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Abstract

Located in Southern Nevada, the Clark County School District (CCSD) is the fifth largest school district in the United States and provides kindergarten through twelfth-grade educational services to over 300,000 students. The CCSD has a large number of students with special needs. Many special needs students have very unique emergency planning requirements. The problem was that special needs students within CCSD elementary schools may have been at increased risk to injury or loss of life due to emergency plans not sufficiently addressing their unique and individualized needs. The purpose of the research was to determine if emergency plans for special needs students in CCSD elementary schools were adequate. Data was obtained via the descriptive research method through organizational analysis, interviews, and a questionnaire. The research focused on answering the following research questions: 1. What special needs populations exist within CCSD elementary schools? 2. What is the current status of emergency planning for CCSD elementary schools? 3. What are schools and similarly situated organizations doing to address this issue? 4. What strategies addressing the needs of special students in emergencies are feasible for CCSD to implement? The results indicated that emergency planning for CCSD elementary schools was sufficient; however, emergency planning for special needs students could be strengthened. Recommendations included additional planning for special needs students, increased collaboration in emergency planning with the public safety community, additional training for CCSD personnel, and further research.
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Assessing Emergency Plans for Special Needs Populations in Clark County School District Elementary Schools

Introduction

Clark County School District (CCSD) has a large number of students with special needs. Many special needs students have very unique emergency planning requirements. The problem is that special needs students within CCSD elementary schools may be at increased risk to injury or loss of life due to emergency plans do not sufficiently addressing their unique and individualized needs.

The purpose of this research is to determine if emergency plans for special needs students in CCSD elementary schools are adequate. Data will be obtained via the descriptive research method through organizational analysis, interviews, and a questionnaire. The research will focus on answering the following research questions:

1. What special needs populations exist within CCSD elementary schools?
2. What is the current status of emergency planning for CCSD elementary schools?
3. What are schools and similarly situated organizations doing to address this issue?
4. What strategies addressing the needs of special students in emergencies are feasible for CCSD to implement?

Background and Significance

Located in Southern Nevada, the CCSD is the fifth largest school district in the United States and provides kindergarten through twelfth-grade educational services to over 300,000 students. It encompasses all 7,910 square miles of Clark County, Nevada, which includes all rural areas, outlying communities, and the cities of Las Vegas, North
Las Vegas, Henderson, Mesquite, Boulder City, and Laughlin. The district operates 347 schools, including 210 elementary schools, employs 38,611 full-time, part-time, substitute and temporary employees, and is continually growing (Clark County School District [CCSD], 2009a).

Clark County, Nevada has been one of the fastest growing regions in the nation for several years. In the mid-1990’s, the CCSD had to expand its educational infrastructure quickly to serve the rapidly growing city of Las Vegas and its surrounding suburbs (Jacobsen, J., 2006). As the population increased, so did the number students. With more students, came a need to expand and modernize the school district. In 1998, a bond was passed approving $4.9 billion in spending to build new schools and improve existing schools. In fact, the district operates one of the largest school construction and modernization programs in the nation. For the 2008-2009 school year, the district will spend over $709.6 million and open seven new schools and four replacement schools (CCSD, 2009a). As the district infrastructure expanded and student population increased, there was a need to reassess the current status of emergency plans to ensure that students were able to learn in a safe and secure environment. The CCSD continually takes proactive measures to protect the well being and overall safety of its students and employees. When a crisis occurs, the districts primary objective is to safely provide for the welfare of the students and staff by keeping them out of harms way (Clark County School District [CCSD], 2008b). While no federal laws require school districts to have emergency management plans in place, thirty-two states report having policies or laws requiring school districts to have such plans; Nevada is one of them (United States Government Accountability Office [USGAO], 2007).
According to Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 392: Crisis Response in Public Schools (2009), Nevada school districts are required by law to establish a development committee to create a single emergency plan to be used by all public schools within each district (Nevada Revised Statute [NRS], 2009). The committee required and established by NRS 392, is comprised of personnel from the CCSD Department of Student Threat and Crisis Response.

Housed in the CCSD Office of School Safety and Crisis Management, the Department of Student Threat Evaluation and Crisis Response was established to maintain a safe and educationally stimulating learning environment. This department is comprised of school counselors, psychologists, and administrators who work with regional public safety professionals, including community emergency responders and emergency management, to ensure the seamless and timely response to a significant event. The department prides itself in responding to the needs of both employees and students and emphasizes the importance of having flexible district resources capable of working within the larger public safety community. It conducts awareness and training activities in all areas of crisis management and school safety to keep current with new trends and sound practices (CCSD, 2008b). This department is also responsible for development and maintenance of the CCSD Crisis Response Plan (CRP) (Clark County School District [CCSD] 2009b).

The CCSD CRP (2009b) was created by the Department of Student Threat Evaluation and Crisis Response. In accordance with NRS 392 (2009), the plan is to be distributed to each school within the district and the principal of each school is required to establish a school committee to perform the initial review and determine if the plan
will work for that site. If it does, the school will incorporate their site specific
information into the CRP template and adopt that plan as its own (NRS, 2009). In
addition to the Crisis Response Plan, the CCSD has an Emergency Action Plan (EAP)
(Clark County School District [CCSD], 2005).

The CCSD EAP (2005) was developed in accordance and alignment with the
Homeland Security Act, the Nevada State Emergency Operations Plan, the Clark County
Emergency Operations Plan, NRS 414: Emergency Management, NRS 392: Pupils, and
Nevada School Law Title 34: Education. The primary purpose of the CCSD EAP is to
serve as an adjunct to each schools CRP relating to specific emergency management
procedures. It also provides general procedures for protecting the welfare of students,
staff, and citizens during an emergency event, and provides a site and district-wide
standard organizational structure for managing resources used to minimize loss from
disaster or peril (CCSD, 2005). In developing the CCSD EAP, CCSD personnel
recognized a need for a more user friendly version that could be quickly accessed and
referenced by teachers. This resource, developed specifically for teachers, is known as
the CCSD EAP Teachers’ Guide (Clark County School District [CCSD], 2006).

Prepared by the Facilities Division, Administrative Management, and the Office
of School Safety and Crisis Management, the CCSD EAP Teachers’ Guide (2006) was
created to aid teachers in their decision-making process during a disaster. While this
wall-mounted emergency action plan does provide solid information, it does not contain
all of the information that may be required during the course of an emergency response.
The purpose of the EAP Teachers’ Guide is to serve as an adjunct to each Principal or
Administrative Designees’ EAP and provide detailed procedures for protecting the
welfare of students during an emergency event (CCSD, 2006). While documented emergency plans like the CRP, EAP, and EAP Teachers’ Guide are currently in place, the need for more comprehensive plans became apparent at a recent meeting of the Clark County Homeland Security Working Group.

On March 9th and 10th, 2009, the Clark County Homeland Security Working Group met to review and critique proposed investment justifications for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP). The HSGP is a primary funding mechanism for building and sustaining national preparedness capabilities including planning, organization, equipping, training, exercising (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2009). One of the proposed investment justifications presented was Schools Prepared and Ready Together Across Nevada, also known as SPARTAN. This proposed investment highlighted the need to address capabilities gaps that currently exist in emergency planning for schools across Nevada, including but not limited to issues regarding statewide standardization, National Incident Management System (NIMS) training and compliance, and the need to adequately train and conduct exercises for school district employees. While this proposed statewide initiative serves to address the needs of over 400,000 students in seventeen counties, the majority of students reside within the CCSD jurisdiction (Smith, C., 2009).

The CCSD has multiple groups of students with highly specialized needs. These groups are considered special populations and include students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP), students qualifying for Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL), students with disabilities, also called Individualized Education Plan (IEP) students, and migrants. Special populations are different from special needs populations. While special
populations includes LEP, FRL, IEP, and migrants, special needs populations only include IEP. According to the CCSD Demographic Profile for special populations, 69% (297,259) of the 432,850 students enrolled in state schools were categorized as being a special population and fell under one of the four previously identified categories. Within the state, students with disabilities accounted for 11% (47,556) of the total district population and 16% of the total special population. In Clark County, 73% (223,753) of the 308,554 students in the district were categorized as being a special population and fell under one of the previously identified categories. Students with disabilities accounted for 10.3% (31,888) of the total district population and 14% of the special population (Clark County School District [CCSD], 2008a). With approximately 70% of students in Clark County and the state categorized as special populations and roughly one in ten students being categorized as being disabled an having special needs, it became apparent that comprehensive emergency plans must address special needs students.

As one of the largest school districts in the nation, the CCSD it is legally required to have comprehensive all-hazards emergency plans in place. These plans should not only address the general student population, but special needs students as well. The problem is that current emergency plans may not be appropriate to safely provide for special needs students during emergencies. Failure to effectively identify and address capabilities gaps that exist in current plans may place special needs students at increased risk of injury or loss of life.

This research paper is consistent with the curriculum themes of the Strategies for Community Risk Reduction course at the National Fire Academy and was written to reduce risk in the local community by ensuring that comprehensive, multi-hazard
community risk reduction plans were in place. Additionally, it is in alignment with United States Fire Administrations’ five-year operational objectives and focuses on reducing the loss of life from fire by fifteen percent and addressing local risks strategically (United States Fire Administration, 2008).

Literature Review

A comprehensive literature review is provided to identify and summarize the current body of knowledge regarding emergency planning for special needs students. The literature review was completed using the College of Southern Nevada library and the Internet.

Human-influenced and natural disasters can have potentially devastating consequences that can result in loss of life and injury for those who are unprepared (Fox, M.H., White, G.W., Rooney, C., & Rowland, J.L., 2007). When disasters strike and emergencies occur, people with disabilities are not exempt from the turmoil and destruction that can follow (Sapolin, M., 2006). Disasters disproportionately affect those who are physically unable or mentally incapable of providing for their own safety. In fact, 2000 Census figures suggest that at least one in six Americans are at increased risk to death or injury in emergency situations by virtue of their disability or special need (Fox et al., 2007).

Developing plans for special needs groups can be difficult as well as frustrating for emergency officials because of the problem of identifying individuals with special needs. The problem is magnified by the fact that many individuals with special needs are dispersed among the general population and their needs not recognized and planned for unless they self-identify and state their requirements (Sorensen, B.P., 2006). According
to the National Response Framework (NRF) (2009), special needs populations are populations whose members may have additional needs before, during, and after an incident in certain functional areas. These areas include but are not limited to maintaining independence, communication, transportation, supervision, and medical care. Individuals in need of additional response assistance may include those who have disabilities; who live in institutionalized settings; who are elderly; who are children; who have limited English proficiency or are non-English speaking; who are from diverse cultures; or who are transportation disadvantaged (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2009). The NRF definition of special needs populations provides a function-based approach for planning and seeks to establish a flexible framework that addresses a broad set of common function-based needs irrespective of specific diagnosis, statuses, or labels (e.g., children, the elderly, transportation disadvantaged). In other words, this function-based definition reflects the capabilities of the individual, not the condition or label (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] and Department of Homeland Security [DHS] Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, 2008). Complicating the matter is the fact that there is no one universal definition for special needs populations. Many consider the impoverished as a special population and the disabled as a special needs population. While all arguably have needs, for the purpose of this research paper, special needs populations will be defined as those individuals who are cognitively, mobility, visually, hearing, or speech impaired.

Special needs students present a unique challenge for emergency planners (Patterson, H., Liggin, R., Shirm, S., Nation, B., & Dick, R., 2005). Effective management of these populations requires a comprehensive school-based emergency
response plan that takes their specific needs into account (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2009). According to School-Based Emergency Preparedness: A National Analysis and Recommendation Protocol (2009), children with special health care needs, including technology dependent children, children with developmental delays, and physically disabled children, will require specialized evacuation, relocation, and other emergency plans. The reason for this is that generalized emergency procedures may not effectively address the mental, physical, motor, developmental, and/or sensory limitations that disabled students may possess (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2009). Students with mobility impairments are a just one subgroup within the disabled community that often require specialized emergency plans that take into account their unique needs.

In some cases, individuals with disabilities may have limited mobility (United States Department of Education, 2007). If the child is mobility impaired, evacuation may be a challenge (Patterson et al., 2005). In an evacuation there may not be enough time or accessibility to move mobility impaired students and staff to traditional shelters. For example, mobility impairments might prevent some staff or students from being able to bend over to assume the protective position recommended during tornadoes. Also, during a fire, elevators will likely be unavailable to transport wheelchairs. As a result, it is critical to identify safe and appropriate shelter areas inside school buildings that can be reached quickly and accommodate individuals with disabilities (United States Department of Education, 2007). In addition to students with mobility impairments, students with hearing and/or visual impairments also require special planning.
Other subgroups within the greater disabled community are persons with auditory impairments and visual impairments. Individuals with auditory disabilities may not be able to communicate verbally, to read lips, or to hear fire alarms or other emergency signals. Visual impairments might impede reading signs or traversing unfamiliar or altered terrain. Do any students or staff have special needs for medicines, power supplies, or medical devices that are not likely to be available in emergency shelters? If so, it is important to consider what alternative arrangements can be made to provide these necessities. In addition to addressing these concerns, school personnel must determine whether specific crises will require additional considerations for hazards, such as fire, severe weather, or earthquake. Emergency planning for special needs populations is an essential component of a comprehensive emergency plan. If the emergency planning requirements of these special needs populations go unaddressed, the disabled community may face the same problems as those who experienced first hand the events of Hurricane Katrina.

In the wake of Hurricane Katrina, the nation realized that was ill equipped and unprepared to provide for special needs populations during emergencies. Katrina showed Americans suffering in conditions that more resembled the nations expectations of disasters in third-world countries than what Americans would expect to see in their own wealthy nation (Brodie, M., Weltzien, E., Altman, D., Blendon, R.J., & Benson, J.M., 2006). While evacuees streamed out of New Orleans, little of the relief effort was aimed at people with disabilities. Lex Frieden, the chairman of the National Council on Disability, noted that relief agencies were sending trailers and other temporary housing, but questioned how many were actually wheelchair accessible. He also noted that the
initial response to Katrina did not appear to include provisions for meeting the unique challenges of people with disabilities and was concerned that special needs populations, to the extent they were being helped, were lumped in with the general population. The founder of the Disability Preparedness Center echoed Frieden’s remarks when he said that emergency planning for people with disabilities had been spotty, at best. He went on to say that while government entities have been very proactive in their attempts to reduce deficiencies, emergency planning for special needs populations, in general, is very sparse nationwide (Singer, P., 2005).

Only in the more recent aftermath has greater attention be given to special needs populations in disasters. Hurricane Katrina survivors told stories of the disabled left behind because busses and other rescue vehicles were not wheelchair lift equipped, of ventilator dependant persons who died for lack of back-up power sources, and of nursing home residents who drowned at blocked doors due to inadequate staff training on evacuation techniques (Fox et al., 2007). If anything came out of the events of Hurricane Katrina and September 11, 2001, it may be the understanding that, over a decade after the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), in a disaster situation, nobody, regardless of their mental or physical condition, should be left behind. If the hurricane season of 2005 taught the nation nothing else, it was that a one size fits all approach to planning for the different phases of disaster management does not work (Fox et al., 2007). Understanding this, the federal government reissued a national call to arms to develop plans, policies, and procedures that effectively address the emergency requirements of special needs populations.
Emergency planning for special needs populations isn’t new for the federal government. In fact, they were quite aware of the gaps that existed in emergency planning for the disabled. Long before the 2005 hurricane season, multiple federal agencies had increased their emphasis on emergency planning for people with disabilities, and had even made it the special focus of the second annual National Preparedness Month (Singer, P., 2005). On July 22, 2004, President George W. Bush signed an executive order charging the Department of Homeland Security with aggressively exploring the matter of addressing the emergency response needs of disabled populations, and established an interagency council specifically for this purpose (Sapolin, M., 2006). The council, the Department of Homeland Security Department’s Interagency Coordinating Council, issued its first annual report on disability preparedness. This report listed steps that federal agencies were taking to improve the consideration of disability issues in emergency planning and coincided with the launch of Homeland Security’s Disability and Emergency Preparedness Resource Center and the new Labor Department guidelines on workplace emergency planning (Singer, P., 2005). This expanded on the president’s New Freedom Initiative, which was a series of policies designed to advance the interest of people with disabilities, by directing the federal government to address the security and safety needs of this unique population (Sapolin, M., 2006). While the federal government took the lead, it also charged the nation with developing comprehensive all-hazards emergency plans that addressed all individuals, regardless of disability.

All individuals, organizations, and governments should have a documented emergency plans. These plans should be practical, easy to understand, and work (Griffin,
The United States Department of Education Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools encourages schools to plan for emergencies and consider emergency management within the context of four phases. These phases include mitigation and prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery (United States Department of Education, 2006). Most school districts across the country have taken an all-hazards approach to planning, considered planning within the context of the four phases of emergency management, and developed emergency management plans. The problem is that many of these plans fail to address IEP and other special needs populations.

Schools in the United States are required by federal law to develop IEPs for special education students. IEPs consider and evaluate many facets of a child’s condition to ensure that an equal education is provided to every student, regardless of disability. A portion of the IEP is to provide for related services; and while not explicitly stated, must consider the particular needs of a child to ensure his or her safety during an emergency. Emergency procedures for people with disabilities are sometimes overlooked and have often times not been given due consideration (National Fire Protection Association [NFPA], 2007b). In fact, a survey conducted by the United States Government Accountability Office (USGAO) confirms that that many school districts emergency management plans do not include procedures for IEP and other special needs students (USGAO, 2007).

The USGAO report, *Emergency Management: Status of School Districts’ Planning and Preparedness* (2007), highlighted the need to develop emergency procedures for special needs students. The survey found that 28% of school districts with emergency management plans did not have specific provisions for special needs students.
Education officials questioned told the USGAO representatives, that because there is no agreement among disability groups on what the best practices are for special needs students in an emergency, districts usually devise their own procedures (USGAO, 2007). *Disaster Preparedness and Response for Persons with Mobility Impairments* (2007) echoes the USGAO report and highlights widespread deficiencies in emergency and disaster response for persons with disabilities (Fox et al., 2007). In another survey that examined preparedness for the prevention and response for mass casualty incidents at Arkansas public schools, most school districts reported that they did not have a written plan for the prevention of a mass casualty event (Patterson et al., 2005). While many emergency planning deficiencies exist in schools across the nation, few schools tap valuable community resources and work with public safety professionals and other subject matter experts to develop plans.

Ensuring that plans are coordinated with local emergency response agencies is important. Although most school superintendent respondents of the New Mexico survey had met with local law enforcement personnel, most had never met with local emergency medical services (EMS) officials to discuss emergency planning, and few school districts reported holding regularly scheduled meetings with either law enforcement or EMS. While emergency response plans are required in many states by law, the Arkansas survey highlighted the need for continued and improved planning and preparation. It also emphasized the need for school district administrators, nurses, physicians, local emergency response agencies, and the local medical community to be involved in formulating a coordinated plan for their local community schools (Patterson et al., 2005). More than half of the school districts with emergency plans who were surveyed in the
USGAO report did not involve community partners when developing and updating emergency plans and did not train with first responders or community partners on how to effectively implement their school district emergency plans. Reasons cited for the lack of coordination were that many school district officials said that they experience challenges in planning for emergencies and some school districts face difficulties in communicating and coordinating with first responders. Many these same schools failed to recognize their own resources, such as school nurses, that could help them significantly in the emergency planning process (USGAO, 2007).

School nurses have the ability to bridge the gap between schools, students, families, and the health care community. They understand how the school operates, they know the students, and they have emergency medical and healthcare training. In a study of rural public schools in New Mexico, only 11% of school nurses were involved in community emergency preparedness planning and only 44% participated in school disaster preparation and planning. While school nurses can play an invaluable role in emergency preparedness due to their knowledge of school processes and policies and the education they provide to the children and families, emergency management professionals from the community need to be more involved in the emergency planning process (Evers, S., & Puzniak, L., 2005). In addition to coordinating emergency planning with school nurses and other public safety personnel, guidance in planning for emergencies and special needs populations is readily available and easily accessible on the internet.

*Preparing for Disaster for People with Disabilities and other Special Needs* (n.d.), developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the
American Red Cross, emphasizes four key elements in effective disaster preparedness. These elements include getting informed, making a plan, assembling a disaster supply kit, and maintaining the plan. While very basic, these planning recommendations emphasize both the need to prepare and personal responsibility (Federal Emergency Management Agency & American Red Cross, n.d.). In addition to this document, additional resources, such as *Emergency Procedures for Employees with Disabilities in Office Occupancies* (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], n.d.), also provide excellent information on how to effectively provide for the safety of special needs populations during emergencies.

Developed by FEMA and the United States Fire Administration, *Emergency Procedures for Employees with Disabilities in Office Occupancies* (n.d.) emphasizes the importance of emergency planning for special needs populations. It highlights the need to ensure that the same level of safety exists for everyone, regardless of disability. It discusses special equipment and devices and provides recommendations on how to effectively plan for special needs populations in an emergency (FEMA, n.d.). Another excellent resource is *Emergency Evacuation Preparedness-Taking Responsibility for Your Safety: A Guide for People with Disabilities and Other Activity Limitations* (Kailes, J.I., 2002).

Developed by the Center for Disability Issues and the Health Professions, *Emergency Evacuation Preparedness-Taking Responsibility for Your Safety: A Guide for People with Disabilities and Other Activity Limitations* (2002) is a good source of information. This guide primarily focuses on the successful evacuation of buildings by people with disabilities and activity limitations. It provides information on personal
responsibility, legal issues, needs assessments, and other points for consideration. It contains checklists and identifies pros and cons of specific evacuation options. Overall, it is a very thorough and easy to understand guide for evacuation during an emergency (Kailes, J.I., 2002). *Personal Emergency Evacuation Planning Tool for School Students with Disabilities* (NFPA, 2007b) is another tool that can be used to assist emergency planners.

Developed by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), *Personal Emergency Evacuation Planning Tool for School Students with Disabilities* (2007) is a tool that can be used to help students with disabilities, teachers, administrators, parents, and others examine some of the issues that are relevant to a student’s ability to evacuate a building in the event of an emergency. It thoroughly discusses legal issues and special factors to consider when it comes to planning for special needs students. One of the best resources in this document is the Personal School Emergency Evacuation Checklist. This tool facilitates the collection of information for specific students and asks a series of questions to determine if the individuals’ emergency needs are met (NFPA, 2007b).

Also developed by the NFPA, *Emergency Evacuation Planning Guide for People with Disabilities* (National Fire Protection Association [NFPA], 2007a) is a supplement to the NFPA planning tool.

The *Emergency Evacuation Planning Guide for People with Disabilities* (2007), also developed by the NFPA, was created in response to the emphasis that has been placed on the need to properly address the emergency procedure needs of the disabled community. This guide addresses the criteria, needs, and minimum information necessary to integrate the proper planning components for the disabled community into a
comprehensive evacuation planning strategy. The guide was developed with input from the disabled community to provide general information on the five general categories of disability which includes mobility impairments, visual impairments, hearing impairments, speech impairments and cognitive impairments. It outlines the four elements of evacuation information that occupants need and includes a Personal Emergency Evacuation Checklist that building services managers and other people with disabilities can use to design a personal evacuation plan (NFPA, 2007a). Another great resource is the *Interim Emergency Management Planning Guide for Special Needs Populations* (FEMA & DHS Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, 2008).

Created by the FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, the *Interim Emergency Management Planning Guide for Special Needs Populations* (2008) was intended as a tool for local, tribal, territorial, and state emergency managers in the development of emergency operations plans that are inclusive of the entire population of a jurisdiction of any size. It provides recommendations for planning for special needs populations and can be completed now, no matter how much, or how little a jurisdiction has completed up until this point. The information in this document is universal in its application and is in alignment with planning policies and guidance such as the National Response Framework and the National Incident Management System (NIMS) (FEMA & DHS Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, 2008). In addition, to informational documentation, there are excellent sources of training available, free of charge, on the internet.

Under FEMA, the Emergency Management Institute Independent Study Program offers self-paced courses designed for the general public and people who have emergency
management responsibilities. All are offered free-of-charge to those who qualify for enrollment. FEMA’s Independent Study Program offers courses that support the nine mission areas identified by the National Preparedness Goal. These mission areas include continuity programs, public disaster communications, integrated preparedness, hazard mitigation, incident management, operational planning, disaster logistics, emergency communications, and service to disaster victims. They also offer NIMS courses and other specialized training for special needs populations (FEMA, n.d.).

An examination of the body of literature emphasized the importance addressing special needs populations in comprehensive all-hazards emergency plans. While there was sufficient federal, state, and local documentation providing information and guidance regarding emergency planning for special needs populations, there was little peer reviewed academic literature that specifically addressed planning for special needs populations. It was logical to expand the literature review and examine other institutions that may develop emergency plans for special needs children. However, based on the findings, it appears as if school districts are at the forefront when it comes to organizational emergency planning for special needs children. A thorough analysis of the literature confirmed the need to develop specific plans for these special needs populations. However, further research needs to be conducted to determine if current emergency plans for special needs students in CCSD elementary schools are sufficient.

**Procedures**

This research project used the descriptive research methodology to answer the research questions. A questionnaire was developed and post-questionnaire interviews were conducted to facilitate data collection. The questionnaire was developed using
Survey Monkey, a web based tool that facilitates the development, formatting, and data collection process. The questionnaire was sent via email to CCSD elementary school personnel on March 31, 2009. Responses to this questionnaire were collected until the questionnaire was closed on April 13, 2009. Once completed, a post-questionnaire telephone interview was conducted to ascertain if there were any additional comments respondents would like to add that weren’t specifically addressed in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire respondents were selected based on their accessibility, willingness to participate in the project, and knowledge of school district emergency plans, policies and procedures for special needs students. Limitations of this questionnaire include but are not limited to the fact that the number of respondents only represents a small fraction of the personnel employed by school district and that data collected may not accurately reflect district-wide knowledge, opinions, and/or perceptions about emergency planning for special needs student in CCSD elementary schools.

**Results**

Question one asked participants to identify what special needs populations exist within their school. Figure 1 shows that the majority of questionnaire respondents confirmed the existence of all special needs populations identified in the questionnaire, which included cognitively impaired, mobility impaired, visually impaired, hearing impaired, and speech impaired students. 7.1% of the respondents indicated that another special needs population existed that was not identified in the questionnaire; emotionally impaired. The majority of respondents noted that cognitively impaired and speech impaired students were the most common impairment with 92.9% of respondents being
aware that they attended their school. Respondents felt that visually impaired students were the least common with 57.1% of respondents being aware that they attended their school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Based on what you know, what special needs populations exist within your school? Select all that apply.</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitively Impaired</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Impaired</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Impaired</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Impaired</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

Question two asked participants how often they interacted with the different types of special needs students. More specifically, they were asked to take individual impairments and indicate their frequency of interaction as either daily, weekly, monthly, yearly, or never. According to Figure 2, the majority of respondents had either daily interaction or little to no interaction with special needs populations. 85.7% of respondents interacted with the cognitively impaired on a daily basis with 90.9% interacting with the speech impaired. Most respondents interacted with the mobility impaired and hearing impaired the least.
2. In your current position, how often do you interact with the following special needs students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitively Impaired</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Impaired</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Impaired</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Impaired</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 28
*skipped question 0

Figure 2

Question three asked participants to select the answer that best describes their feelings about their schools current emergency plans. According to Figure 3, 57.1% of respondents know that emergency plans are in place and they are thoroughly familiar with them. 35.7% of respondents indicated that emergency plans are in place but wish they knew more about them. 7.1% of respondents said that they believed that no emergency plans were in place.
Figure 3

Question four asked respondents to identify, in their honest opinion, to what degree they were familiar with different emergency procedures and plans within their school. According to Figure 4, the majority of respondents were familiar with emergency procedures but unfamiliar with emergency plans. 64.3% were very familiar with school evacuation procedures, 71.4% were very familiar with school shelter-in-place procedures, and 71.4% were very familiar with school lock-down procedures. With regard to emergency plans, 35.7% of respondents were somewhat familiar with the CRP and 28.6% said they had never heard of it. 28.6% of the respondents also indicated that they had never heard of the EAP and the EAP Teachers’ Guide.
Question five asks respondents to what degree they are satisfied with their schools ability to meet the needs of students with special needs as compared to those without special needs. According to Figure 5, 21.4% of respondents said they were very satisfied with emergency planning for students without special needs. 42.9% rated their level of satisfaction as eight on a scale of one to ten, with one being very unsatisfied and ten being very satisfied. For students with special needs, 14.3% of the respondents indicated that were very satisfied with the majority (28.6%) of respondents indicating their level of satisfaction as an eight on the same scale.

Figure 4
Figure 5

Question six asked participants to, in their opinion, identify what their school could do to improve its ability to help special needs student during emergencies. According to Figure 6, 58.3% of respondents indicated that there was a need to involve teachers and personnel who work regularly with special needs students more in the planning process. 33.3% felt that being more organized during an emergency, more clearly defining roles and responsibilities during emergencies, and conducting more emergency related training would all be beneficial.
Figure 6

Question 7 asks participants to rate how satisfied they are with their schools ability to provide for special needs students during specific emergencies. These emergencies include fire, gas leak, and active shooter. Because each of these events would require a different protective action, it forces the participant to evaluate evacuation, shelter-in-place, and lock-down capabilities. Figure 7 shows that respondents are least satisfied with their schools ability to provide for special needs students during an active shooter situation and most satisfied with their schools ability during a fire. In fact, almost 70% of respondents rated their school at a five or greater on a scale from one to ten.
Participants were asked to fill in what recommendations, if any, they had for improving emergency planning for special needs students in their school. Figure 8 shows that only 14.3% of participants answered this question and Figure 9 shows the specific comments that were made.
Once specific recommendations were solicited, participants were asked to identify what strategies in addressing the needs of special students in emergencies were feasible for the CCSD to implement. Figure 10 shows that the majority of respondents (92.9%) were unable to provide feasible strategies to implement. Figure 11 shows the actual comments regarding feasible strategies.
Once the participant completed the questionnaire, a follow-up post-questionnaire interview was conducted with each respondent. The majority of respondents either had no additional comments or echoed their responses to the questionnaire. Many emphasized that additional planning for special needs students would be beneficial to them. The majority of interviewees said that they would like to be more involved in the planning process, not just for special needs students, but for all students. Interviewees found it difficult to know what strategies were feasible to implement because they were unfamiliar with the emergency planning process. Overall, the majority of interviewees

---

### Figure 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. What strategies addressing the needs of special students in emergencies are feasible for CCSD to implement?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comment Text

1. Perhaps having the children become familiar with the local police and fire departments could reduce some of the stress occurring during these drills. It might also be helpful to have a different sound/signal so that the children, whether they are special needs or not, do not become panicked and worried, which often leads to more stress on both the students and staff, ultimately leading to more chaos during the emergencies.

2. None that I know of at this time.
noted that they would do everything in their power to provide for the safety of special needs students and were more than willing to be involved in the process of developing emergency plans for them.

Discussion

According to NRS 392 (2009), the Board of Trustees of each school district shall establish a development committee to create one plan to be used by all the public schools in responding to a crisis. As required by NRS 392, the membership of a development committee must consist of specific individuals in the county the school district is located. These individuals must include a representative from the following: The Facilities Division, the Board of School Trustees, Community and Government Relations, Health Services, Community Affairs, the Office of School Safety and Crisis Management, the Communications Office, CCSD Police, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Student Support Services, Basic High School, and a Campus Monitor, Teacher, and parent. The concern is that NRS does not require the inclusion other disciplines in the planning process that would respond to an emergency. In fact, most of the incidents identified in the CCSD EOP that would generate a crisis response would fall under the command of a fire department, emergency management organization, or emergency medical services or public health agency. While law enforcement personnel within the region are extremely competent, they do not have the ICS experience and resources that the fire department has to respond to a natural or manmade disaster. Failure to require these disciplines to be involved in the development of the CRP opens the door for gaps in planning. NRS 392 also does not have any language about planning for special needs students. While a generalized approach to emergency planning may be beneficial from a
political or legal standpoint, special attention needs to be paid and plans need to be
developed to address the most vulnerable population within the school district; the special
needs population (NRS, 2009). Since NRS does not mandate specific planning for
special needs students, planning for them would most logically fall under the
responsibility of the Department of Student Threat Evaluation and Crisis Response.

The Department of Student Threat Evaluation and Crisis Response is comprised
of highly educated individuals with an undeniable passion to provide for the safety of
CCSD students and staff. The majority of personnel in this department have backgrounds
as school psychologists, school counselors, and school administrators. Their knowledge
of school policies and operational procedures is exceptional and most are experts and
thoroughly experienced in identifying and appropriately responding to psychological and
social crises. However, an analysis of emergency training for department personnel
leaves room for improvement. In fact, most have not had any NIMS training or specific
training related to emergency planning for special needs populations. Their experience in
planning for natural and man-made disasters also appears limited. Planning for,
responding to, and dealing with a student having a psychological crisis is very different
from planning for, responding to, and dealing with multiple patients during a natural
disaster or other large-scale medical surge type event. While a natural disaster will have
a psychological impact that will need to be addressed, the primary goal during a
significant incident is addressing physical injuries that have occurred and preventing
additional physical injuries from occurring. Arguably, no one performs this more
effectively than emergency medical services, law enforcement, public health, and the fire
department. While a representative from the Department of Student Threat Evaluation
and Crisis Response said they were working hand-in-hand with these disciplines, interaction, collaboration, and coordination could be strengthened. The school district and department should be more proactive to initiate dialogue externally with regional public safety partners in order to create more solid long-lasting relationships. In addition to the support from the public safety community, each school has emergency plans available to them in the form of the CCSD EAP (CCSD, 2005), EAP Teachers’ Guide (CCSD, 2006), and the CRP (CCSD, 2009b)

The CCSD EAP (CCSD, 2005), the EAP Teachers’ Guide (CCSD, 2006), and the CRP (CCSD, 2009b) are distributed to every school and provide excellent information on what to do during a crisis or emergency. However, 28.6% of the respondents were unaware that they even existed. Approximately 70% of the respondents said they were familiar with their schools evacuation, shelter-in-place, and lock-down procedures which are described in the EAP, EAP Teachers’ Guide, and CRP. Additionally, the EAP and EAP Teachers’ Guide, do not reference or address special needs students. The CRP is an excellent resource and very thorough. It specifically references disabled students and staff in evacuation procedures in multiple sections. Special needs student are also specifically referenced in the CRP appendix entitled, Health Services Emergency Response Plan. The Health Services Emergency Response Plan for Medically Fragile Students is used to plan ahead for a potential emergency to assess the specific needs of medically fragile students. Medically fragile students requiring special assistance should be documented in this plan and the information necessary for their management should be noted. This information includes the students name, room number, teacher, and essential medications. It also used to document who is responsible for monitoring and
moving medically fragile students if the school nurse is not present. There is also a Students Requiring Special Assistance form in the CRP appendix. This form lists the students' name, health concerns, room number, responsible adult assigned to assist during evacuation, special supplies for this child, and if the child has a known heat sensitivity. For example, a child with mobility impairments would be documented in this form. It would note that he has a medical condition that confines him to a wheelchair and a teacher would be assigned to him. While these forms within the CRP document the students with special needs, what their special need is, and who is responsible for them, it does not provide information on how to properly provide for special needs students (CCSD, 2009b). Take for example a wheelchair bound child who must be immediately and safely evacuated from a two story building when the elevator is not working. How does the teacher know what the proper patient lifting and carrying techniques are. Does that teacher know if the school as a stair-chair available? Who has trained that teacher on how to use the stair-chair properly, and who is capable of assisting her if no other school personnel are available? These scenarios, and many others, need to be thought out well in advance.

The CCSD deals with members of a vulnerable population on a daily basis, children. Having a child with a special need arguably increases that student's risk and vulnerability. In an effort to determine how vulnerable this population actually was, CCSD personnel were asked to complete an emergency planning based questionnaire.

Identification of what special needs populations exist within CCSD elementary schools is arguably one of the most important steps in effective special needs planning. If a school district is not aware of the special populations it must plan for, then plans will
not effectively address the right people. There is no one size fits all method to emergency planning. Of the major special needs sub-categories, all were identified by questionnaire respondents as being present at CCSD elementary schools. As a result, comprehensive emergency plans must address the cognitively impaired, mobility impaired, visually impaired, hearing impaired, and speech impaired. While certain impairments are more present than others, all must be addressed in emergency plans. Failure to do so is morally, legally, politically, and socially unacceptable. Building on the baseline knowledge of what special need populations exist within CCSD elementary schools, it was important to assess the frequency of interaction between school district employees and special needs students.

Based on the data, respondents interacted most frequently with the cognitively impaired, visually impaired, and speech impaired. Most indicated that they had daily interaction or no interaction at all with very few participants indicating weekly, monthly, or yearly interaction. With many of the respondents interacting with special needs students on a regular basis, it was important to obtain their opinion on emergency plans.

Respondents were then asked to describe their feelings about their schools current emergency plans. Different phrases were provided as possible responses and respondents were as to identify which most accurately reflected their opinion on emergency planning in their specific school. While only 7.1% believed that no plans were in place, 92.8% knew plans existed. Of that 92.8%, 57.1% said they were thoroughly familiar with them and 35.7% said they wished they knew more. With 42.9% of respondents not aware of emergency plans or wishing they knew more about them, it is apparent that more training needs to be done.
The generalized term *emergency plans* was then broken down into specific procedures and plans to identify what exactly the respondents were familiar with. While most were very familiar with the more routine procedures of evacuation, shelter-in-place, and lock-down, they were less familiar with the documented plans in place. In fact, 28.6% of all respondents had never heard of the CRP, EAP, or EAP Teacher’s Guide. The procedures for evacuation, shelter-in-place, and lock-down are described in each of these plans which lead to questions about how personnel were trained on procedures. Overall, CCSD personnel should be aware of and have access to these documents so that they may become familiar with them and reference them in an emergency.

Most respondents indicated a high degree of satisfaction with their schools ability to meet the needs of special needs students during an emergency. However, they were less satisfied with their ability to provide for special needs students. Many respondents indicated that several things could be done to improve their schools ability to help special needs student during emergencies. At the top of the list was involving teachers and other personnel who work regularly with special needs student more in the planning. This shows a willingness by personnel to be involved in the planning process and an ability to identify solutions that may address the capabilities gaps that exist. Few respondents were able to provide recommendations or specific strategies to address identified deficiencies. This is most likely because they may we unfamiliar with the emergency planning process.

The CRP, EAP and, EAP Teachers’ Guide are excellent resources and provide exceptional information regarding district emergency plans, policies, and procedures. Research showed the need to invite more public safety disciplines to the planning table, include, annexes that provide more specific, highly detailed information about special
needs populations during an emergency, and close the gap between the plan writers and the personnel who will be carrying out the plan during times of crisis.

Research confirmed that emergency plans currently exist within the CCSD. The research also showed that students with cognitive, mobility, visual, hearing, and speech impairments all attend CCSD elementary schools. Schools across the nation are at the forefront when it comes to organizational planning for special needs children. Many schools are turning to school nurses, public safety professionals, and the internet for guidance on emergency planning for special needs students. There are several strategies that are feasible for implementation by the CCSD. First, provide additional training to CCSD personnel including but not limited training on emergency plans, policies and procedures, the NIMS, and special needs populations. Second, increase collaboration with public safety professionals in the community including fire departments, EMS, emergency management, law enforcement, and public health. Lastly, develop annexes to existing plans that provide specialized instructions on how best to provide for the safety of special needs students during all phases of an emergency.

Based on a thorough analysis, current emergency plans are appropriate to safely provide for special needs students during emergencies. However, theses plans can and should be improved. Failure to address the identified capabilities gaps that exist in these plans may place special needs students at increased risk of injury or loss of life as compared to students without special needs. A one size fits all approach to planning for the different phases of disaster management does not work. Disaster and crisis response plans need to be specific and individualized. It is important to remember, that in a
disaster situation, and especially in dealing with children, nobody, regardless of their mental or physical condition, should ever be left behind.

Recommendations

1. The author recommends that CCSD Department of Student Threat Evaluation and Crisis Response personnel should be certified in the following:
   a. IS-100.SCa Introduction to the Incident Command System, I-100, for Schools
   b. IS-200.a (ICS 200) ICS for Single Resources and Initial Action Incidents
   c. IS-700.a National Incident Management System (NIMS), An Introduction
   d. IS-800.b National Response Framework, An Introduction
   e. IS-197.EM - Special Needs Planning Considerations for Emergency Management.

Taking IS-100, IS-200, IS-700 and IS-800, available online and free of charge through the FEMA Emergency Management Institute, will allow department personnel to better understand the organizational structure and standardized terminology that will be used by public safety professionals who respond to CCSD facilities during an emergency. The ability of the Department of Student Threat Evaluation and Crisis Response to speak the same language and understand the command structure of emergency response and management organizations will help ensure that they are of the same mindset when it comes to the phases of emergency management; mitigation and prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery. Taking IS-197 will help the department better understand the unique planning requirements for special needs populations and ultimately give department personnel
a stronger foundation as they update the Crisis Response Plan to include provisions that address special needs populations.

2. The author recommends that the CCSD and the Department of Student Threat Evaluation and Crisis Response solicit additional emergency planning guidance and assistance from multiple public safety disciplines in the region including but not limited to law enforcement, fire, emergency management, public health, local government, and emergency medical services. Increased outreach, by the school district as a whole and the department specifically, will help to strengthen relationships, coordinate planning efforts, and ultimately make response to an actual emergency more effective.

3. The author recommends providing additional emergency training to school administrators, teachers, and support staff. Since ICS is referenced in the Crisis Response Plan, school administrators, at a minimum, should be IS-100, IS-200, IS-700, and IS-800 certified. This will help them to more effectively and efficiently interact with the Department of Student Threat Evaluation and Crisis Response as well as the public safety professionals that will respond to their campus during an emergency. While teachers and support staff do not necessarily require ICS training to function within an ICS, they should understand that an incident command system exists and they will have a role within it. However, the author believes being IS-100 certified would be extremely beneficial to and highly recommended for teachers and support staff.

4. The author recommends involving teachers and support staff more in the emergency planning process. This will encourage feedback from personnel who interact with
special needs students on a daily basis, promote buy-in, increase plan awareness, and ultimately make the plan more effective.

5. The author recommends developing emergency procedures and/or manuals for special needs students to be included as an annex to the Crisis Response Plan, Emergency Action Plan, and Emergency Action Plan Teachers’ Guide. These annexes should address protective actions for identified impairments and provide guidance on addressing impairment limitations during an emergency.

6. The author recommends increasing awareness of emergency plans by school employees by conducting training and exercises on a more frequent basis. CCSD personnel should not only focus on shelter-in-place, lockdown, and evacuation procedures, but should also ensure personnel are thoroughly familiar with the CRP, EAP, and EAP Teachers’ Guide. Practicing the emergency management plan on a regular basis, both internally with school personnel and externally with the public safety community, will help to ensure a more effective emergency response during an emergency.

7. The author recommends that future readers view this literature as a sincere effort to create positive change within the Clark County School District. This literature is intended to act as a starting point for future research in addressing capabilities gaps that currently exist in emergency planning for special needs students in Clark County School District elementary schools.
Reference List


APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

1. Based on what you know, what special needs populations exist within your school? Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitively Impaired</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Impaired</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Impaired</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Impaired</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 28

skipped question 0

2. In your current position, how often do you interact with the following special needs students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitively Impaired</td>
<td>85.7% (24)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>7.1% (2)</td>
<td>7.1% (2)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Impaired</td>
<td>25.0% (6)</td>
<td>8.3% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>16.7% (4)</td>
<td>50.0% (12)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Impaired</td>
<td>63.6% (14)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>9.1% (2)</td>
<td>27.3% (6)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>27.3% (6)</td>
<td>9.1% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>63.6% (14)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Impaired</td>
<td>90.9% (20)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>9.1% (2)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20.0% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>40.0% (2)</td>
<td>40.0% (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 28

skipped question 0
3. Select the answer the best describes your feelings about your school's current emergency plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No emergency plans are in place</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know if emergency plans are in place or not</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency plans are in place but I am unfamiliar with them</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency plans are in place but I knew more about them</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency plans are in place and I am thoroughly familiar with them</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 28

skipped question 0

4. In your honest opinion, to what degree are you familiar with the following school procedures and plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Never heard of it</th>
<th>Very unfamiliar</th>
<th>Somewhat unfamiliar</th>
<th>Somewhat familiar</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Evacuation Procedures</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>35.7% (10)</td>
<td>64.3% (18)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Shelter-in-Place Procedures</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>28.6% (8)</td>
<td>71.4% (20)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Lock-Down Procedures</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>28.6% (8)</td>
<td>71.4% (20)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSD Emergency Action Plan</td>
<td>28.6% (8)</td>
<td>7.1% (2)</td>
<td>21.4% (6)</td>
<td>35.7% (10)</td>
<td>7.1% (2)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSD Emergency Action Plan Teachers’ Guide</td>
<td>28.6% (8)</td>
<td>14.3% (4)</td>
<td>21.4% (6)</td>
<td>28.6% (8)</td>
<td>7.1% (2)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSD Crisis Response Plan</td>
<td>28.6% (8)</td>
<td>21.4% (6)</td>
<td>21.4% (6)</td>
<td>21.4% (6)</td>
<td>7.1% (2)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 28

skipped question 0

5. To what degree are you satisfied with your school's ability to meet the needs of students during emergencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students WITHOUT Special Needs</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students WITHOUT Special Needs</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>7.1% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.9% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (7)</td>
<td>42.8% (12)</td>
<td>6.0% (0)</td>
<td>21.4% (6)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students WITH Special Needs</td>
<td>7.1% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>21.4% (6)</td>
<td>3.9% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (7)</td>
<td>42.8% (12)</td>
<td>6.0% (0)</td>
<td>14.3% (4)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 28

skipped question 0
6. In your opinion, what does your school need to do to improve its ability to help special needs students during emergencies? Mark all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop better emergency plans</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more organized during an emergency</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More clearly define roles and responsibilities during emergencies</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct more emergency related training</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct more fire, shelter-in-place, and evacuation drills</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve teachers and personnel who work regularly with special needs students more in the planning process</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get more involvement from parents</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 24
skipped question 4

7. On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied are you with your school's ability to provide for SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS during the following emergencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>7.7% (2)</td>
<td>7.7% (2)</td>
<td>12.2% (5)</td>
<td>15.4% (4)</td>
<td>12.2% (5)</td>
<td>7.7% (2)</td>
<td>23.1% (6)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Leak</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>10.0% (4)</td>
<td>5.0% (2)</td>
<td>10.0% (4)</td>
<td>0.0% (2)</td>
<td>38.0% (7)</td>
<td>0.0% (2)</td>
<td>10.0% (4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active shooter</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>7.7% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>7.7% (2)</td>
<td>15.4% (4)</td>
<td>30.8% (8)</td>
<td>7.7% (2)</td>
<td>7.7% (2)</td>
<td>7.7% (2)</td>
<td>15.4% (4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. What recommendations, if any, do you have for improving emergency planning for special needs students in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>