




OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR



REVIEW OF VIOLENCE PREVENTION AT THE CHEMAWA INDIAN SCHOOL



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

JUL 27 2015

Memorandum

To: Ms. Amanda Ward
Academic Principal, Chemawa Indian School

From: Mary L. Kendall *Mary L. Kendall*
Deputy Inspector General

Subject: Inspection Report – Review of Violence Prevention at the Chemawa Indian School
Report No. C-IS-BIE-0025-2014

This memorandum transmits the findings of our inspection of violence prevention efforts at the Chemawa Indian School. Our objective was to determine the quality of education facility safety measures in place to prevent violence against students and staff from internal and external threats at schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE).

Please provide us with your written response to this report within 30 days. The response should provide information on actions taken or planned to address the recommendations, as well as target dates and title(s) of the official(s) responsible for implementation. Please send your response to:

Kimberly Elmore
Assistant Inspector General
Office of Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations
U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Inspector General
Mail Stop 4428
1849 C Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20240

The legislation creating the Office of Inspector General requires that we report to Congress semiannually on all audit, inspection, and evaluation reports issued; actions taken to implement our recommendations; and recommendations that have not been implemented.

Table of Contents

Results in Brief	1
Introduction.....	2
Objective	2
Background	2
Findings.....	3
Emergency Preparedness/Security Plans	3
Training	4
Physical Security Features	5
Conclusion and Recommendations.....	7
Conclusion.....	7
Recommendations Summary.....	7
Appendix 1: Scope and Methodology.....	8
Scope	8
Methodology	8
Appendix 2: Schools Visited	9
Appendix 3: Prior Coverage	10
Appendix 4: Review of Major Components of Emergency Plans	12
Appendix 5: Training at Education Facility.....	13
Appendix 6: Matrix of Safety Measures	14

Results in Brief

We conducted an inspection of the Chemawa Indian School to determine the quality of safety measures in place to prevent violence against students and staff from internal and external threats. We found Chemawa Indian School's safety measures to be adequate.

Specifically, while the Chemawa Indian School's comprehensive emergency plan contained all five topics we reviewed, we found that it did not contain detailed information on hostage situations. The school provided training on violence prevention and emergency preparedness to both staff and students. We were unable to run evacuations or lock-down drills during our visit on April 28, 2014, however, because the school already had held its graduation ceremony and sent students home for the summer.

Finally, of the 18 safety measures we checked for, Chemawa Indian School did not have 3 in place. While no single safety measure is so critical that its absence at an educational facility is cause for immediate concern, we found that the more safety measures not in place, the less prepared the school is to respond to an incident.

This is the eleventh in a series of 16 inspections regarding violence prevention at schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education. We issued reports in 2008 and 2010 on this same topic where we concluded that schools were not prepared to prevent violence and ensure the safety of students and staff. Chemawa Indian School, an off-reservation boarding school located in Salem, OR, was among the schools previously visited.

We provide three recommendations to help Chemawa Indian School improve its safety measures.

Introduction

Objective

Our objective was to determine the quality of safety measures in place to prevent violence against students and staff from internal and external threats at schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE). The scope and methodology for this inspection are included in Appendix 1.

Background

In this current series of inspections, we assessed safety measures and procedures at a non-statistical selection of 16 Indian schools: 7 BIE-operated, 8 grant-operated, and 1 contract-operated (see Appendix 2). We visited 6 of the 16 schools in previous evaluations (see Appendix 3). Specifically, we visited 28 BIE-funded schools in 2 previous evaluations:

- Controls to Prevent Violence at Bureau of Indian Education Operated Education Facilities (Report No. NM-EV-BIE-0001-2008) issued August 2008; and
- School Violence Prevention (Report No. NM-EV-BIE-0003-2008) issued February 2010.

Chemawa Indian School was among the schools previously visited.

BIE funds approximately 185 schools in 23 states, including 119 day schools, 52 boarding schools, and 14 peripheral dormitories. Of these schools, 131 were grant- or contract-operated schools funded through grant agreements or contracts with BIE and operated by the respected tribes. The remaining 54 were operated directly by BIE. The Chemawa Indian School is a BIE-operated off-reservation boarding school for students in ninth through twelfth grade, located in Salem, OR.

Findings

The quality of safety measures in place at Chemawa Indian School was adequate to prevent violence against both students and staff, from internal and external threats. Specifically, we found the school—

- had an adequate comprehensive emergency plan in place, but lacked detailed guidance to address a hostage situation;
- provided training in violence prevention and emergency preparedness to both staff and students; and
- was missing 3 of the 18 safety measures we inspected (see Appendix 6).

Emergency Preparedness/Security Plans

In our prior evaluations (see Appendix 3), we reviewed school emergency plans against five key topic areas, including bomb threats, shootings, fights, hostage situations, and off-campus emergencies. We evaluated the Chemawa Indian School emergency plan against the same key topic areas in both April 2008 and April 2014 (see Appendix 4). We found that the school made significant improvements since 2008 and now has an adequate comprehensive emergency plan.

Specifically, in April 2008 we found that the emergency plan did not address any of the five topic areas we chose to review. When we returned in April 2014, we found that the emergency plan adequately covered four of the five topic areas, including bomb threats, shootings, fights, and off-campus emergencies. A closer review revealed that the plan did list hostage situations, the fifth topic area, as a type of emergency but it did not contain detailed information or steps to take in this type of emergency. We recognize that no individual safety measure is so critical that its absence is cause for immediate concern; however, detailed guidance and training in this area may enable staff to respond appropriately to a hostage situation.

A comprehensive emergency plan should always be readily available to provide those with operational responsibilities detailed instructions on what to do in an emergency, when to do it, and why to do it; while providing instructions to outside emergency responders on how to provide campus specific support during an emergency.

Recommendation

We recommend that Chemawa Indian School:

1. Update its comprehensive emergency plan to include detailed information on hostage situations; and
2. Once the emergency plan is updated, train all staff members on the new procedures.

Training

In our prior evaluations, we identified training topics that should be provided, to some degree, in all BIE-funded educational facilities to help reduce the risk of a violent incident. For staff, six training topics include crisis/emergency plans, conflict resolution, anger management, suicide prevention, and drugs; for students, the six training topics include gangs, conflict resolution, anger management, bully prevention, and drugs (see Appendix 5). Since this was a follow-up review, we chose to evaluate the training provided at the Chemawa Indian School against these same topics. We found that training in basic violence prevention during crisis situations and emergency preparedness was provided (see Appendix 5).

In April 2008, we found that—

- four of the six training topics had been provided to staff; and
- five of the six training topics had been provided to students.

In April 2014, we found that—

- all six training topics had been provided to staff; and
- all six training topics had been provided to students.

In addition, while the school reported running monthly evacuation drills and at least six lock-down drills each school year, including a drill at night when students were in the dormitory, we were unable to determine if it was performing the drills effectively or safely because the school had already held its graduation ceremony and sent students home for the summer.

Drills and exercises, when properly run and evaluated, can help identify gaps and weaknesses in the emergency plan so that they can be corrected before an actual emergency situation arises. There are different levels of emergency plan exercises that entail different amounts of planning, time, and resources to perform, including—

- tabletop exercises involving only a small number of high-level school officials;
- drills and functional exercises; and
- full-scale exercises involving multiple agencies and community resources such as fire response, law enforcement, or emergency medical services.

Before making a decision about how many of which types of exercises to implement, a school should consider the costs and benefits of each type. Ideally, schools should use a combination of exercise types since each have advantages and will allow school administrators to identify different plan strengths and weaknesses.

Physical Security Features

In our prior evaluations, we found no guidance for required safety measures for BIE-funded education facilities. Therefore, we used several public sources to compile a list of 18 safety measures we considered to be critical in areas such as physical access and communication. We found that the school had made significant improvements since 2008. Specifically, in April 2008, we found 8 of the 18 critical safety measures we inspected were absent, while in April 2014, only 3 of the 18 critical safety measures were absent (see Appendix 6).

When we arrived on campus on April 28, 2014, we immediately noted the security fencing improvement from our previous visit in 2008. Specifically, security fencing previously surrounded the entire property. As a result, individuals were granted access to the property for a number of reasons, including visiting Indian Health Services. Due to privacy concerns, no identifying information, including license plate number, was recorded, if a visitor cited an appointment with Indian Health Services. In 2008, school resource officers indicated this was a security concern and, that “drug dealers accessed the campus by telling the security guard they were going to IHS (Indian Health Services)”.

The security fencing has now been moved so that it only surrounds the school campus. Now, individuals visiting Indian Health Services no longer need to enter the security fence line. In addition, because the old fence went through the wooded area at the back of the property, maintaining it proved difficult because it was not easily visible. Now that the security fence has been moved to only surround the school campus, the full fence line is easily visible and, therefore, easier to maintain.

Further, once through the security fence and on campus, we were unable to bypass the main building or enter the campus through any entrance other than the main building’s visitors’ entrance. School officials informed us, however, that doors into academic buildings were unlocked and unmonitored during the school day to allow students to access various classrooms. This security weakness, however, is offset by the countermeasures implemented by the school, including

the multiple armed school resource officers, who are on campus during academic and early evening hours, and the updated security fencing.



Figure 1. Main gate onto Chemawa Indian School campus. Source: OIG

As we mentioned in our prior report, we recognize that no individual safety measure is so critical that its absence is cause for immediate concern. The fewer safety measures used at an educational facility, however, the less likely a school is prepared to respond adequately to an incident, ensuring the safety of students and staff from internal or external threats.

Recommendation

We recommend that Chemawa Indian School:

3. Evaluate the 18 safety measures in Appendix 6 and determine the correct combination of safety measures for the campus necessary to ensure the safety of staff and students from internal and external threats. Once determined, work to put the selected safety measures in place.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

Adequate emergency planning, practice of the plans, and implementation of appropriate safety measures resulted in Chemawa Indian School being generally prepared to prevent violence and ensure the safety of students and staff.

Recommendations Summary

We recommend that Chemawa Indian School:

1. Update its comprehensive emergency plan to include detailed information on hostage situations.
2. Once the emergency plan is updated, train all staff members on the new procedures.
3. Evaluate the 18 safety measures in Appendix 6 and determine the correct combination of safety measures for the campus necessary to ensure the safety of staff and students from internal and external threats. Once determined, work to put the selected safety measures in place.

Appendix I: Scope and Methodology

Scope

The scope of this inspection was limited to violence prevention programs in place at the Chemawa Indian School, an off-reservation boarding school located in Salem, OR. We performed the same inspection at 15 other schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), which are listed in Appendix 2.

We also performed a separate review at the Chemawa Indian School to evaluate the programs in place at schools funded by BIE to improve academic achievement. The result of that review will be presented in a separate report.

Methodology

We conducted this review from April 2014 to August 2014 in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspections and Evaluations as put forth by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency. We believe that the work performed provides a reasonable basis for our conclusions.

To address our objective, we:

- reviewed the following items—
 - criteria (including laws, regulations, policies, and procedures),
 - studies,
 - prior reports, and
 - school documentation;
- interviewed officials at Chemawa Indian School; and
- visited Chemawa Indian School on April 28, 2014.

We did not extensively review training records and materials, but relied on information provided to us through our interviews with school officials.

Appendix 2: Schools Visited

Facility Name	Type	Location	Grades	Date Visited
Tonalea Day School	BIE	Tonalea, AZ	K-8	January 14, 2014
Lukachukai Community School	Grant	Lukachukai, AZ	K-8	January 15, 2014
Tuba City Boarding School	BIE	Tuba City, AZ	K-8	January 16, 2014
Moencopi Day School	Grant	Tuba City, AZ	K-6	January 17, 2014
Flandreau Indian School	BIE	Flandreau, SD	9-12	January 28, 2014
Sicangu Owayawa Oti (Rosebud Dormitory)	Grant	Mission, SD	1-12	January 29, 2014
Pierre Indian Learning Center	Grant	Pierre, SD	1-8	January 30, 2014
Cherokee Central Schools	Grant	Cherokee, NC	K-12	February 11, 2014
Ahfachkee Indian School	Grant	Clewiston, FL	PreK-12	February 13, 2014
Miccosukee Indian School	Contract	Miami, FL	K-12	February 14, 2014
Chemawa Indian School*	BIE	Salem, OR	9-12	April 28, 2014
Yakama Nation Tribal School*	Grant	Toppenish, WA	8-12	April 30, 2014
Paschal Sherman Indian School*	Grant	Omak, WA	K-9	May 1, 2014
Ojo Encino Day School*	BIE	Cuba, NM	K-8	May 20, 2014
Te Tsu Geh Oweenge Day School*	BIE	Santa Fe, NM	K-6	May 21, 2014
San Ildefonso Day School*	BIE	Santa Fe, NM	K-6	May 22, 2014

* We revisited these six campuses from our prior reviews (see Appendix 3) to determine whether conditions noted had been corrected.

Appendix 3: Prior Coverage

Project NM-EV-BIE-0001-2008

Facility Name	Type	Location	Grades	Date Visited
John F. Kennedy Day School	BIE	White River, AZ	K-8	April 8, 2008
Tohono O'odham High School^	BIE	Sells, AZ	9-12	April 10, 2008
Santa Rosa Boarding School	BIE	Sells, AZ	K-8	April 11, 2008
Pine Ridge School^	BIE	Pine Ridge, SD	K-12	April 17, 2008
Ojo Encino Day School*	BIE	Cuba, NM	K-8	April 22, 2008
Chemawa Indian School^*	BIE	Salem, OR	9-12	April 22, 2008
Te Tsu Geh Oweenge Day School*	BIE	Santa Fe, NM	K-6	April 23, 2008
Blackfeet Dormitory	BIE	Browning, MT	1-12	April 24, 2008
San Ildefonso Day School*	BIE	Santa Fe, NM	K-6	April 24, 2008

Project NM-EV-BIE-0003-2008

Facility Name	Type	Location	Grades	Date Visited
Tohono O'odham High School^	BIE	Sells, AZ	9-12	February 11, 2009
Pine Ridge School^	BIE	Pine Ridge, SD	K-12	February 5, 2009
Chemawa Indian School^#*	BIE	Salem, OR	9-12	February 10, 2009 January 11, 2010
White Shield School	Grant	Roseglen, ND	K-12	September 16, 2008

Facility Name	Type	Location	Grades	Date Visited
Mandaree Day School	Grant	Mandaree, ND	K-12	September 17, 2008
Twin Buttes Day School	Grant	Halliday, ND	K-8	September 18, 2008
Red Water Elementary School	Grant	Carthage, MS	K-8	September 30, 2008
Tucker Elementary School	Grant	Philadelphia, MS	K-8	October 1, 2008
Choctaw Central High School	Grant	Choctaw, MS	9-12	October 2, 2008
Conehatta Elementary School	Grant	Conehatta, MS	K-8	October 3, 2008
Two Eagle River School	Grant	Pablo, MT	K-12	October 7, 2008
Northern Cheyenne Tribal School	Grant	Busby, MT	K-12	October 9, 2008
Chief Leschi School	Grant	Puyallup, WA	K-12	October 20, 2008
Muckleshoot Tribal School#	Grant	Auburn, WA	K-12	October 20, 2008 January 13, 2010
Yakama Nation Tribal School*	Grant	Yakima, WA	9-12	October 21, 2008
Paschal Sherman Indian School*	Grant	Omak, WA	K-9	October 23, 2008
St. Stephens Indian School	Grant	St. Stephens, WY	K-12	October 30, 2008
Dunseith Day School	BIE	Dunseith, ND	K-8	February 18, 2009
Ojibwa Indian School	BIE	Belcourt, ND	K-8	February 19, 2009
Sherman Indian High School#	BIE	Riverside, CA	9-12	February 23, 2009 January 15, 2010
Gila Crossing Day School	Grant	Laveen, AZ	K-8	February 25, 2009
Salt River Elementary School	Grant	Scottsdale, AZ	K-6	February 26, 2009

^ We visited these schools in both Project NM-EV-BIE-0001-2008 and Project NM-EV-BIE-0003-2008.

We revisited these three campuses during Project NM-EV-BIE-0003-2008 to determine whether conditions noted had been corrected in the time between visits.

* We revisited these six campuses in our current reviews (see Appendix 2) to determine whether conditions noted had been corrected.

Appendix 4: Review of Major Components of Emergency Plans

Preparedness Plan Components	04/28/14		04/22/08	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
Adequately Covered Bomb Threats	✓			X
Adequately Covered Shootings	✓			X
Adequately Covered Fights	✓			X
Adequately Covered Hostage Situations		X		X
Adequately Covered Off-Campus Emergencies	✓			X
Plan Less Than A Year Old	✓			X

Appendix 5: Training at Education Facility

Training	04/28/14		04/22/08	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
STAFF:				
Crisis/emergency plans	✓		✓	
Conflict resolution	✓			X
Anger management	✓			X
Bully prevention	✓		✓	
Suicide prevention	✓		✓	
Drugs	✓		✓	
STUDENTS:				
Gangs	✓		✓	
Conflict resolution	✓		✓	
Anger management	✓		✓	
Bully prevention	✓		✓	
Suicide prevention	✓		✓	
Drugs	✓			X

Appendix 6: Matrix of Safety Measures

Safety Measures (Summary)	04/28/14		04/22/08	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
Adequate security fencing*	✓			X
Secured exterior doors		X		X
Designated visitors' entrance	✓		✓	
Visitors' entrance that prevented unobserved entering	✓		✓	
Visitors required to sign in or show identification	✓			X
Visitors required to wear a visitors' badge	✓		✓	
Security camera(s)	✓		✓	
Metal detector		X		X
Security guard	✓		✓	
Hall monitors	✓		✓	
Operable central alarm systems	✓			X
Intercom system in classrooms	✓		✓	
Exits clearly marked	✓		✓	
Evacuation maps clearly displayed	✓		✓	
Graffiti free walls, playground equipment, etc.	✓			X
Student dress code**	✓		✓	
Staff required to wear identification cards	✓			X
Students required to wear identification cards		X		X

* We defined "adequate fencing" as security fencing (such as chain link versus boundary fencing, such as split rail), at least 6 feet high, and in good repair.

** Dress codes reduced violence and gang activity in benchmarked mainstream education facilities.

