.org>; Kemp, Jason (BOE) <kempj@region18.org>; Miller, Jennifer (BOE) <millerj@region18.org>; Powell-St Louis, Mary (BOE) <powellstlouism@region18.org>; Shoemaker, Martha (BOE) <shoemakerm@region18.org>; Staab, Christopher (BOE) <staabc@region18.org>; Thompson, Suzanne (BOE) <thompsons@region18.org>; Wilson, Steven (BOE) <wilsons@region18.org>
Cc: Neviaser, Ian <neviaseri@region18.org>
Subject: EXTERNAL: Arming security guards in LOL Schools

Dear Members of the Region 18 Board of Education and Superintendent Neviaser,

This is beyond the 11th hour but I am writing to urge you to vote against the proposal to arm security guards in Lyme-Old Lyme Schools.

It is hard to put into words how strongly I feel about this but I was heartened when all four of our children, each of whom was educated from KG/1st through 12th grade in Lyme-Old Lyme Schools, said they felt the same as I did and moreover that most of their peers did.

The whole topic is so controversial and politicized that I do not believe any amount of statistics will affect your thinking. I could obviously send you pages and pages proving that armed guards do not increase safety in schools but you could counter with pages that say the opposite.

I think the only thing I can say which is irrefutable is that LOL Schools have been a trail-blazer in many respects regarding how they have handled COVID crisis. Schools here remained open when most others were closed, which set them apart from the majority, and ultimately caused LOL Schools to be viewed in a positive light.

Why do you not similarly set yourselves apart from the crowd on gun violence? You have an excellent security system, which works. (Uvalde did not.)

Why do you not attack the real problem of the availability of guns? Lyme-Old Lyme current students and those who have graduated in the recent past (like our children and their peers) are part of the future of changing the gun culture in the US, which is the real solution to gun violence anywhere, including schools. I believe that a majority of that segment of the population urgently wants that change.

Why not have the students and staff help organize a gun buy-back program with Old Lyme Police? [See this article for an example of how successful these programs can be.](#) Or start a Gun Awareness Club, which could, among many other things, review the statistics of gun availability vs. gun deaths in the US and compare the data with other countries where guns are not freely available. Or ...???

Rather than fan the flames by arming security guards, do something that starts to change gun culture in a microcosm of the country, which ultimately might be seen as another trail-blazing initiative by Lyme-Old Lyme Schools.

Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely,

Olwen Logan

Oiwen Logan

Publisher of LymeLine.com (covering Lyme & Old Lyme since 2003)

Delaura, Jeanne

From: Neviaser, Ian
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 9:19 AM
To: Delaura, Jeanne
Subject: FW: EXTERNAL: Board of Education Decision

For the minutes

From: CHRIS OLSEN <chrisolsen6@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 8:20 PM
To: Neviaser, Ian <neviaseri@region18.org>; Shoemaker, Martha (BOE) <shoemakerm@region18.org>; Staab, Christopher (BOE) <staabc@region18.org>; Thompson, Suzanne (BOE) <thompsons@region18.org>; Wilson, Steven (BOE) <wilsons@region18.org>; Dean-Frazier, Laura (BOE) <deanfrazierl@region18.org>; James, Anna (BOE) <jamesa@region18.org>; Kemp, Jason (BOE) <kempj@region18.org>; Miller, Jennifer (BOE) <millerj@region18.org>; Powell-St Louis, Mary (BOE) <powellstlouism@region18.org>; tgriswold@oldlyme-ct.gov; selectman@townlyme.org; mward@oldlyme-ct.gov
Subject: EXTERNAL: Board of Education Decision

Regarding collective decision of the Board of Education to support the arming of school security staff within your school buildings, I ask you to think this decision through further.

As a former state trooper, Resident Trooper of Old Lyme and Haddam, a former School Resource Officer for Region 18 and Westbrook Public Schools, and currently a Director of Safety and Security for a local neighboring school, I come to you with some knowledge relative to efforts in keeping schools, students, and staff safe.

A few questions jump out which indicates a lack of knowledge on the Boards part as well as that of Superintendent Neviaser. Mr. Neviaser's comments regarding School Resource Officers and the perceived "School to Prison Pipeline" is a clear indication that he is more interested in political talking points than facts of what a School Resource Officer is and does for a school. The School Resource Officer program is designed around bridging the relationships between schools and law enforcement, and based on my experiences over approximately 8 years in your school district, I worked very hard to achieve this goal and I believe my work speaks for itself. Mr. Neviaser further states that School Resource Officers make arrests on issues that should be handled as a school matter. This too indicates a lack of understanding on these matters, as police officers, whether assigned to a school, or working in the town are called to incidents by school staff, mostly administrators. So if Mr. Neviaser feels arrests are being made based on incidents that should be handled as a school matter, than perhaps, better training for staff and administrators would be the solution. The very few arrests I made in my time within the schools were typically at the request of, or after careful consultation with school administrators, as you need a complainant, and a crime being committed to make an arrest. The typical political statement does not take into account that a crime needs to be committed before a police officer, in school or out of school, makes an arrest. Therefore, one can argue, if you did away with any juvenile criminal statutes, there should be no further "pipeline to the prisons". Whether you have a School Resource Officer in a school or a responding officer to a school, if a crime is committed by a student and the school requests a police officers presence, an arrest is possible.

Questioning response times for law enforcement, Mr. Wilson stating up to "20 minutes easily", I would question whether you have any data or documentation to support such a claim. Statements such as

this, indicate a lack of knowledge and limited scope of preparation for such a step. Yes, it is entirely possible for a 20 minute response time to some of the northern roads of Lyme but it is very difficult to believe this is the norm for response time. I can state clearly, based on my experiences in the area and responding to many police matters in Lyme and Old Lyme, that this is an inaccurate response time for emergency calls. In calls relative to school events, you will have many other agencies and law enforcement personnel responding beyond the typical patrol Troopers or local police officers.

Relative to the training of armed security and the anticipated budgeted amount of \$4,000 for training, again clearly shows a lack of knowledge in training of armed persons. That amount may cover the simple firearm proficiency training, but either you did not anticipate or did not plan for actual training needs. Training, at a minimum should include Use of Force Training, Weapons Retention Training, Legal Responsibilities, and training with local law enforcement towards a coordinated response. Statements made on this path to the decision leads me to question whether any of you have received training in Basic Incident Command responses, as history clearly shows coordinated training, much less communications between agencies is a must. Communications between agencies has apparently not even been considered, yet in law enforcement and other emergency responders it is a must have.

Do you have plans for conducting psychological background checks on current and future employees who would be carrying weapons within your schools? This is a direction police agencies are heading based on the Police Accountability training, so it would be in your best interest to at least consider this type of background check and continued monitoring of mental health of the armed security staff through the assistance of outside trained professionals. With the recent passage of Police Accountabilities bill and the removal of Qualified Immunity protection for law enforcement, I question whether you all have adequately taken the liability into account beyond the typical day to day insurance as you have quoted. Will the school district financially and legally support an individual should an event happen relative to being armed within the school, and are your potential staff aware of what level of protection the district will afford them? This level of protection, after consultation with school district attorneys, should be clear to all, as this may alter your current staff all being in agreement with being armed.

It has been stated that the armed security staff would only engage in an "Active Shooter" situation, raises my concern as do you not see the potential for a person to inflict harm on another with a knife, scissors, or other sharp objects, all of which are readily available within school environments. This type of attack, as can a physical assault without weapons, could prove fatal so what would your expectations be for your security staff as this would not qualify for your stated "Active Shooter" response. Do you not recall the tragedy of 2014 at Jonathan Law High School in Milford in which Maren Sanchez was stabbed to death by a classmate.

Additionally, the selection of the type of weapon is a question. How was that weapon decided to be the most appropriate weapon for the application you desire? What research indicates that would be the most appropriate weapon? As far as who actually carries a weapon, you state the security staff, but it has also been mentioned that your Facilities Director would carry as well. Is that solely because he is a former trooper, and does that open the door to any additional staff that have law enforcement backgrounds to eventually become armed as well?

Statements being made by members of the Board of Education and the Superintendent clearly show that this has not in fact been thought about for 10 years as if it had, you did not put much thought into it as there are still far too many questions relative to this decision.

As stated in my introduction, my careers have centered around keeping people safe with an extensive background in school safety, so I would ask that you listen to people with training and experience in this field and do some more research on this matter. This decision should not have been made as it was, as clearly there is a lack of understanding of the totality of circumstances when introducing armed persons into an environment. As stated, yes, having an armed person immediately in the vicinity of an armed intruder could potentially save lives. The concern here is all of the other aspects to having armed persons on campus or in buildings.

Feel free to respond back should you have any concerns or questions or if you desire an opinion from a person that has walked your hallways in my official capacity as a state trooper.

Respectfully,
Christopher Olsen

Delaura, Jeanne

From: Neviaser, Ian
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2022 9:39 AM
To: Delaura, Jeanne
Subject: FW: EXTERNAL: State Legislature/BOE Agenda

For the minutes.

From: Jim Miller <jim.miller105@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2022 9:35 AM
To: Wilson, Steven (BOE) <wilsons@region18.org>; Dean-Frazier, Laura (BOE) <deanfrazierl@region18.org>; James, Anna (BOE) <jamesa@region18.org>; Kemp, Jason (BOE) <kempj@region18.org>; Miller, Jennifer (BOE) <millerj@region18.org>; Powell-St Louis, Mary (BOE) <powellstlouism@region18.org>; Shoemaker, Martha (BOE) <shoemakerm@region18.org>; Staab, Christopher (BOE) <staabc@region18.org>; Thompson, Suzanne (BOE) <thompsons@region18.org>
Cc: Neviaser, Ian <neviaseri@region18.org>; Dean, Michelle <deanm@region18.org>
Subject: EXTERNAL: State Legislature/BOE Agenda

Dear Region 18 Board of Education,

I wanted to share the speech by Bari Weiss regarding the current climate in education as a follow-up to my proposal on our Anti-Discrimination Policy, which you thoughtfully addressed.

The culture that Bari is describing accurately reflects the agenda of our State Legislature, State BOE and SERC. her advice to the student she is addressing is a sensible response to this culture, that I hope we can adopt in our schools.

Enjoy your summers,

Jim

https://www.commonsense.news/p/the-new-founders-america-needs?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email

Here is the podcast version: [The New Founders America NeedsBy Bari WeissPodcast episode](#)

On Feb 2, 2022, at 4:22 PM, Jim Miller <jim.miller105@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Region 18 Board of Education,

It is my understanding that tonight's meeting may cover Region 18's policies on anti-discrimination.

Since a number of you are new to the Board, I am attaching two email I sent to the Board after I spoke at the August meeting on this topic. These material include a proposed policy to replace the current policy. I cannot attend in person , but I will try to Zoom in.

Regards,

Jim

<Board of Education Resolution.docx>

Dear Region 18 School
Board

August 6, 2021

As a parent of three Region 18 students (one now in college), I have found the learning environment to be exceptionally kind, inclusive, and conducive to learning - allowing each student to excel. I am especially touched when I see how students with learning disabilities are accepted as treasured members of the community at Lyme Consolidated School. My concern is that we maintain this environment for the benefit of future students, teachers and staff.

Thank you for listening to my proposal recommending adoption of a new anti-discrimination policy for the district during the public comment period at your August 4th meeting. As I said, the existing policy fails to define "discrimination" and is inadequate to address the applications of critical theories that are working their way through our society, some of which are both unconstitutional and/or illegal under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. My proposed policy and the existing CAGE policy are attached below.

The five-minute allotment for public comment did not allow sufficient time to present a full case for this urgent proposal. I am writing to more fully explain the necessity of considering my proposed policy.

After Wednesday's Board meeting, a parent came to me and informed me that a seventh grade English class was recently given an assignment requiring that the students write a paper affirming their racism. This is a perfect example of compelled speech. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled (in a case brought by a Jehovah's Witness in New Hampshire) that the State of New Hampshire cannot compel a person to display a license plate saying "Live Free or Die" on their car. Freedom of conscience is inherent in our right to free speech. Another area that may compel speech is establishing course requirements that students participate in political activism. My proposed policy addresses this practice as well.

Since the murder of George Floyd, and the emergence of the Black Lives Matter movement, racism has become front page news. The year the State Legislature passed [a bill declaring racism a public health crisis](#) America is having a reckoning with race, and perhaps a third great awakening. We all want what is best for a for all Americas, especially those who suffer and have the fewest opportunities to thrive. There are many opinions on how to get there. I have spent the past 18-months studying and seeking to understand these issues. I come to the table simply as a concerned parent, my views are my own, I do not speak for any organization or political party.

It is important to note that the public schools are the government. Teachers do not have First Amendment rights in their classroom capacity. What teachers are permitted to teach and not teach, is rightly the decision of the Board of Education, under the powers granted to it by the State Legislature.

Critical theories, including Critical Race Theory, Critical Gender Theory and Critical Pedagogy have deep philosophical roots, stretching back 200 years to GFW Hegel and his concept of the dialectic. These theories developed around the dialectic and absorbed concepts from Marx (dialectical materialism), Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci (cultural Marxism), The Frankfurt school, and in particular Herbert Marcuse (who proposed the origins of cancel culture), and the post-modernism concepts of Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault (that there is no objective truth, only lived experience). [Critical Race Theory emerged from the work of Harvard Law professor, Derrick Bell in the 1980s](#). It seeks to understand society through power dynamics of race, represented through the laws of a society.

Critical theories have evolved beyond law schools and into the public debate often containing certain common premises including:

- People are group members, not individuals.

- Power differentials among groups is the frame of reference to understand society.
- People in the “power” group have privilege.
- Humanity will inevitably create utopia on earth by applying the dialectical process – there is and arc of history with a predestined outcome. Those in favor of this dialectical process stand “on the right side of history.” Those that resist its prescriptions stand on “the wrong side of history.” Theory must be put into practice (called praxis) in order to perfect society.
- Outcomes are determined by a person’s circumstances, not by the exercise of their free will or effort. This is called structural determinism.
- People who have not adopted critical consciousness (this belief system) suffer from false consciousness and must be reeducated to become “woke.” They are trapped in their current belief system because their experiences and perceptions are constrained by the existing oppressive societal framework.

I am all for teaching about critical theories, in the context that they are theories, and that there are also other ways to think about society, but not in the context that they are Truth.

I believe that the rising level of teenage angst and mental health issues is at least in part related to teaching children, if privileged, that they have collective guilt for the ills of society; or, if oppressed, can only succeed with the help of the oppressor class. Further, that their outcomes in life will be determined by their circumstances. These concepts leave children with the sense that they have no control over their futures, unless they overthrow the existing society.

I also believe that we should teach all of U.S. history including the many wrongs that have been done by our country. The history curriculum, however, should contain context and comparisons to other countries and civilizations. All humans are flawed and as a result all nations are flawed. These observations form the basis of the Constitutional concept of limited government.

The critical theorists believe that their theories must be put into practice because acting on critical theories is part the dialectic – opposing the thesis (the current system) with its antithesis (the criticism of the system) to reach the synthesis (the higher level of society that they believe will inevitably result from this process of deconstruction). As such, people who believe in critical theories must put their beliefs into practice in the classroom. Critical Race Theory has become more than a theory - it is an activist movement seeking to “question the very foundations of the liberal order.” As critical theorists, Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, wrote in the opening paragraph of his book *Critical Race Theory - An Introduction*:

<IMG_0651.jpeg>

Application of critical theories often directly violates our constitutional rights under the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For example, requiring people, as a part of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion training, to separate into “affinity groups” by race or gender. The second category of First Amendment violations relates to compelled speech – forcing people to express views with which they do not agree as a condition of participation in school or receiving a grade.

No student, teacher or staff member of Regional District 18 should suffer the violation of their Constitutional rights. It is the duty of the School Board to enact policies that protect and insure those rights. I urge you to consider the attached proposed policy at your next meeting. I am happy to meet with you and discuss this matter should you have any questions or concerns.

There is much to be done to make America a better country and I believe we should each do what we can to contribute to that effort. I am a member of Lyme's Affordable Housing Commission and the Sustainable Lyme committee, working to bring renewable energy to our town facilities.

With our children in mind,

Jim Miller

Lyme, CT

Hi all,

In my oral remarks I mentioned the NEA's policy from their conference and SERC's policy statement on CRT and NEA's controversial removal of CRT from their website after approving it at their annual conference. I have included those below for additional context.

Best,

Jim

<Critical Race Theory and Education: SERC's Perspective - State Education Resource Center.pdf>

<https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/union-members-to-discuss-critical-race-theory-school-police-at-100th-nea-assembly/2021/06>

<https://www.nationalreview.com/news/largest-teachers-union-erases-campaign-to-push-critical-race-theory-from-website/>

<CABE anti-discrimination policy.doc>

NOTICE: This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential and protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, as attorney work product, or by other applicable privileges. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Jim

NOTICE: This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential and

protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, as attorney work product, or by other applicable privileges. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Curriculum Renewal Process



Theory of Action

If we provide students with curriculum that is rooted in current best practices in education, is rigorous and offers opportunities for all students to grow as learners, students will have the necessary skills to be successful in school and careers.

Common Understandings

Curriculum - A course of study including standards/content, assessment criteria and instructional strategies.

Curriculum Revision Cycle - The time frame in which curriculum/resources are reviewed by teams based on needs assessments, current educational research and/or new mandates.

Revision Summary - Internal document that notes where each curriculum falls in the continuous improvement cycle and is updated annually.

Standards - Define the knowledge and skills students should possess (at points in their education).

Framework - A structure of standards/learning outcomes that defines the content to be learned and provides guidance to develop curriculum.

State Mandated vs Locally Controlled Curriculum

State mandated curriculum or program mandates are materials, courses and/or resources that are required by state legislation to be taught in schools.

Examples:

Scientifically Research-Based Intervention (SRBI) - 2009

African American and Latino Studies course and SERC curriculum/resources - 2022

Center for Literacy Development curriculum requirements for early literacy instruction in grade K-2 - 2023

Based on CT state approved standards or content, schools are allowed to adopt or develop curriculum aligned with standards.

Examples:

Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)

Common Core Standards - Math/ELA

CT Social Studies Framework

Climate Change

Native American studies (CT tribes)

Rigorous and Relevant Curriculum

1. Provide students with a rigorous and comprehensive experience.
2. Support educators in research-based best practices.
3. Encourage innovation, collaboration, dialogue and creativity.
4. Create conditions for personalized learning opportunities and differentiated instruction
5. Provide reliable assessment data to inform instruction/student mastery.
6. Be a 'living document' and road map for staff.

Curriculum Revision Cycle

1. Needs assessment conducted to identify future needs based on research, standards and student data.
2. Review of current curriculum (and/or other curriculums) against an audit checklist developed out of step 1.
3. Refreshing of current curriculum/implementation of new curriculums.
4. Monitoring of response (student, teacher, sometimes parent)
5. Evaluation of implementation (pilot or otherwise)
6. Revision of curriculum implementation based on quantitative/qualitative data.
7. Adoption of curriculum.

Continuous Renewal Process

In Region 18, most curriculums are regularly reviewed and adjusted as part of best practice in meeting the needs of our current student population.

While curriculum itself may not change, adjustments to delivery are made regularly based on quantitative and qualitative data.

Region 18 Curriculum Revision Summary

- Each year department leaders (DL) document [curriculum revision needs/plans](#) in conjunction with Director of Curriculum (DOC).
- DOC reviews with DL plan of action and supports as needed.
- DLs share [curriculum documents](#) with DOC and house in internal folders (Canvas/Google Drive) for review.

Thank you for the time...

...Questions?