The South Carolina constitution establishes a right for all children in our state to access a “free” education. Traditionally, the word free has been read through a financial lens, but increasingly, access to a high quality education also requires another form of freedom- the freedom from the fear that far too many children currently experience as a result of increased incidents of violence and mass shootings in schools and communities across our state and nation.

Unfortunately, this rising epidemic of violence against children is the result of complex societal factors. As a result, efforts to find solutions can seem overwhelming and even impossible to achieve. Given the multi-faceted nature of the problem, there is no single policy or community action that will completely eliminate or even mitigate the threats to the safety of our children. However, instead of providing a justification for inaction, the scope of the challenges faced by our children should compel all South Carolinians toward collective action.

For this reason, our associations have worked collectively to develop a School Safety Policy Agenda that we believe can increase the ability of all children to grow and learn free of fear in their schools and communities. In recognition of the multiple and interlocking factors that influence child safety, this agenda focuses on five out-of-school policy areas and five in-school policy areas. While we do not believe that enactment of any single policy- or even the entire policy agenda- can completely eliminate all threats of violence for our children, we firmly believe that enactment of each of these policies holds the potential to be the solution that can save a single child from a single act of violence.

We also acknowledge that there are other potential policy solutions that are not incorporated into this agenda. As such, we do not claim that enactment of this full agenda would represent the end of the work to enhance child safety in South Carolina. Instead, we believe this agenda contains common sense policy solutions that are practical, possible, and hold great promise to keep children safe.

The policies outlined in this agenda call for action by policy makers at the federal, state, and local level, often by working in the same collaborative fashion that led to the creation of this policy agenda. However, the burden and duty of protecting the children of South Carolina does not rest exclusively with the elected leaders of the state, which is why our associations pledge to work collectively to support the advancement of these policies and invite other groups to join us in this work. We welcome other groups to join in our coalition for the advancement of policies to keep children safe. Finally, we ask all South Carolinians- including families, educators, law enforcement officers, and community and faith-based leaders- to join together to prioritize and advance efforts to build safe schools and communities for all of the children of South Carolina.

-The South Carolina Coalition for Safer Schools
In his 2022 State of the State Address, Governor McMaster stated that a “mental health crisis exists in South Carolina, especially among our young people.” This declaration was spurred in large part by reports from the medical community documenting increased rates of mental health concerns for children nationally. This troubling trend has been documented in communities across South Carolina; for example, in December 2021, Charleston County School District reported a 45% increase in suicide assessments and a 50% increase in incidents of violent threats compared to 2019. While it is impossible and irresponsible to link every instance of violence in schools to student mental health, both medical and educational professionals acknowledge violent behavior as one potential symptom of increased mental health challenges for students. However, thanks to the focus provided by the Governor and the Joint Citizens and Legislative Committee on Children, we know that our schools lack sufficient resources to meet student needs in this area. As reported in a May 2022 report from SC DHHS, less than 50% of South Carolina schools were able to provide school-based mental health services through DMH, with a mental health counselor-to-student ratio of 1:1300.

### Mental Health Professional-to-Student Ratios
Currently, the State Board of Education has regulations establishing maximum school counselor-to-student ratios but no such required ratios for other school employed mental health professionals. South Carolina must adjust the existing counselor-to-student ratio to align to the ASCA recommended ratio of 1:250, establish and implement a school psychologist-to-student ratio that aligns with the NASP recommended ratio of 1:500 and a social worker-to-student ratio, and work with mental health professionals to establish an appropriate ratio for mental health professionals in schools. The state must also work with districts to ensure adequate funding to recruit and retain the necessary professional staff to comply with ratios. To achieve these recommended ratios, the state must increase opportunities for graduate education, aligned with professional association standards, that lead to a credential as a school psychologist, school counselor, or other school employed mental health professional and ensure adequate funding for districts to comply with the established state regulations.

### Evaluate and Remove Non-Counseling Requirements
Like most school employees, the roles of school counselor and school psychologist have steadily evolved in recent decades to include an ever-increasing list of responsibilities. However, additional tasks like standardized test administration and conducting mandatory annual Individual Graduation Plan conferences diminishes the capacity of school mental health professionals to meet their core duties in schools. According to the American School Counselor Association, such tasks should account for 20% or less of a school counselor’s daily work, but the significantly higher percentage spent by most counselors prevents them from meeting the ASCA’s recommendation for 80% of their work day to be spent in “direct and indirect services to students,” including involvement in the classroom. In order to better support the mental health of students, South Carolina must audit the tasks being assigned to school counselors and psychologists in order to eliminate tasks that inhibit the ability of these professionals to engage in direct services with students. As part of this review, the State Department of Education should adopt the NASP Practice Model as the standard of service provision from school psychologists.
In-School Factors

Policy Area #1-

Student Mental Health Services

Needed Policy Actions (continued)

1. **School Social Workers:** Currently, the state does not require schools to employ social workers; instead, individual districts determine whether or not they will fund these positions. However, other states have requirements for social worker positions in schools, including some states that have established specific school social work certification requirements. School social workers can enhance safe learning environments in multiple ways, including the delivery of mental health services and maximizing school and community resources for students and families. South Carolina should establish, fund, and implement a social worker-to-student ratio aligned to the SSWA recommendation of 250:1.

2. **Family Intervention Services:** As shown by the SC DSS Family-Centered Community Support Services program, family engagement is a critical component of student support. Local school districts have demonstrated how a family-engagement model to counseling can be effective. Students statewide should have access to this type of family-centered counseling and support system in order to both enhance prevention efforts and to provide needed treatment.

3. **Increased Flexibilities:** The “partial lift” of the Rehabilitative Behavioral Health Services moratorium enacted on July 1, 2022 is an important tool to expand student access to mental health supports. The General Assembly should establish this policy on a permanent basis. Additionally, the General Assembly should address the situation where private insurance fails to cover school-based services provided through DMH because of the licensing status of the counselor. Currently, state law allows DMH counselors to serve in schools with credentialing but not formal licensure, which can lead to denial of coverage by private insurance. Finally, consistent with the recommendations from the May 2022 SCDHHS Bureau of Program Integrity and Internal Audit, policy actions should be taken to allow districts to bill Medicaid directly for school-based services and to expand telehealth counseling access in schools.

4. **Deployment of Federal Resources:** The recently passed Bipartisan Safer Communities Act includes historic investments in a variety of school-based programs to support student mental health, including $500 million to the School Based Mental Health Services Grant Program and another $500 million to the School Based Mental Health Service Professionals Demonstration Grant for training school-based mental health professionals. The South Carolina Department of Education needs to develop a comprehensive plan for how to best invest these and other funds. This plan should be developed through meaningful consultation with teachers, counselors, psychologists, administrators, and other school personnel. One critically important area to address through these funds is the need for high-quality training in trauma-informed care, a topic identified as important by groups like the American School Counselor Association. Additionally, the state should enact the necessary policies to access the available federal funds for “crisis intervention” and “extreme risk protection order” programs.
Connection to School Safety
The body of research on the role of positive school climates in enhancing school safety is significant, including the finding that one of the key elements of creating such a climate is the “quality of interpersonal relationships between and among students, teachers, and staff.” However, across South Carolina, too many students lack strong interpersonal relationships with adults at school due to the persistent and growing shortage of teachers, counselors, instructional assistants, and School Resource Officers (SROs). While fully staffing all of these positions can enhance school climate, the shortage of SROs is particularly important in discussions around school safety. As noted in 2016 by the U.S. Department of Education, “school resource officers can be valuable assets in creating a positive school environment and keeping kids safe.” A 2020 U.S. DOJ report found trained School Resource Officers (SROs) have been “demonstrated to prevent school shootings” and have been responsible for mitigating “active school shootings.” SROs in South Carolina are required to complete school-specific training prior to serving, either through the Criminal Justice Academy or through NASRO.

Needed Policy Actions
1. **Reverse the State’s Educator Shortages:** In February 2021, CERRA reported 1,121 teaching vacancies across the state. To enhance school safety, South Carolina must ensure that every child learns in a classroom staffed with a highly qualified teacher. This increases the importance of the work of the Teacher Retention and Recruitment Task Force created in the FY23 state budget. An ongoing shortage of school social workers is also critically important to reverse given the important role of these professionals in supporting student well-being and building home-school-community partnerships.

2. **Ensure Full-Time SRO on Every Campus:** The work to ensure a SRO on every school campus must be completed. For the 2021-2022 school year, approximately 300 of the more than 1200 public schools in South Carolina did not have a full-time SRO, in spite of the additional funding provided by the General Assembly for this purpose.

3. **Addressing Law Enforcement Staffing Shortages:** To alleviate the challenge of finding qualified SROs, the General Assembly should pass legislation to allow retired law enforcement officers to return-to-work without an earnings limitation. The General Assembly has provided for return-to-work for law enforcement in two separate provisos in the FY23 budget, but such provisions should be codified in statute to provide greater stability and certainty to SROs and school districts. Additionally, the General Assembly must find ways to enhance recruitment and retention of law enforcement officers as continued shortages can result in agencies pulling officers from SRO duty to fill other needs.

4. **Supporting Staff Experiencing Trauma:** As incidents of violence have increased on school campuses, so have the number of school personnel experiencing resulting trauma. As a result, in addition to providing enhanced mental health support for children, school districts should implement resources like Employee Assistance Programs to provide cost-free mental health support for school staff that have been involved in responding to violence in schools or in the community.
Connection to School Safety
While schools often serve as the central gathering point for a community, it is essential to ensure school facilities are designed and equipped to prevent unauthorized access any time students are on campus. South Carolina’s professional educators indicate that facility upgrades have the potential to significantly enhance school safety. In a May 2022 poll, PSTA members were asked to evaluate the potential impact of various policy proposals. For the policy of “facility upgrades,” 66% of respondents said such policies would be “very effective” with another 24% rating the policy as “effective.” No other policy received such high ratings, and perhaps more telling, less than 1% of members rated facility upgrades as “not effective.” However, multiple PSTA members reported a lack of basic security features in their schools, a fact especially troubling in light of the role that unsecured building and classroom access played in tragedies in places like Parkland and Uvalde.

Needed Policy Actions
1. Requirement of Automatically Locking Classroom Doors: The state Department of Education’s Office of School Facilities should take necessary steps to ensure that all classroom doors must automatically lock or, at minimum, must be able to be locked from the inside. In taking these steps, the term “classroom” should apply to any area where groups of students receive instruction during the day, including cafeterias and media centers.
2. Requirements for Universal Staff Locking Ability: Every staff member in a school building should have the ability to lock external doors from inside the building. Failure to meet this requirement increases the odds that a school is not able to successfully execute a lockdown procedure. Ideally, this requirement should be met by use of a common key/pass card that staff use for all doors (classrooms, external, etc.) to reduce the risk of staff being unable to quickly identify the necessary key to lock an external door.
3. Requirements for Locked External Doors: During school hours, state statute should require the locking of all external doors of a school. Implementation of this policy will require installation of features like a telecomm system at the front door as well as equipping staff with keys to access the building from outside during the day in the event they are outside of the building for class activities (recess, PE, science experiments, etc.)
4. HVAC Improvements: Too many schools in SC lack sufficient central HVAC systems, often necessitating open windows due to poor ventilation or excessive heat. Open windows, especially on a ground floor, pose a safety risk that must be avoided.
5. Elimination of Portable Classrooms: Numerous schools across South Carolina address overcrowding through use of “portable” classroom modules. The thin walls and non-reinforced doors of these portables put students and staff at higher risk from violence and extreme weather compared to students in a brick-and-mortar classroom.
6. Requirements for Blinds/ Window Covers: Standard lockdown protocol in schools requires staff to gather students out of line-of-sight of any window. However, this is often impossible due to either building design or lack of blinds or covers for windows. In classroom settings where blinds are required by safety protocols, teachers should not be required to make out-of-pocket purchases.
Connection to School Safety
While not true in every case, students that commit violent actions in schools have often been subject to bullying in the past. For example, in a review of 15 school shootings in the 1990s, the federal government found 12 of the students involved had reported being bullied at school. As a result, South Carolina schools must continue to build on efforts to train staff to identify and address bullying as well as how to respond in the event of a crisis situation.

Needed Policy Actions
1. Revision of Data Collection Protocols: Currently, SCDE releases annual reports on topics such as “Persistently Dangerous Schools” and “Bullying.” However, these reports are developed using discipline data reported in PowerSchool using ten pages of incident codes, many of which are either potentially duplicative (i.e.- “Threat” vs. “Bomb Threat”) or excessively vague and subjective (i.e.- “Inappropriate Behavior”). Within existing federal data collection regulations, the state’s incident management reporting system should be streamlined to better identify the rates of bullying and threats in schools.

2. School-Based Violence Prevention Programs: According to the CDC, school-based violence prevention programs contribute to decreased rates of violence, delinquency, and substance abuse across all grade levels. While the state’s 2006 “Safe School Climate Act” states that districts are “encouraged to establish bullying prevention programs and other initiatives,” such programs should be required across all schools, following the lead of states like Oregon that have determined how to incorporate such programs into existing student and staff training and instruction. To aid in this work, the South Carolina Department of Education and State Board of Education should develop model policies for districts to adopt and implement that address bullying prevention as well as important topics like conflict management and alternatives to violence. Efforts in this area can also be enhanced by continued work in districts to fully and effectively implement MTSS models.

3. Review of Training Programs: In 2006, districts across South Carolina adopted policies and training programs in response to the Safe School Climate Act. However, since that time, the nature and scope of school bullying and threats has evolved, most notably as a result of the expansion of the internet and social media. As a result, all districts should conduct an audit of existing programs concerning bullying prevention and threat assessment and response. This review should include opportunities for robust input from diverse stakeholders, including educators, parents, families, law enforcement, and students.
Connection to School Safety
While it is impossible to predict that any single policy action can eliminate the threat of violence in schools, a review of past tragedies on school campuses can illustrate potential policies that, if mandatory, could have significantly reduced the chances of a violent incident. Such policies should be viewed as “best practice” in schools, a fact that makes establishment of these actions as policy requirements even more important.

Needed Policy Actions
1. Uniform Reporting of Weapons on Campus: Currently, state statute requires school administrators to report to local law enforcement any situation “which may result or results in serious threat or injury.” A further section of state code (§59-63-350) requires local law enforcement to report any “crime involving a weapon…on school property” to an Attorney General “school safety phone line,” but implementation of this policy appears to be inconsistent and should be reviewed, refined, and enforced.

2. Mandatory Search Procedures: In late 2020, two different teachers in Oxford, Michigan reported concerns that a student posed a risk of harm to other students. In response, school administration spoke with the student and his parents but did not conduct a search of the student’s possessions, including the locker where the student had stored the firearm he used to take the lives of four students. In an instance where a school convenes a threat assessment team (a team required for each school in state statute), policy should require administration to search all items and areas under the control of an individual deemed a potential risk to himself or others, including lockers and vehicles on campus.

3. Mandatory Threat Evaluation Process: In an instance where a school’s threat assessment team makes a determination that a student may pose a risk to himself or to others, a school must ensure that all recommended actions from a threat assessment team are completed prior to a student’s return to a classroom setting with other students.

4. Implementation of Statewide Threat Assessment Protocols: While state statute requires each school to have a threat assessment team, it is largely at the discretion of each individual district to determine the protocols a team must follow in response to a reported threat. Additionally, the State Board’s “Model Safe Schools Checklist” does little to indicate essential components of a “comprehensive safety plan.” State statute and/or State Board regulations should be updated to require the creation of statewide model protocols to be adopted by school districts to guide the work of school-level threat assessment teams. Model protocols should include provisions for annual reporting by districts to the South Carolina Department of Education or a statewide School Safety Center about the outcomes of threat assessment team actions. A good starting place for model protocols would be the South Carolina Department of Education’s 2019 “School-Based Behavioral Threat Assessment and Management: Best Practices Guide for South Carolina K-12 Schools.”

5. Penalties for Battery Against Students and School Employees: Increasingly, incidents of violence in school have been committed by adults against students and staff inside of school buildings during the ordinary school day. Such actions are deeply troubling and must be addressed. Currently, South Carolina Code §16-3-1040 establishes a criminal penalty equivalent to the penalty for second-degree assault for any communication “which contains a threat to take the life or to inflict bodily harm upon” a “teacher or principal.” This section of state code should be expanded to apply the same penalty for any adult (not student) who commits battery against a student or staff member on school property during school hours to match the existing penalty under state code for a threat against teacher or principal.
Connection to School Safety
Reducing the threat of violence in schools requires cooperation and communication between multiple government agencies and community groups. In order to coordinate these efforts, states like Texas, Colorado, and Virginia have established dedicated statewide school safety centers.

Needed Policy Action
1. **Establishment of Statewide School Safety Center**: This center should bring together information from multiple agencies in order to ensure consistent statewide practices in areas like violence prevention and response that are consistently evaluated, improved, and updated.
2. **Establishment of Statewide Tip Hotline**: To facilitate the ability of students and community members to report potential threats against schools and students, South Carolina should follow the lead of Colorado in establishing a statewide tip hotline that can coordinate responses to reports of threats.
Connection to School Safety
Like all rights in a democracy, firearm ownership also comes with responsibilities, and this is especially true for firearm owners that have children in their home. Any effort to reduce and eliminate shootings in schools must include policies that reduce unauthorized and unsupervised access of school-aged children to firearms. The consequences of irresponsible firearm storage are dire for children, as research shows that up to 80% of incidents of gunfire in schools came from children that obtained a firearm in their home or from the home of their friends or relatives. Improperly secured firearms in homes also contribute heavily to off-campus incidents of unintentional shootings and suicide among children. This point is especially important as the incidence of American children committing suicide with firearms has reached the highest rate reported in the last twenty years.

Needed Policy Action
1. Passage of Child Access Prevention Law: Currently, 32 out of 50 states have some form of Child Access Prevention (CAP) Laws, including North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, and Florida. The stringency of these laws vary from state to state, but at their core, the laws impose some element of legal responsibility for an adult that provides a minor with access to a firearm, either intentionally or through negligence. CAP laws do NOT restrict the ability of law-abiding citizens to purchase or possess any type of firearm; instead, a CAP law simply sets minimum standards for limiting access by children to weapons as well as penalties for failure to meet these minimum standards. While there is a wide variety of CAP laws in place across the nation, South Carolina currently lacks any statute of this sort. At minimum, the state should join Georgia and Tennessee in passing a CAP law that imposes criminal liability for an individual that intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly provides a firearm to minors, especially in instances where that firearm is taken onto a school campus or is used to commit a violent act. Depending on how a policy defines proper storage of a weapon, it could also help reduce the growing rate of firearm thefts from homes.
Connection to School Safety
While the passage of a CAP law is essential to reduce unauthorized student access to weapons in homes, these actions will do little to address the growing epidemic of stolen guns in South Carolina. According to research from the National Institute of Justice, 23% of firearms used in mass shootings were either illegally obtained. Gun theft rates have increased drastically, with a recent FBI report showing a 225% increase in stolen firearms from vehicles over the last decade, with Columbia and North Charleston among the top five cities in the nation for rate of stolen firearms per 100,000 people. In response, South Carolina’s law enforcement community has called on state leaders to pass “common solutions.” Passage of such policies can enhance school safety as stolen firearms have been brought onto school campuses in South Carolina and used in fatal shootings of children in communities.

Needed Policy Action
1. **Mandatory Reporting of Stolen Firearms:** Currently, 15 states require gun owners to report lost or stolen firearms to local law enforcement. In order to assist the efforts of local law enforcement, South Carolina should join this list of states.
2. **Enhanced Penalties for Theft of Firearm:** As supported by Governor McMaster, the General Assembly should pass a law to provide for increased penalties for individuals that are guilty of illegal gun possession. Such actions should seek to, among other things, bring state law into alignment with existing federal law, similar to the proposal in H. 5160 introduced during the 124th General Assembly.
Connection to School Safety
Schools do not exist in a vacuum and often serve as the center of their community. As a result, schools are not immune to increased incidents of violence in the surrounding community. For this reason, efforts to reduce violence in schools inevitably must include a comprehensive plan to reduce the rate of violent acts across South Carolina.

Needed Policy Actions
1. **Community-Based Violence Intervention Programs**: Proviso 34.66 in the FY23 state budget appropriates $200,000 to establish the Community Violence Intervention and Prevention Program. The General Assembly should expand on this investment in FY24 and pass legislation to permanently establish the program. This is another area where the state must strategically allocate resources made available through the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. Strategic use of funds can enhance the capacity of school social workers and other personnel to liaison with community violence intervention programs.

2. **Increased School-Community Partnerships**: The Department of Education, school districts, and local law enforcement agencies should continue to develop and expand school-community partnerships to reduce violence. One example of a program of this type that has demonstrated effectiveness is the BeSMART program, which eight Midlands area school districts, local law enforcement, and health systems signed a MOU to enter in 2022. Schools should also seek ways to partner with families, community organizations, and faith-based groups to provide mentoring and support for students, such as the “Dads on Duty” and “Moms on a Mission” programs implemented in late 2021 in Colleton County School District.
Out-of-School Factors

Policy Area #5 - Social Media Regulation

Connection to School Safety
The development of social media over the past decade has resulted in significant consequences for school safety and the well-being of children. In spite of most social media platforms requiring users to be at least 13 years old, one study found that as many as half of children between the ages of 10 and 12 are using a social media app. The consequences of social media use for children can include damage to both physical and mental health as well exposure to cyberbullying and online predators. Even internal research by social media companies have found that social media use is "harmful for a sizable percentage" of children. In the area of school safety, individuals that have committed violent acts in school have often communicated their intent to do so on social media in advance of the act. While families obviously have a significant role to play in monitoring social media use by children, social media companies also must play a greater part in reducing the negative consequences of social media for children.

Needed Policy Actions
1. Age Requirements for Social Media Access: While this is an area that would most likely require federal policy action, a minimum age for access to social media platforms should be enacted. The existing Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA) is an inadequate protection for minor access to social media as it is focused almost exclusively on preventing the tracking of data for children under age 13 on social media. At minimum, Congress should pass the bipartisan Children and Teens' Online Protection Act (COPTA) that was introduced in 2021 to, among other things, increase the age of consent for data tracking from 13 to 15. However, given the growing body of research demonstrating the negative effects of social media on the development of younger children, Congress should go further by implementing an outright prohibition on social media companies allowing access for users under the age of 13. Many social media companies already have processes in place for an individual to prove their age in the event it is contested as well as processes for an individual to “verify” an account. Such processes should become required for the creation of any account for a minor on any platform to ensure a user meets a minimum age requirement. While action in this space is best achieved at the federal level, the South Carolina state legislature must also look for ways to protect children if Congress fails to act.

2. Requirements to Act on Reports of Violence: While it is impossible to monitor and respond to all threats on social media, that does not absolve social media companies from a responsibility to do more to address threatening content on their platform. For example, in the Uvalde tragedy, the shooter posted several threats on a social media platform called Yubo, and these threats were in turn reported to Yubo prior to the shooting with no apparent response by the company. South Carolina should establish policies that require social media companies to develop mandatory protocols to receive and respond to reports of potential violence within 24 hours, including notification of local law enforcement. Failure to comply with these policies should result in civil or criminal liability for the social media company. As with age restrictions, this is an area where Congress should take the lead, but the General Assembly must be ready to act in the absence of federal legislation.
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