



ICPC-CIPC
www.crime-prevention-intl.org

International
Centre for the
Prevention of
Crime

Centre
international pour
la prévention de
la criminalité

Centro
internacional para
la prevención de
la criminalidad

Police, Schools and Crime Prevention: A preliminary review of current practices

**Prepared by Margaret Shaw
Director – Analysis and Exchange
Draft Discussion Paper**

Police, Schools and Crime Prevention: A preliminary review of current practices¹

Introduction

The involvement of the police in schools is not a new phenomenon. They have been associated with schools in many countries, and in a variety of ways, for most of the past century. For much of that time, that role was limited to collecting truants, ensuring bicycle or traffic safety, or the prevention of child abuse.² Since the 1960's, however, there have been gradual changes, resulting by the 1990's in the development of a variety of much more formalized and closer links between local police and schools. In the USA, for example, the development of dedicated police officers as school resource officers, the delivery of drug prevention programmes, or enforcement of zero tolerance policies, have all brought the police much closer to the day to day running of schools.

Much of this change has been in response to the general increase in youth offending which was characteristic of most Western countries from the 1960's to the 1990's. It also reflects more general changes in attitudes towards aggression and violence by young people. The public and policy makers, in many countries, now recognize the issue of school-based violence as a problem. Bullying, school fights, truancy and drug use have all been characteristic of school life for many years, but their important links with offending and victimization, and their impact on health and social development, are now much more widely acknowledged. There is also much more willingness to label school behaviours as violent, and to see the police, rather than the school, as the appropriate response.³ Finally, extreme incidents of violence such as the Columbine tragedy in the United States or the school shooting in Erfurt, Germany, have also helped to increase concerns about the need to develop effective prevention programmes in schools.

The result is that in many countries, schools are now actively collaborating with the police to combat crime and violence in and around their premises. School violence and problems behaviours are also increasingly seen as a community and family issue too. Regional forums such as the Council of Europe have urged governments to promote the development of local partnerships for preventing and combating violence at school, and the police are seen as one of the most important parties in such partnerships.⁴

A wide range of approaches and programmes

There are considerable differences, however, in the ways in which relationships between the police and schools have developed in different countries, in their objectives and organization, their underlying philosophies, and their style and range of intervention. This report examines some of the recent trends in the development of police-school links, based on a preliminary review of existing programmes in a number of countries. These range from police-run educational programmes, through violence prevention and pupil

support programmes, to primarily deterrent surveillance functions, or undercover drug and anti-terrorist work.

The range of police-school links can be characterized on a number of dimensions, although they are rarely clear-cut. Some initiatives do not constitute specific or formalized programmes. Many programmes do not have a clear theoretical basis and expected outcomes. Many initiatives combine different approaches and methods. In some cases police forces have developed protocols for all school relations, or individual agreements with education authorities or individual schools. Overall, police-school initiatives reflect aspects of the following dimensions:

- *Proactive or reactive* - in reactive mode, the police respond to incidents and requests from schools when an event has occurred, and take the appropriate measures. A proactive approach requires them to intervene to prevent situations or behaviours conducive to offending, violence, drug abuse or other problems.
- The police role may be primarily *deterrent or preventive*. Examples of a deterrent approach include the presence of uniformed officers for surveillance purposes, or the use of undercover police officers. A preventive approach may involve drug prevention education or close liaison work with 'at risk' children.
- Interventions may be *general or targeted* – directed to the whole school population, or targeted to specific children such as truants, or to schools in more disadvantaged neighbourhoods.
- Programme goals may be *broad or specific* – to develop good relations with young people and break down mistrust, or focused on a specific issue such as preventing gang recruitment, or drug and alcohol use.
- The way police perform their tasks in schools can be *formal or informal* – a uniformed presence and an emphasis on police knowledge and functions, or in civilian clothes and informal contact with the students or families, playing sports, or developing closer ties as adult mentors.
- The intended outcomes of programmes may be *short term* such locating drug traffickers or gang members, or *medium or long term* to change attitudes and behaviours and reduce the likelihood of future offending.
- Finally, they may work in a *bilateral or multi-partnership* way – liaising just with the school, or on a more multi-partnership basis with a range of other local services and organizations.

Some of these dimensions are illustrated in Table I below.

Table I
The range of police-school interventions on five dimensions

Dimension	Range of interventions	
Basic philosophy	Preventive e.g. educational and supportive visits, activities, teaching, undercover drug investigations.	Deterrent e.g. uniformed presence, surveillance, searches.
Intervention	Proactive e.g. interventions to prevent problems arising such as gang recruitment, drug trafficking, shoplifting. Formal & informal presence.	Reactive e.g. responding to calls from schools or public; investigating incidents. Formal presence.
Target group/region	All schools or pupils e.g. elementary or secondary level activities, general education initiatives.	Targeted pupils or areas e.g. drug users, those at risk of drop-out, truants, schools in disadvantaged areas.
Programme outcomes	Single or short term goals e.g. eradicate drug trafficking	Short, medium and long term goals e.g. establish safety plans and reporting procedures, develop mentoring programmes to reduce drop out, train in conflict resolution to reduce violence, change attitudes to offending to reduce delinquency.
Type of partnership	Bi-lateral or police-centred e.g. police work directly with the school or education authority, no involvement of other sectors.	Multi-lateral - police are part of a broader network e.g. police and school work with youth services, health services, community organizations.

A recent survey of police activity in schools in the province of Quebec, Canada illustrates the complex and overlapping nature of police-school relations. The survey, undertaken by the *Ministère de la sécurité publique*, surveyed all police forces in the province in 2002. Almost one third of the police forces had a regular presence in targeted secondary schools (at least 18 hours a week) and some in primary schools.⁵

Their roles were very varied, and included resolving problems, acting as a deterrent, improving relationships between pupils and the police, undertaking investigations, gathering information, and increasing the level of school security. Some police forces focused mostly on investigations, other on problem solving; some were in uniform, others not. Some forces have written protocols and agreements, eg. interventions by the provincial police force the Sureté du Québec, are based on a written programme (*Programme d'intervention en milieu scolaire*). The costs of the police presence were paid by school boards in a few instances, and by the police service in others. In most cases drugs and bullying and violence in schools, were seen as the major concerns, and in a few cases the presence of gangs.

Many regional governments and individual police forces have developed protocols and policies to direct police involvement in schools and safe school policies. In Canada, for example, the Toronto Police, the Peel Regional Police, and Ottawa-Carleton Police, have all developed extensive programmes and protocols in recent years.⁶

Apart from differences between police forces within a single province or country, there are also some marked differences in traditions and approaches adopted between countries and regions. This applies in particular to differences between the United States and European countries or Australia, for example. In part this reflects differences between common law and continental law systems, as well as historical and political differences in the role, structure and organization of policing.

In the United States, the presence of police officers in schools is widely accepted. There is a long history of police-school co-operation in many States. They have a strong presence, and are seen as an effective tool to make schools safer, and prevent certain forms of crime. The federal *COPS in Schools* grant programme, for example, is designed to help police forces hire school resource officers and undertake community policing in and around schools. Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) have awarded US\$715 million to 2,600 police agencies to fund over 6000 school resource officers, and US\$21 million for training those police and school administrators.⁷ They have also developed a number of tools, guides and software for school-based police officers on bullying, school discipline, and crime and disorder issues, and provide training and a support network.

In Europe, on the other hand, police involvement in schools is not always as well developed. It has tended to be less intrusive than in the US, and has often been restricted to an educational role. In Scandinavian countries there is a long history of police-school liaison, but it has functioned very differently from that in the US. For several decades, police and schools have worked together in Sweden, Norway, Finland and Denmark, but always as part of a broader network of services including youth and social services, community institutions, health care etc. In Denmark, for example, social services, education and police are mandated by law to work together on crime prevention. The SSP cooperation system brings together the three sectors in almost every municipality in the country, at management, coordination and implementation levels.⁸

Only in recent years has there been greater European interest in an increasing police presence or developing more structured involvement in schools. In Germany, for example, police–school projects to tackle bullying and theft have been established since the mid 1990's, as in the case of the state of Schleswig-Holstein⁹, or the Wetzlar police.¹⁰ In Belgium, some schools have recently called on the police to undertake drug searches. In the UK, a series of Safer Schools Partnerships was initiated in 2002, involving the allocation of police officers to some 400 schools in deprived areas, or with histories of serious pupil disaffection. In the Netherlands, 'school agents' have recently been placed in some schools.

For developing countries, such as those in Africa or Latin America, their very different histories and contexts make it difficult to make comparisons with the north. Police forces in some of these countries have a history of corruption and violence, leaving a legacy of mistrust by the population, including schools. Therefore, the first objective of police–school co-operation in such circumstances is to try to change negative attitudes towards the police, and build trust and confidence.

Some countries may also experience serious levels of violence at all institutional levels, from the family to schools, workplace and in public places. Protecting school populations from violence, sexual assault, guns and gangs under such circumstances is a major preoccupation. In South Africa, for example, the National Secretariat for Safety and Security, in collaboration with the Department of Education and the National Youth Commission, developed a national initiative which lays out a number of important principles to guide the development and implementation of prevention strategies around schools. The *Safer Schools* approach provides a framework within which to examine practice in South Africa¹¹. The joint framework document, *Tirisano – towards an intervention strategy to address youth violence in schools*, promotes an integrated, measurable, targeted interdepartmental approach. It argues that it is necessary to intervene in a comprehensive and sustainable way on three levels:

- address the system underlying youth violence to shift the risk factors and build resilience in youth
- eliminate the spaces where violence often occurs
- increase the protective factors that prevent the occurrence of crime involving young people.

The impact of new technologies

The growing popularity of the internet among adolescents as well as young children has presented new challenges for schools and the police. This includes protection from pornography or sexual abuse and exploitation, and hate crime and propaganda. The police are beginning to take on a preventive role in terms of programmes which attempt to limit the harmful exposure of students to images or messages through the internet. The Calgary Police, for example, have developed a series of educational programmes to alert students, school staff and parents on how to deal with such issues.¹²

On the other hand, new technology can also help to support more effective preventive action. The *School Cop (School Crime Operations Package)* in the United States, for example, is designed to address student discipline and crime problems. School Cop is a software application, to enable school administrators, police officers assigned to schools and school security staff, to record detailed information about incidents of individual student misconduct and offending, criminal histories, and to help identify students who are victimised. This enables the police and staff to prioritise problems in the school, identify strategies to prevent future incidents, conduct searches by type of incident, location and so on, and determine whether these strategies are addressing the problems found.¹³

Such tools may also be seen as a quite intrusive. They raise questions about the sharing of information, respect for privacy, and their impact on the rights of young people in school. Such close monitoring of the lives of students may not help to build positive and trusting relationships with school administrators, nor with the police. Further, the detailed recording of incidents may also increase concerns about school-based crime, since minor incidents previously dealt with informally, now become formally processed.

An absence of systematic information and evaluation

While some police forces have developed police-school protocols and specific initiatives, the lack of a clear theoretical framework and objectives for many police-school programmes is problematic. In such cases, the basis for decision-taking and action may not be clear. Nor is it easy to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of programmes, if goals are not clearly established or achievable.

Few programmes have in fact been evaluated in terms of their effectiveness. There are a number of process evaluations, but these are often internal or partial evaluations, raising questions about the extent to which their conclusions are valid. In the case of some projects, while short-term evaluations have provided positive results, longer-term evaluations suggest that they have no lasting impact. This is the case for the widely used and popular drug prevention programme DARE, for example.

Other issues raised by investigators include the absence of consideration of gender issues, racial diversity and differences in socio-economic status in police-school projects, and between the backgrounds of police officers and the students with whom they come in contact. Few programmes appear to take these issues explicitly into account, or to adapt projects to suit the characteristics of their student populations. Another concern is the absence of a careful analysis of problems before programmes are instituted, so that good base-line information for assessing changes and outcomes is often not available.

Finally, while many positive projects have been developed, most of them remain isolated local initiatives, developed around one school or educational authority, or one police force. This makes it harder to measure the replicability of local and small-scale programmes. Many programmes begin as pilot projects lasting a few years, and then, even when the outcome is positive, die quietly.

Only in a few cases have there been regional or national initiatives. The end result is that knowledge about ‘what works’, ‘what is promising’ and ‘what doesn’t’, in relation to police-school programmes, is not accumulated, and valuable findings remain unavailable to others who could benefit from that experience.

Different models

In this short overview three different models of police involvement in schools are highlighted. As with other forms of crime prevention, many of the current programmes used around the world draw on models initially developed in the United States. While comparisons between countries are sometimes difficult, given differences in the organisation of the police, education systems and overall cultures and contexts, it is still useful to consider the range of programmes falling within these three overall types. The three major models of police-school co-operation identified are:

- School-based officers: programmes which place police officers in schools on a permanent basis, such as the School Resource Officer model
- Police as educators: programmes where police officers act as educational resources
- Comprehensive police-school liaison schemes: where the police usually form part of a wider network of local organisations, community or social services working with the school.

A number of projects combine aspects of two or all three models. The report provides examples of projects based on their major emphasis, in terms of stated objectives and functions. Where possible the report also considers evaluation of outcome and effectiveness.

I School-Based Police Officers

The first and most extensive model of police involvement in schools includes programmes which place dedicated police officers in schools on a permanent basis, whether, as part-time or full-time resources.

School Resource Officers - USA

Probably the best known school-based police model is the School Resource Officer (SRO) developed in the United States. School Resource Officers are certified law enforcement officers assigned to a school or a group of schools. Developed during the 1950s, the model has been adopted and modified by a number of other countries. The role and duties of SRO’s have expanded considerably in the past decade. They represent a form of community policing, with a collaborative partnership between the police and the school, and proactive prevention and intervention strategies.¹⁴ They are often seen as a part of the school staff, and have very extensive interactions with school personnel. This distinguishes them from other uniformed staff in schools such as private security guards, or off-duty law enforcement officers hired for security and deterrence duties.

The first 'official' SRO programme was developed in Flint, Michigan, during the 1950's, to improve relations between the police and young people, using a pro-active policing approach.¹⁵ It expanded to a number of other school systems in the 1960's. The SRO approach gained renewed popularity, along with community policing, in the 1990's, as one of many responses to increases in youth crime and violence during that period. Currently, there are SRO programmes throughout the United States, and a national association with over 15,000 members. Variations on the SRO model have been adopted in countries such as Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom.

While there are differences between individual programmes within or between States, in general SRO programmes have two main goals: to maintain security in the school and to encourage a more positive perception of the police and more 'responsible' attitudes towards law-breaking. Most SRO's in the United States are assigned full-time to one school, and provide full-service policing, role modelling, problem solving, and support services at their assigned schools.¹⁶ Since they are on school premises all the time, they can develop personal relationships with the students, teachers and staff, and act as a comprehensive resource for their school, in keeping with the notion of community-oriented policing. In many programmes, officers have three distinct duties to perform:

- As a law enforcement officer: their primary purpose is to keep the peace in the school and take precautionary measures to ensure that the school is safe and secure. This includes foot patrols of the school grounds and site inspections.
- As a law-related counsel: providing advice to students on law-related issues, and act as a link to support services inside and outside the school eg. they may provide advice on youth court procedures and services.
- As teachers and additional educational resources: on issues relating to crime and the law, and the consequences and disadvantages of law breaking.¹⁷

Apart from these tasks, surveys of School Resource Officers show that most of them participate in school activities such as sports, field trips, school clubs or community outreach programmes. This is seen as an important way of building healthy and trusting relationships with students, as well as gathering intelligence on what is happening in the school. They may also work closely with parents and members of the community.

There are, nevertheless, wide variations in the emphasis and character of different SRO programmes. One programme appears to be primarily a law enforcement one: 'reducing the prevalence of weapons, drugs, and gang-related activities; monitoring students' movements; maintaining a secure school environment; providing support to school administrators, teachers and staff; providing counselling services to students; and being highly mobile, visible and flexible'.¹⁸ Other programmes pay less attention to security tasks, and give more to positive contacts with the students. The *Safe Communities – Safe Schools Model* developed by the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence in Colorado, for example, includes SRO's as a key component of its comprehensive safe school plan.¹⁹

In spite of their widespread popularity, individual SRO programmes do not always provide a detailed account of their objectives, purpose and design. They tend to provide a programme outline with optimistic statements about their aims and expectations, but little reference to rationale, measures of effectiveness, or grounding in educational or crime prevention theory or research. Given the vagueness of such programmes, it is not surprising that school principals and SRO's tend to conceptualise their role differently. In a recent study, principals emphasised that the primary purpose of the SRO programme was ensuring the safety of the school on a day-to-day basis. SRO's tended to see their functions as much broader, and less traditionally security focused. This study underlines the need for a more solid theoretical rationale for such programmes.²⁰

Evaluation

Since School Resource Officer programmes are widespread, it is important to know how effective they are. Unfortunately, few evaluations have been conducted, and those that have tend to be based on qualitative only. The lack of clear programme objectives, and of baseline data which would enable changes to be tracked, is often problematic. Schools themselves generally report very positive views about SRO programmes and their effectiveness, but these are usually based on survey responses and not on quantitative or long-term analysis.²¹

Completed evaluations suggest that the goal of maintaining security in the school seems to be achieved. An evaluation of an SRO programme in the southern US in the 1980's found that it was meeting its goal of providing a safe school environment, but it was not possible to measure its long-term impact.²² However, results are mixed in terms of the development of more positive attitudes towards the police, or changing attitudes to offending. One study assessed whether SRO programmes increased young people's respect for the police, and increased their understanding of the law and the role of law enforcement. Based on comparisons between a high school SRO programme and two non-programme schools, there was no evidence that interaction with the SRO had a significant impact on students' perceptions of the police in general. Nevertheless, the SRO had helped prevent assaults on school campus.²³ Similar results, that students do not generalise their positive views of SRO's to other police officers, have been found in other studies.

A study of 12 schools in Idaho, on the other hand, found that the SRO programme resulted in changes in young people's attitudes and beliefs about the police, and a very positive level of trust and respect. There was equally strong evidence that the programme significantly reduced disciplinary problems, as well as personally or socially dangerous behaviour during school hours.²⁴

School Liaison Officers - England

Police forces in England have always had some contact with schools, but their role has developed rapidly since the 1970s, following legislative changes which placed greater emphasis on a prevention and welfare approach to juvenile offending.

Police work with juveniles in general led to increased involvement with schools, as well as other agencies such as social services. This work has often involved school liaison officers, specially appointed officers, who work primarily with schools.

The first full-time School Liaison Officer programme was established by Sussex Police in 1966. By the mid-1970's several other forces had appointed police officers to work specifically in schools. For example, a police officer was appointed as a full-time counsellor at a large comprehensive school experiencing disruption in Hampshire in 1980, and four police officers joined the staff of a comprehensive school in County Durham in 1981. In Devon and Cornwall in 1987, twenty-four full-time officers covered the thousand schools in the country, and a full-time 'moral education advisor' was jointly funded by the police and the education authority.²⁵ In other forces, they remained regular beat officers, or were located in education offices. In general the work of SLO's appeared to be a combination of teaching and accessing information from pupils. Police access to schools also increased after 1986 when guidelines between teachers unions and the police were agreed.

Safer School Partnerships - England

A much more targeted police-school initiative, the Safer School Partnership programme (SSP) began in April 2002. This is a joint pilot initiative of the Department for Education and Skills, the Youth Justice Board, and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO).²⁶ The overall aim is to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour in and around schools. The project has placed 100 police officers in selected schools in 34 Local Education Authorities (LEAs). These are the LEA's facing 'the toughest challenges' in the country. They also fall within ten police 'crime hot-spot' areas, those with a high incidence of youth offending, truancy and antisocial behaviour.²⁷

The police will have an operational, rather than a teaching role in the schools, and bring a high level of police resources to the schools. They aim to develop close relationships with the schools and their communities. The main difference from the US School Resource Officer model is the targeting to high-risk areas and schools. The programme's objectives include the prevention and reduction of crime, anti-social behaviour and related incidents in and around the school, including bullying and violence experienced by pupils and staff, truancy and exclusion, damage to school buildings and drug-related incidents. The police officers are based in the school premises, enabling them to establish a presence and to respond quickly to problems arising. They work in partnership with teachers, other education services and related agencies, to identify, support and work with children and young people regarded as being at high risk of victimisation, offending and social exclusion. The programme will also form part of a package of measures to improve pupil in school behaviour (see Section III below). The specific aims of the pilot project are:

- to reduce the prevalence of crime and victimisation amongst young people, and the number of incidents and crimes in schools and their wider communities
- to provide a safe and secure school community which enhances the learning environment

- to ensure that young people remain in education, actively learning and achieving their full potential
- to engage young people, challenge unacceptable behaviour, and help them develop a respect for themselves and their community.²⁸

Evaluation

The pilot programme is being evaluated before any wider implementation. A one-year study of its impact and effectiveness, based on a sample of the targeted schools, began in July 2002.²⁹

The School Agent - The Netherlands; School-Based Policing – Queensland, Australia

In the Netherlands, the first experiments placing full time police officers in schools are recent, and modelled on the US School Resource Officer programme. The *School Agent*, a two-year experimental project began in 2001, placing a full time police officer in a secondary school in Duiven.³⁰ The officer has an office, and is available to all staff, students, and the local community to provide information, and respond to problems arising.

A *School-Based Policing Programme* has been developed in the state of Queensland, Australia. This appoints a police officer to cluster of schools in an area, both primary and secondary. Their role is to assist the schools to achieve their educational, developmental and prevention goals, but they do not carry out teaching staff functions.³¹

Police undercover agents in schools

A very different model of police-school involvement is the placement of undercover police officers in schools, which has been used in the United States in particular. While this has received considerable recent attention, undercover police operations in high schools have been used for several decades. For example, a 1974 study found that 28% of school districts surveyed reported the use of police undercover agents in their schools. The high number of US news articles about undercover officers in high schools also suggests that these kind of operations take place fairly often.³² The use of police dogs to detect drugs in schools has also been reported recently in a number of countries, including Britain.

The primary focus of undercover initiatives is usually drug dealing. In the US police officers are often recent graduates for police academy, and thus still young enough to infiltrate high schools posing as students. Their aim is to entrap drug-dealing students by identifying with them and trying to buy drugs. A number of techniques are used to be accepted and get to know the students who are dealing, including acting as trouble-makers.³³

This approach has been criticised on a number of grounds. Lying to students is likely to increase their negative perceptions of the police, and relations between young people and the police in general.

It is also argued that such police procedures in schools have the potential to cause emotional harm to students, and encourage misbehaviour, aggression and violence.³⁴ The long-term deterrent effect of such undercover operations is probably small, given that most officers only operate in a school for a few months. It is likely that students will not stop using drugs, just be more careful, while targeting the small users and dealers does not deal with the larger dealers in the outside community. Finally, such operations may have legal implications concerning provocation, especially since it involves young people.

II Police Officers as ‘Teachers’

A second popular model of police involvement in schools is as an educational resource. This is the oldest model of police-school co-operation and has been used since the early 20th century. Initially this included occasional lessons on bicycle safety, road safety, or the prevention of child abuse.³⁵ Over time there has been a greater emphasis on crime prevention, and especially drug use. Most of these programmes are bi-lateral limited to police and schools or education authorities. Many police forces offer a series of presentations on crime-related topics to school pupils, staff and parents. In Canada, for example, the Winnipeg and the Calgary Police Services have developed a series of presentations for schools and parents on topics ranging from bullying, impaired driving, and personal safety to internet crime. The Metropolitan Police force in London similarly provides a variety of services which are adapted to the needs of primary and secondary schools.³⁶

In recent years, in the US in particular, the police have become involved in the delivery of structured educational programmes developed in collaboration subject experts and targeting specific issues. These include programmes such as DARE and GREAT, which are designed to build resistance to drug abuse and youth gangs. Delivery of such programmes sometimes forms part of the duties of a School Resource Officer, but in most cases they constitute the only police involvement in a school.

Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE)

Drug Abuse Resistance Education is a comprehensive drug and violence prevention education programme for children from kindergarten to 12th grade. It was originally developed in Los Angeles in 1983, and is now being implemented across most of the United States. Its primary goals are:

- to prevent substance abuse among schoolchildren and
- help them develop effective gang and violence resistance techniques.³⁷

Drug education is seen as the key for reducing the demand for drugs. DARE aims its police-led classroom lessons at children before they are exposed to drugs.³⁸ The emphasis is on helping students recognise and resist the many direct and subtle pressures that influence them to experiment with alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, inhalants, or other drugs or to engage in violence.³⁹

It is seen as a collaborative programme between local law enforcement and schools. Additionally, the programme aims to establish positive relationships between students and police, teachers, parents and other community leaders.⁴⁰

The lessons focus on acquiring the knowledge and skills to recognise and resist peer pressure to experiment with drugs, enhancing self esteem, learning assertiveness techniques, learning about positive alternatives to substance use, learning anger management and conflict resolution skills, developing risk assessment and decision making skills, reducing violence, building interpersonal and communication skills, resisting gang involvement. Police officers are expected to serve as positive role models for the students.⁴¹ The officers participating in the programme, receive special training in child development, classroom management, teaching techniques and communication skills, as well as teaching the structured curriculum.⁴²

DARE can be seen as an example of a proactive, preventive educational programme, aiming for long-term effects. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, DARE is the largest and most widely implemented drug and violence prevention programme in the world, having been adopted in more than 50 countries.⁴³

Evaluation

DARE is one of the few police-school programmes which has been extensively evaluated, however, the most controversial aspect is its effectiveness. While there is considerable satisfaction among users, none of the methodologically rigorous evaluations undertaken have found any reduction in drug use among students.⁴⁴ In general, the better-controlled studies tend to show the smallest effects, and follow-up studies suggest that it has little or no lasting effects on student drug use.⁴⁵

Further, one study comparing DARE and non-DARE high school students, found that drug use was identical for both groups of students, except that the DARE students smoked marijuana more often than their counterparts.⁴⁶ A six-year follow-up evaluation found that students in suburban schools who had been through the DARE programme had a slight increase in drug use compared with non-programme students.⁴⁷ As Gottfredson has concluded:

DARE does not work to reduce substance use. The program's content, teaching methods, and use of uniformed police officers rather than teachers might each explain its weak evaluations. No scientific evidence suggests that DARE core curriculum, as originally designed or revised in 1993, will reduce substance use in the absence of continued instruction more focused on social competency development.

Nevertheless, the programme is evaluated positively by the people involved, and both its prevalence and popularity continue to expand. Student receptivity to DARE has been rated higher than for other prevention programme and it is strongly supported by school staff, students, parents and the community.⁴⁸ It seems clear that the programme continues to expand because it is well liked and gives the impression that 'something is being done' to counter drug use among young people.

In response to the negative findings, the programme has in some cases been replaced by another police-taught programme 'Just say life skills', but since its methods are very similar to DARE, it may be as ineffective.⁴⁹ It has been argued that the financial costs of running DARE could be better used to develop more effective tools for drug prevention.

Gang Resistance Education and Training Program (GREAT)

GREAT is an educational, school-based gang prevention programme taught by uniformed police officers.⁵⁰ The curriculum consists of 13 interactive lessons, and uses structured exercises and interactive approaches to learning to help children set goals, make sound judgements, learn how to resolve conflicts without violence, and understand how gangs and youth violence negatively affect the quality of their lives.⁵¹ Thus it focuses on the development of personal skills, resiliency skills, resistance skills and social skills. The programme has an optional curricula for grades three to six, a Family Component, and a follow-up summer recreation programme, help strengthen the effectiveness of in-class lessons by involving family and the community.

The GREAT programme was initially developed in 1991 by the US Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, in collaboration a number of Texas and Arizona police departments, to deal with an escalating youth gang problem. It was modelled on DARE.⁵² By 1996, the programme had been incorporated into the school curriculum in 47 states.⁵³ Following a programme review in 2000, the original 9-lesson programme was increased to 13 lessons.

Evaluation

An evaluation of the effectiveness of the GREAT programme has looked at a five-year period (1995 to 1999), using cross-sectional and longitudinal information from students, police officers, teachers, and parents.⁵⁴ Based on an analysis of the programme in eleven cities, it was found that GREAT students reported committing fewer delinquent acts. They also had more positive social attitudes towards the police, higher levels of self-esteem and greater attachment to parents and commitment to school.⁵⁵ An analysis of the programme in six cities compared the experiences of participants and non-participants at yearly intervals up to four years after programme completion. No significant differences were found between participants and non-participants after two years, but after four years they were. GREAT students reported lower levels of risk-seeking and victimisation, more positive attitudes towards the police, more negative attitudes towards gangs, and more friends involved in positive social activities than the other students.

Other examples of police-taught curricula include programmes modelled on DARE, such as *Reduce Abuse In Drugs (RAID)* developed by Peel Regional Police in Ontario, Canada. It consists of a set of seven lessons for children, each focusing on specific topics to develop resistance to drug use. The classes are taught by trained police officers attached to the Peel Regional Police Youth Education Bureau, which provides proactive and intervention services to elementary school students (see Section III below).⁵⁶

The Police Schools Involvement Program (PSIP) - Victoria, Australia

The Police Schools Involvement Program in Victoria Australia involves a proactive partnership between school communities and police officers. The police are also called School Resource Officers, but unlike the US model, their focus is entirely on education.⁵⁷ They do not act as law enforcement officers. The programme began in 1999, and employs around 80 police officers, each working with up to 10 primary or secondary schools across the State. In 1999, some 548 primary and 127 secondary schools were involved in the programme. Each school receives a visit about only one a fortnight. The aims of the programme are:

- to reduce the incidence of crime in society
- to develop a better relationship between the police and youth in the community
- to create in young people an understanding of the police role in the structure of society
- to extend the concept of crime prevention into the Victorian school system
- to equip young people with the necessary skills to avoid dangerous and threatening situations.⁵⁸

The SRO's participate in staff room discussions, school camps, playground activities and parent meetings. At the beginning of each school year, the SRO consults with the whole school community to ensure that it is responsive to their needs. A programme for the school is then developed on a collaborative basis, linked with the curriculum, the learning needs of the students, the social and welfare approach of the school, and identified concerns in the local community.

Evaluation

Initial evaluations of the programme in 1990 and 1995 suggested that students had increased their understanding of the role of police, and teachers felt that the programme had an impact on antisocial behaviour. Most teachers thought that the programme had given young people the skills to avoid dangerous and threatening situations.⁵⁹

Annual surveys track reactions to the programme. These continue to be positive and suggest that the students develop a better understanding of the role of police, and a trusting relationship with the SRO's. Young people in the programme develop the skills, knowledge and behaviours which encourage pro social attitudes and lead to individual and community safety, and the reduction of crime.⁶⁰

The School Adoption Plan - The Netherlands, Belgium, Slovakia, Poland and Estonia

In Europe, many pro-active police-led educational programmes exist. One example is the School Adoption Plan in which police officers, known as 'Adoption Agents', teach crime prevention in elementary schools.⁶¹ The project is based on a community policing philosophy, and the notion that 'You better build a child, than repair an adult'.⁶² The programme was originally developed in the Netherlands in 1995, in 150 schools in the Rotterdam-Rijnmond region, under the title 'Act normal!'.⁶³

It was modelled on the DARE-programme, although there are considerable differences in implementation. It subsequently spread to other regions in the Netherlands. In 1998-1999 the project was also implemented in Poland, Slovakia and Belgium, and in 2001 in Estonia. Other European countries are also interested in its implementation.⁶⁴

The course is given by police officers to 10-12 years olds pupils in elementary schools, and consists of twelve lessons based on course manuals. Topics range from the environment and public transport, to discrimination, child justice, policing, crime, and alcohol and drugs. There are three main goals:

- to improve/enhance relations and contacts between youth (and their parents), the school and neighbourhood police;
- to change existing attitudes towards crime;
- to provide early signalling of offender behaviour, and ultimately, changes in behaviour.

Evaluation

An evaluation by the WODC of the Dutch Ministry of Justice looked at four schools participating in the project.⁶⁵ It assessed the activities of the police officers, and attitudes of those involved in the programme. Overall, the conclusions on the project were positive. Police officers, school principals and staff, students and parents involved in the project all had very positive reactions. Students also had positive views on the adoption officers themselves. However, not all the aims of the project had been achieved. There was no evidence that police had been able to identify children at risk of later offending, or to develop better neighbourhood contacts outside school. This would require much greater commitment of police time. The research concluded that the school adoption project should focus on those aims which were actually achievable. The study also raised the question of the extent to which the police had the capacity to cover all schools, or to extent their work to secondary schools, and whether it was better to prioritize certain types of school.

The Adopt-a-Cop Programme and Captain Crime Stop Campaign - South Africa

In South Africa, several programmes which establish some kind of relationship between police and schools have been implemented. The end of the apartheid regime in 1994, left a legacy of an authoritarian government based on racist ideology. This has had two major consequences for police-schools co-operation. First, the apartheid regime encouraged a violent social context. Violent crime is still widespread in South African society, including schools. For example, girls in South African schools continue to be raped and sexually abused, by male classmates and teachers. Other major concerns are the presence of gangs and small arms in schools, as well as violence against both pupils and staff.⁶⁶ Secondly, a major task is to restore confidence in the police. Crime in schools in South Africa has had to be addressed through specific programmes. The involvement of the police in schools forms part of a major campaign to change the public's attitudes towards the police, through the development of positive contacts between the police and young people.

The *Adopt-a-Cop programme* began operation in 1996. Adopt-a-Cop units visit schools involved in the programme on a daily basis, to give classes to pupils. Topics such as illegal weapons, drugs, gangs, or child abuse are discussed. Police officers aim to build up a positive working relationship with the children, as well as gain their co-operation in preventing and solving crimes. They also organize events such as Police and Parents Day, Sports Day, Christmas parties for street children, and police station and court tours.⁶⁷ The programme also aims to facilitate a strong and proactive relationship between school management and the police at the local level.⁶⁸

The aim of the *Captain Crime Stop Campaign* is to educate children about personal safety, including child abuse. The Campaign targets nursery school children between three and six years, and primary school children from grades one to seven. Captain Crime Stop has four goals: to educate children and supply them with personal safety tips; to create awareness of emergency telephone numbers; to explain the meaning of child abuse and what to do if it is affecting you; and to convince children that the South African Police Service is a friend that can be trusted.⁶⁹ The campaign forms part of the broader Crime Stop Programme which invites the public to report information on criminal activity anonymously.⁷⁰

Das Präventionsprogramm 'Kinder- und Jugenddelinquenz' and a team approach to reduce delinquency in schools – Germany

In Hamburg, Germany, a collaborative school-police education programme was established in 1982, following an agreement between the education authorities and the police. The aim of the programme is to increase student resistance to peer pressures by providing information on values and the causes and prevention of youth crime. It is offered to all schools. In 2002, the programme was in place in 267 out of the 429 schools in Hamburg, covering some 41,500 students. The programme relies on volunteer officers who visit the schools in their free time. Classes are developed in discussion with staff, and the style and methods of teaching is left to individual officers.⁷¹ Tools such as videos on theft, violence and vandalism have been developed for classes in primary schools.⁷²

Evaluation

An evaluation of 300 participating and 250 non-participating 8 and 18 year-old pupils found increased knowledge about crime prevention among all those participating. Three quarters of the pupils felt they could put themselves in the position of victim as well as perpetrator of a crime. Older pupils had a less positive attitude towards the police than the younger pupils eg. over 70 % of 8 and 11 year olds saw the police as a friend who could help them, but only 25 % of 17 and 18 year olds.⁷³

The State of Schleswig-Holstein in Germany developed its PIT programme, a *team approach to preventing delinquency*, in partnership with schools, in 1996.⁷⁴ The programme aimed to increase awareness about the consequence of offending, reduce offending, increase social skills and problem-solving skills.

Schools develop sets of rules about socially acceptable behaviour, and a series of focused lessons are given by teachers and by police officers who both receive training. Over 151 schools have taken part in the project since 1996. A survey of 18 schools found that two-thirds of teachers reported an increase in pro-social attitudes among students, and nearly three quarters a decrease in aggression in classes.

III Comprehensive Police-School Liaison Schemes

A third broad type of police-school involvement includes multi-partnership or comprehensive liaison schemes which include other service sectors apart from the schools and the police. They may have a variety of purposes including information exchange, assistance in implementing specific programmes, regular school visits and counselling and support. Some individual projects discussed under previous models may also fit these criteria. The *Safer Schools Partnerships* being piloted in England, for example, are to form part of a wider package of measures to improve pupil in-school behaviour, and this will require considerable networking with a wider partnership under the guidance of the Youth Justice Board and others at the local level. Those measures include learning support units, electronic registration monitoring, intensive truancy sweeps, full-time education for excluded pupils, multi-agency behavioural and education support teams, named key workers for all at risk pupils, and summer holiday activities for at risk pupils.⁷⁵

Community Outreach through Police in Schools - United States

The Community Outreach through Police in Schools Program is a short-term, prevention-oriented, school-based intervention.⁷⁶ It was developed in 1998 by the Child Development-Community Policing programme at Yale University's Child Study Centre. It brings together community police officers with child clinicians to provide weekly sessions for middle school students at risk of exposure to violence in the community. The programme consists of a structured curriculum of eight 50-minute weekly sessions, as well as pre-test and post-test survey sessions, for a total of 10 weeks. The programme takes place during the school day. Police officers are specially selected and trained, and attend weekly meetings with the supervising clinician.

Schools in areas identified as having high rates of crime and community violence are targeted, and students at high risk are invited to attend the group sessions. The collaborative partnership between schools, police and mental health services combines law enforcement expertise in knowledge about the community with mental health expertise on the psychological and emotional consequences of exposure to violence. During the weekly sessions, the children interact with and establish relationships with police officers. This is intended to lead to changes in attitudes toward police and their role in the community. Feedback is given to the school and parents at the end of sessions, and pupils needing more support are referred to community services.

Evaluation

The programme has been evaluated on an ongoing basis since it began in 1998. Baseline assessments for each site allows differences in behaviour and attitude before and after the programme to be measured. Preliminary results show that the programme has been successful in targeting schools and pupils at considerable risk of violence, and has some promising outcomes. Overall, participation in the programme appears to improve children's ability to express and cope with the emotional consequences of exposure to violence. While changes in attitudes towards police officers are mixed, most children seem to improve their relationships with community police officers.

The Truant Recovery Program - United States

The Truant Recovery Program was developed in a school district in California in 1994-1995.⁷⁷ It responds to evidence that chronic truancy is an important risk factor for delinquency. The school district had a serious problem of truancy in the early 1990s, ranging from 5% of pupils to over 30% percent in some schools. The programme is a collaborative, non-punitive initiative to keep youth in school and off the streets during school hours. The police do not have a presence in the schools.

Local police contact students on the streets during school hours. Those without a valid excuse slip are taken into temporary custody at the local SWAT office. SWAT personnel contact parents for an in-person meeting, in which both can be counselled. If a parent cannot be reached or is unavailable, SWAT personnel return the student to school. The Department of Probation assigns an officer to the SWAT office to screen all contacted juveniles for probation or court violations. The school and the SWAT office closely monitor the student's attendance in subsequent weeks. A Student Attendance Review Board (SARB) has been created to review habitual truancy cases and deal with aggressive or combative students. Cases can be referred to the juvenile court for review and adjudication, and sanctions may be imposed.

Suspension Alternative Class (SAC) has also been created to reduce the impact of out-of-school suspensions on school attendance levels. The focus is on reintegrating truants into the school, rather than punishing their truancy with more time away from school. The SAC allows students to remain in school, but not in their regular classes. SAC teachers determine any underlying problems which led to the truancy, and schoolwork ensures that they do not fall behind.

Evaluation

An evaluation of a random sample of 178 truants picked up by police and taken to the SWAT office in 1997 shows mixed results.⁷⁸ During the 18- to 21-month follow-up, contacts with local police departments, particularly formal arrests, increased considerably. Academic performance measures showed that the majority of truants continued to struggle in school after the truancy sweep. However, there was substantial improvement in fundamental school civility, comparing behaviour one year before and after the sweep. Moreover, progress appeared to be the greatest among those students who had the poorest performance.

The study concluded that there was an association between improved school performance and the programme, but the impact of formal arrests on their behaviour could not be discounted.

Programme d'intervention en milieu scolaire (PIMS) - Québec, Canada

This multi-partnership co-operative programme in which the police form part of a broader network has been developed to respond to concern about drug use, bullying and school violence in secondary schools in Quebec. The network includes school administrators, principals and staff, school bus drivers, guards, psychologists, youth workers, students, and parents.⁷⁹ The programme began in 1987 to combat drug trafficking in schools and subsequently expanded across the whole province, and included violence and bullying. Terms of reference were developed by a round table setting out the basis for police presence in schools, as part of a well-planned partnership strategy which combines pro-active and reactive approaches.

Police give an initial presentation to school authorities, specific school problems are then identified in collaboration with school personnel, and a series of appropriate measures planned and implemented.⁸⁰ Preventive activities include police information sessions for school staff and parents, and sessions for the students, including the use of videos, role plays and games on how to react to bullying. In the case of suspected offending, police officer tasks are clearly identified:

- collecting information by talking to school witnesses or others
- interrogating suspects (usually not on school premises)
- searching school premises or individuals once legal authorization is obtained
- making arrests if necessary.

Evaluation

In 2002, the programme was implemented in 140 high schools, including 7764 pupils. An evaluation of the principles and methods is in progress to help in the development of a global prevention and intervention strategy.⁸¹

Neighbourhood Policing Unit, The Youth Education Bureau and the S.A.F.E. Project - Peel Regional Police, Ontario, Canada

The Peel Regional Police have developed a series of initiatives in partnership with local partners and schools, to address school safety and insecurity. They form an integrated approach, with a broad network of information sharing.

The Peel Region *Neighbourhood Policing Units* were established in 1995. Concerns about increased violence, drugs and gang related activities at secondary schools, resulted in a shift to addressing the special policing need of secondary schools.⁸² Their primary responsibility is to create a safe learning environment for young people in secondary schools. Officers are assigned to schools and are responsible for determining their policing needs by meeting with school administrators, students and parents.

They are responsible for investigating all incidents and responding to issues and problems relating to schools identified in the community, as well as monitoring youth gang activity and teaching classes.

The *Youth Education Bureau* was established in January 2001.⁸³ It is staffed by twelve Youth Education Officers, three drug education officers, who teach the RAID programme (see above), an Internet Safety officer, and two Children's Safety Village officers. The mandate of the Bureau is to provide proactive and intervention services to kindergarten and elementary students through:

- developing and delivering educational programmes on eg. the prevention of crime, bullying, drug use and weapons
- counselling children below the age of criminal responsibility (under 12) in conflict or potential conflict with the law
- mentoring young people deemed at risk of offending, to provide positive role models
- teaching and co-ordinating the Schools Against Fearful Environment (SAFE) programme.

The *Schools Against Fearful Environments Project* (SAFE) programme was developed in collaboration between Peel Regional Police, the Peel District School Board, and the Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board.⁸⁴ The project aims to encourage students, staff and police to work in partnership to ensure a safe school and community environment. Individual schools identify causes of insecurity among students at school and in the community. Each school is able to develop its own focused plan of action, and appoints a School Team consisting of the school principal, a staff member from each grade, two students from each grade, two parent volunteers, and the Youth Education Officer. The School Team is responsible for selecting the issues to be addressed, based on responses to a preliminary survey, implementing the plan of action and monitoring and evaluating its progress.

The Amsterdam School Safety Project - The Netherlands

Surveys of secondary schools in Amsterdam in 1997-9 found high levels of victimization and offending. Rather than increase policing or respond punitively, the school system chose to develop a pro-active response by developing a collective, rational and integrated approach to school safety. This brought together the police, justice, and city administration and services with the schools to develop the *Veiligheid In en Om School-Project* (VIOS) - otherwise known as the Amsterdam School Safety Project.⁸⁵ Schools undertake a careful diagnosis of the safety problems faced in school and around school premises and develop a safety plan. Some 40 schools are involved in the project.

A series of regional focus groups of students, teachers and experts including the police, examine different security issues and help decide on priorities. Implementation of plans includes physical changes to the environment, buildings, public transport and routes to and from school, the development of an incident register, providing training for staff and pupils on problem solving and the handling of school incidents, peer mediation training, and victim support.

The project has developed over time, and each school now has a safety coordinator, and there is a full-time project director who advises schools, provides technical support and links student planning groups principals and coordinators. A CD Rom outlining a model school safety and security plan has been developed which schools use to analyse their own situation. The police are essential members of the partnership. Most schools have developed formal agreements with the police, including regulations on the control on the possession of fire arms, appointing liaison officers, and providing counselling services to the school. They also sit on the overall project steering group, and may participate in other meetings which concern the project.

The Student Assistance Centre and Community Outreach Programme – USA

The *Student Assistance Centre* (SAC) developed at East Hartford High School in the USA is an example of a pro-active school-based project in which the police form a part of a larger school partnership.⁸⁶ It is a comprehensive program that combines school, community, social service organisations, police and local universities. The project was developed in the early 1990's in a secondary school facing increased violence, drug, gang and gun-related incidents as well as ethnic tensions, and in recognition that tough policies alone would not deal with the underlying causes. The project aims to reduce violence, truancy, school suspensions and expulsions and enhance student self esteem. Its main focus is on embedding conflict prevention and resolution, combined with a range of other supports and services.

The SAC is run by a full-time staff member, and a rotation of teachers and interns, a substance abuse counsellor, and trained student mediators. The Centre is linked to local social services, police, probation and career advice and job training services. Three groups of police work with the schools: two School Resource Officers, fourteen outreach officers, and regular police officers whose help may be requested as necessary. The *Community Outreach Programme* of East Hartford Police assigns officers to particular neighbourhoods, and creates opportunities for them to visit and work with schools on a regular basis. They refer and take referrals from the SAC for support and counselling services, and share information to prevent potential problems. The police also run in-school gang and drug resistance education programmes.

Evaluation

No external evaluation of the project has been completed, but since the implementation of the SAC in 1993, over 4000 students bee through the SAC, and 600 new students are served yearly. In the first year of operation there was a 44 percent decrease in detentions and suspensions. The decrease has continued in subsequent years.

Truancy also dropped 70% by 1995, and physical violence maintained a 35% reduction since the inception of the Center.⁸⁷

Community Alliance for Safe Schools (CASS) - South Africa

The South African Community Alliance for Safe Schools (CASS) grew out of a conflict resolution programme in schools, with the recognition that conflict resolution was not a sufficient response to school violence.⁸⁸ CASS is an alliance of government, non-government, community-based, and voluntary organisations. The partners include Business Against Crime, the South African Police Service, the Association of School Governing Bodies, provincial government departments, higher education, and a wide range of NGOs. Conflict resolution was integrated into school curricula in the early 1990's to help teachers, students and school governing bodies develop effective conflict management skills. Evaluation of the programme in 1997 was positive, but it was clear that the high levels of gang activity, carrying of weapons, bullying and victimisation of students and teachers limited the application of the new skills. It was concluded that a broader community-based intervention strategy was required. CASS has three goals:

- build partnerships that instill a sense of community ownership of schools
- mobilise communities to protect children, and
- equip school governing bodies with the training and information needed to create safe environments for pupils and educators.

Pilot projects were developed in 1999 and 2000 to reduce incidents of crime and violence in clusters of schools in the Durban Metropolitan area. They combined intervention and training with support between schools and with the police. A School Management Training Project was also established in 2001 to train school management teams. The main activities are the provision of public information on school safety, training of school governing bodies on techniques and methods for providing security, and mobilising community resources through workshops, communication, partnerships, and ongoing research. IPT facilitates workshops around 'whole school' issues raised in a practical guide, and schools define their own needs and priorities and take action accordingly. CASS is an example of a targeted programme, serving those in greatest need in the areas most vulnerable to crime.⁸⁹

Evaluation

Evaluation of the two pilot projects found that schools had improved their security and there were great improvements in staff, students and police perceptions of school safety. There was a general view that serious signals were being sent to students and outsiders that crime and violence would no longer be tolerated, and that the police would be involved when necessary. The clustering of schools to provide mutual support and problem solving was very productive.⁹⁰ The second pilot project, which involved 14 schools, also found a very positive impact especially on students, but identified a need for follow-up and continuity, as well as more resources in terms of time, money and personnel to implement the strategy effectively.⁹¹

The Wetzlar Police-School Project - Germany

In 1995 schools in Giessen, Germany were concerned about violence, drug dealing and racial incidents. There was also a general lack of trust in the police, and unwillingness to call them in. This led to the development of the Wetzlar Model Police-School Project.⁹² A task force report recommended a partnership between the police and school staff, pupils and parents, school boards, youth welfare and other groups in the area. Five secondary schools and 6 vocational colleges were involved. The police instituted a hotline for reporting incidents, responded swiftly to school requests for assistance, and gave training on protocols for handling incidents. Mediation and conflict resolution training, organized sports nights and break-time activities, and supports for youth with behaviour problems, and project nights for immigrant students and their families were all initiated. A school safety council was set up, and the police meet on a monthly basis with school officials and other key members of the partnership.

IV Summary and next steps

This brief report has provided a preliminary overview of a variety of practices and programmes involving police and schools in a number of countries. It is far from complete. There are indications that police-school co-operation is becoming more popular, with the development of more structured and focused initiatives, often targeted to 'at risk' populations or schools, and that the range of tools and training materials is expanding. Part of the expansion of police-school interventions is in response to increased concerns about school-based violence, intrusion and drug use, to the increasing use of zero tolerance policies in some countries since the 1990's, and to a climate of increased insecurity and risk aversion. The expansion of dedicated school-based police officer programmes, particularly modelled on those in the USA, is evident.

- Three models of involvement are identified although there is considerable overlap: school-based police officer programmes, police as 'teachers', and comprehensive or broad-based liaison programmes.
- Police-school programmes represent a range of unstructured and structured programmes with varying combinations of pro-active and reactive approaches, and prevention, intervention, enforcement and deterrent objectives, and short and long-term goals. They include bi-lateral initiatives, which work exclusively with schools, and multi-lateral initiatives in which the police are one of a wider range of partners.
- Many initiatives see themselves as part of a community policing approach, which is primarily pro-active and preventive. Such programmes can help to create better relationships between young people and police working in schools, which can be seen as an important prevention strategy in itself. However, these attitudes may not always be transferred to other police.

- Some interventions, such as those which are primarily deterrent or investigative, may be very effective in the short term in reducing incidents of drug trafficking or violence, but raise concerns about their negative impact on students attitudes, their long-term ability to deal with the problems facing at risk students, and their infringement of the rights of children and young people.
- Police involvement as educators, particularly using structured courses to reduce drugs, violence or gang involvement, are very popular with police and education authorities, parents and students, but not necessarily effective in their long-term ability to change attitudes and behaviour. Part of the problem may lie not with the programmes themselves, but their inability to deal with the broader problems and police response policies in the surrounding community.
- Co-operation between the police and schools would appear to be particularly constructive when the police form part of broader comprehensive programme or multi-partnership network. The third model of police-schools co-operation, involving comprehensive or multi-partnership liaison projects generally provide a strategic and integrated series of responses to safety and security issues in schools and their surrounding communities. This allows for a balancing of police expertise and contributions with that of other specialists.
- The weakest aspect of many of police-school programmes is evaluation. Many programmes appear to ‘take for granted’ their benefits and outcomes. In other cases there has been widespread adoption of models which, while very popular, do not achieve their stated outcomes and cannot provide cost benefits.

Future work in this area might include:

- A more comprehensive comparative review of police-school interventions.
- The systematic collection and documentation of good practice models and tools.
- A review of protocols and guidance for police-school interventions at municipal, regional or national levels.
- Assessing the long-term impact of investigative and deterrent police involvement on relationships with young people, and how this can be *balanced* with the rights of students and staff, and long-term prevention.
- Assessing the impact of zero tolerance policies on police-school relations and pro-active prevention.
- Assessing the extent and role of private security in schools.
- Assessing the experiences and challenges of working in multi-agency partnerships and linking police-school initiatives into comprehensive community crime prevention strategies.
- Development of an exchange of experiences or joint projects between schools, school boards, police services and municipalities in different cities.

Bibliography

- Atkinson, A. J. (March, 2001) "School Resource Officers: Making Schools Safer And More Effective", *The Police Chief*
- Audette, J. (2003) *Programme d'Intervention en Milieu Scolaire: Une approche pluridisciplinaire pour contrer la violence, le tabac et les drogues à l'école*, Présentation sur la Conférence Internationale sur la violence dans les écoles, Québec, May 11-14, 2003
- Baas, N. J. (1997) *Het effect van voorlichting op school. Een literatuurverkenning*
- Becker, H. K. and Agopian, M. W. (1992) "Impact Evaluation of Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE)", *Journal of Drug Education*, Vol. 22 (4), p. 283-291
- Brown, J. H. and Kreft, I. G. G. (1998) "Zero Effects of Drug Prevention Programs: Issues and Solutions", *Evaluation Review*, Vol. 22 No. 1
- Bureau of Justice Assistance, *Bureau of Justice Assistance Fact Sheet*, URL: www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/darefs.pdf
- Council of Europe, *Local partnerships for preventing and combating violence at school. Final Declaration adopted at the close of the Conference*, Strasbourg, 2-4 December 2002
- Danish Crime Prevention Council. (1998). *SSP Co-operation. Basis and Organization*. Copenhagen.
- Department for Education and Skills. (2002). *Safer School Partnerships Guidance*. London: Dept of Education and Skills 2002.
- Drug Abuse Resistance Education. We must take responsibility and prevent the problem*, URL: phoenix.gov/POLICE/dare1.html
- Esbensen, F.-A., Freng, A., Taylor, T. J., Peterson, D. and Osgood, D. W. (July, 2002) "National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) Program", in W. L. Reed and S. H. Decker (eds.), *Responding to Gangs: Evaluation and Research*, Washington DC: U. S. Department of Justice.
- Esbensen, F.-A., Osgood, D. W., Taylor, T. J., Peterson, D. and Freng, A. (November 2001) "How Great Is G.R.E.A.T.? Results From a Longitudinal Quasi-Experimental Design", *Criminology and Public Policy*, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 87-118
- Esbensen, F.-A. *Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) Program in the United States, 1995-1999. Summary*, URL: www.icpsr.umich.edu:8080/ABSTRACTS/03337.xml
- Gillis, J. W. (August 2003) "Community Outreach through Police in Schools", *OVC Bulletin*, p. 1-4
- Gordon, P. (1987) "Community policing: Towards the local police state?", in P. Scraton (ed.), *Law , order and the authoritarian state*, Milton Keynes/Philadelphia: Open University Press
- Grüner, M. Böhm, C. and Kaeding, P. (2002) *Gewalt in der Schule- was ist zu tun? Eine praktische Handreichung für Lehrerinnen und Lehrer*, Hamburg: Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg
- Harber, C. (2001) "Schooling and violence in South Africa: creating a safer school", *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 12, No. 3

Hopkins, N., Hewstone, M. and Hantzi, A. (1992) "Police-Schools Liaison and young people's image of the police: An intervention evaluation", *British Journal of Psychology*, 83, 203-220

Hyman, I. A. and Perone, D. C. (1998) "The other side of school violence: Educator policies and practices that may contribute to student misbehavior", *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 36 No. 1

ICPC (2000). 'A Team Approach to Reduce Delinquency in Schools'. State of Schleswig-Holstein. In *Inspiring Police Practices*. www.crime-prevention-intl.org

Jackson, A. (2002) "Police-school resource officers' and students' perception of the police and offending", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 25 No. 3

Jacobs, B. A. (1994) "Anticipatory undercover targeting in high schools", *Journal of criminal justice*, Vol. 22 No. 5

Johnson, I. M. (1999) "School violence: the effectiveness of a school resource officer program in a southern city", *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 27 No. 2

Lambert, R. D. and McGinty, D. (2002) "Law enforcement officers in schools: setting priorities", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 40 No. 3

Lynam, D.R., Milich, R., Zimmerman, R., Novak, S. P., Logan, T. K., Martin, C., Leukefeld, C. and Clayton, R. (1999) "Project DARE: No Effects at 10-Year Follow-Up", *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 67 No. 4.

McCall, R. *Undercover drug bust at Los Gatos High School*, December 20, 2001, URL: beta.kpix.com/news/local/2001/12/20/Undercover_Drug_Bust_at_Los_Gatos_High_School.html

McCord, J., Spatz Widom, C. and Crowell, N. A. (eds.) (2001) *Juvenile crime, Juvenile justice*, Washington DC: National Academy Press

McDaniel, J. *School Resource Officers : What we know, what we think we know, what we need to know*, URL : www.ncsu.edu/cpsv/sro.htm

Meggie, M., Edwards, S. W. and Gwozdz, K. (2001). *Conflict revolution. A blueprint for preventing school violence*. New York: The Solomon Press.

Ministère de la Sécurité publique, Quebec. (2002). *La police dans les écoles. Résultats de l'analyse*. Unpublished document.

Ministère de la Sécurité publique, Quebec. (2002). *Réflexion sur les enjeux de la présence policière en milieu scolaire*. Conseil consultative québécois en prévention de la criminalité.

Peel Regional Police, Youth Education Bureau, *Program overview. Proactive and intervention services for elementary school children in grades JK to eight*. Ontario.

Peel Regional Police. *Project R.A.I.D.-Lesson summary. Reduce Abuse In Drugs*. Ontario.

Peel Regional Police, Neighbourhood Policing Unit, *Neighbourhood Policing Unit*. Ontario.

Policy Research Bureau, *Central Monitoring and Evaluation of the Safer School Partnership Programme*. www.prb.org.uk

Roper, M. (2002) "Kids first: approaching school safety", in: E. Pelsler (ed.), *Crime prevention partnerships. Lessons from practice*, Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies

- Ryan, C. Mathews, F. and Banner J. (1994) *Community project to fight violence in schools: a model partnership between the police and schools*. Central Toronto Youth Services.
- Scheffer, M. W. (1987) *Policing from the schoolhouse: police-school liaison and resource officer programs: a case study*, Springfield: C. C. Thomas
- Shaw, M. (2001). *Promoting Safety in Schools: International Experience and Action*. Washington DC: US Dept of Justice, BJA, & ICPC, Montreal. www.crime-prevention-intl.org
- Smith, V. *Final Report to Open Society Foundation: Safe School Project*. www.webpro.co.za
- Sûreté du Québec (June 1999) *Document de référence de programme d'intervention en milieu scolaire*
- Sutton, L. (2002). *Police/school/kids – A safety partnership*. Paper presented at the The Role of Schools in Crime Prevention Conference, Melbourne, 30 September-1 October 2002. www.aic.gov.au/conferences
- Sutton, L. (1998). *Police Schools Involvement Program: An investment in our young people's future*. Paper presented at the conference Partnerships in Crime Prevention, in Hobart, 25-27 February 1998. : www.aic.gov.au/conferences
- Tait, J. "Undercover officer played a student", *Eagle-Tribune*, December 16, 2001, URL: www.eagletribune.com/news/stories/20011216/FP_005.htm;
- Terlouw, G. J. and Kamphorst, P. A. (1999) *De politie op school. Schooladoptie in Rotterdam-Rijnmond*, WODC, Ministerie van Justitie
- U.S. Department of Justice (2001). *Guide to Using School Cop to Address Student Discipline and Crime Problems*. Washington DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. www.cops.usdoj.gov
- Van Dijkhuizen, E. *Een eigen "lokaal" voor de politie*. : www.ond.refdag.nl/ond/010921ond02.html
- White, M. D., Fyfe, J. J., Campbell, S. P. and Goldkamp, J. S. (October 2001) "The school-police partnership. Identifying At-Risk Youth Through a Truant Recovery Program", *Evaluation Review*, Vol. 25 No. 5
- Youth Justice Board. *Safer School Partnerships*. : www.youth-justice-board.gov.uk

¹ This paper is based on the research report prepared by Kristien van Buyten, University of Gent, during her three month's Internship at the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime in 2003. We would like to thank all those police services and governments who so generously gave us their time. Any errors in this report are our own.

² R.D. Lambert and D. McGinty, "Law enforcement officers in schools: setting priorities", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 40 No. 3, 2002, 258

- ³ See M. Shaw, *Promoting Safety in Schools: International Experience and Action*, US Dept of Justice BJA, 2001.
- ⁴ Council of Europe, *Local partnerships for preventing and combating violence at school. Final Declaration adopted at the close of the Conference*, Strasbourg, 2-4 December 2002
- ⁵ *La police dans les écoles. Résultats de l'analyse*. 2002. Ministère de la Sécurité publique, Quebec.
- ⁶ Eg. C. Ryan, F. Mathews and J. Banner (1994) *Community project to fight violence in schools: a model partnership between the police and schools*. Central Toronto Youth Services.
- ⁷ US Dept of Justice Fact Sheet *COPS in Schools*. 2003. www.cops.usdoj.gov
- ⁸ SSP Co-operation. 1998. Copenhagen: Danish Crime Prevention Council.
- ⁹ Schleswig-Holstein 'A Team Approach to reduce Delinquency in Schools'. In ICPC (2000). *Inspiring Police Practices*.
- ¹⁰ See Shaw 2001 op. cit.
- ¹¹ M. Roper, "Kids first: approaching school safety" in E. Pelsler (ed.), *Crime prevention partnerships. Lessons from practice*, Institute for Security Studies, Pretoria, 2002.
- ¹² Internet Safety Presentation, Calgary Police: www.gov.calgary.ab.ca/police/crimeprev
- ¹³ *Guide to Using School Cop to Address Student Discipline and Crime Problems*, 2001. U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- ¹⁴ 'Promising' Strategies for Schools: School Resource Officer Programs. www.ncsu.edu/cpsv/sro.htm
- ¹⁵ R.D. Lambert and D. McGinty, 2002. op. cit.; McDaniel op. cit.
- ¹⁶ I. M. Johnson, 1999, op. cit.
- ¹⁷ 'Promising' Strategies for Schools: School Resource Officer Programs. www.ncsu.edu/cpsv/sro.htm
- ¹⁸ I. M. Johnson, 1999, op. cit.
- ¹⁹ See Safe Communities – Safe Schools www.colorado.edu/cspv
- ²⁰ R.D. Lambert and D. McGinty, 2002, op. cit.
- ²¹ 'The North Carolina High School Strategy Survey: The center's safe schools pyramid and other strategies for ensuring safety and security', *Center.Link Research Bulletin Center For The Prevention Of School Violence*, July 1997, Vol. 1, No. 2 : www.ncsu.edu/cpsv/sro.htm
- ²² I. M. Johnson, 1999, op. cit.
- ²³ A. Jackson, "Police-school resource officers' and students' perception of the police and offending", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 25 No. 3, 2002, p. 631-650
- ²⁴ M. W. Scheffer, *Policing from the schoolhouse: police-school liaison and resource officer programs: a case study*, C. C. Thomas, Springfield, 1987, p. 1-101
- ²⁵ P. Gordon, 'Community policing: Towards the local police state?' in P. Scraton (Ed.), *Law, order and the authoritarian state*, PA: Open University Press, Milton Keynes/Philadelphia, 1987, p. 125-126
- ²⁶ Youth Justice Board, *Safer School Partnerships*; see also *Youth Justice Board News Issue 16 February 2003*: www.youth-justice-board.gov.uk
- ²⁷ Policy Research Bureau, *Central Monitoring and Evaluation of the Safer school Partnership Programme*, www.prb.org.uk/research
- ²⁸ Department for Education and Skills, Home Office, Youth Justice Board, Association of Chief Education Officers & Association of Chief Police Officers, *Safer School Partnerships Guidance*.
- ²⁹ Policy Research Bureau, *Central Monitoring and Evaluation of the Safer school Partnership Programme*, URL: www.prb.org.uk
- ³⁰ E. van Dijkhuizen, *Een eigen "lokaal" voor de politie; Projecten in Rivierenland. Schoolagent; Schoolagent Rob Verhoef, Schoolagent groot success*. www.ond.refdag.nl ; www.politiegelderlandmidden.nl
- ³¹ School-based Policing. Queensland Police Service. www.police.qld.gov.au
- ³² J, Tait, 'Undercover officer played a student', *Eagle-Tribune*, December 16, 2001. www.eagletribune.com ; 'Undercover deputy poses as Port St. Lucie high school student'. *Naples Daily News*, March 22, 2002. www.naplesnews.com ; R. McCall, *Undercover drug bust at Los Gatos High School*, December 20, 2001.
- ³³ B. A. Jacobs, "Anticipatory undercover targeting in high schools", *Journal of criminal justice*, Vol. 22 No. 5, 1994.
- ³⁴ I. A. Hyman and D. C. Perone, 'The other side of school violence: Educator policies and practices that may contribute to student misbehavior', *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 36 No. 1, 1998.
- ³⁵ R.D. Lambert and D. McGinty, 2002, op. cit.

- ³⁶ eg. Kensington & Chelsea Police, and Merton Police. www.met.police.uk
- ³⁷ Bureau of Justice Assistance Fact Sheet, www.ncjrs.org
- ³⁸ Drug Abuse Resistance Education. *We must take responsibility and prevent the problem.* phoenix.gov/POLICE/dare1.html
- ³⁹ www.sayno.com/dareinfo.html
- ⁴⁰ www.dare.com/default.asp
- ⁴¹ Bureau of Justice Assistance Fact Sheet, URL: www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/darefs.pdf
- ⁴² www.dare.com/default.asp
- ⁴³ Bureau of Justice Assistance Fact Sheet, URL: www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/darefs.pdf
- ⁴⁴ eg.: H. K. Becker and M. W. Agopian, 'Impact Evaluation of Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE)', *Journal of Drug Education*, Vol. 22 (4), 1992, p. 283-291; D. R. Lynam, R. Milich, R. Zimmerman, S. P. Novak, T. K. Logan, C. Martin, C. Leukefeld and R. Clayton, 'Project DARE: No Effects at 10-Year Follow-Up.' *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 67 No. 4, 1999, p. 590-593
- ⁴⁵ Review Of Existing Dare Evaluations, www.welcomehome.org
- ⁴⁶ Safety first: parents, teens and drugs. www.drugpolicy.org
- ⁴⁷ J. McCord, C. Spatz Widom and N. A. Crowell (Eds.), *Juvenile crime, Juvenile justice*, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2001, 133
- ⁴⁸ Bureau of Justice Assistance Fact Sheet. www.ncjrs.org
- ⁴⁹ J. H. Brown and I. G. G. Kreft, 'Zero Effects of Drug Prevention Programs: Issues and Solutions.' *Evaluation Review*, Vol. 22 No. 1, February 1998, p. 7
- ⁵⁰ Gang Resistance Education and Training Program. *Program Record.* : www.hamfish.org
- ⁵¹ Gang Resistance Education and Training. *History of the GREAT Program.* www.phoenix.gov/POLICE
- ⁵² F.-A. Esbensen, *Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) Program in the United States, 1995-1999. Summary.* : www.icpsr.umich.edu
- ⁵³ J. McCord, C. Spatz Widom and N. A. Crowell (eds.), *Juvenile crime, juvenile justice*, Washington, DC, National Academy Press, 2001, 134
- ⁵⁴ F.-A. Esbensen, D. W. Osgood, T. J. Taylor, D. Peterson and A. Freng, "How Great Is G.R.E.A.T.? Results From a Longitudinal Quasi-Experimental Design, *Criminology and Public Policy*, Vol. 1, No. 1, November 2001, p. 87-118
- ⁵⁵ F.-A. Esbensen, A. Freng, T. J. Taylor, D. Peterson and D. W. Osgood, "National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) Program", in W. L. Reed and S. H. Decker (eds.), *Responding to Gangs: Evaluation and Research*, U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, July 2002, p. 146
- ⁵⁶ *Project RAID - Lesson summary. Reduce Abuse In Drugs. Program overview. Proactive and intervention services for elementary school children in grades JK to eight.* Youth Education Bureau, Peel Regional Police, Ontario.
- ⁵⁷ L. Sutton, *Police/school/kids – A safety partnership.* Paper presented at the The Role of Schools in Crime Prevention Conference Melbourne, 30 September-1 October 2002.: www.aic.gov.au/conferences
- ⁵⁸ Victoria Police www.police.vic.gov.au
- ⁵⁹ L. Sutton, *Police Schools Involvement Program: An investment in our young people's future.* Paper presented at the conference Partnerships for Crime Prevention, Hobart, 25-27 February 1998. www.aic.gov.au/conferences
- ⁶⁰ L. Sutton, *Police/Schools Involvement Program- A case study*, 1996. www.aic.gov.au/policing
- ⁶¹ *Doe eens normaal*, www.politie.antwerpen.be
- ⁶² *Schooladoptie Doe Effe Normaal- Introductie.* www.doe-effe-normaal.nl
- ⁶³ *Rotterdam- Schooladoptie (1996).* www.ilv.nl
- ⁶⁴ *Schooladoptie Doe Effe Normaal- Introductie.* : www.doe-effe-normaal.nl
- ⁶⁵ G. J. Terlouw and P. A. Kamphorst, *De politie op school. Schooladoptie in Rotterdam-Rijnmond*, WODC, Ministerie van Justitie, 1999.
- ⁶⁶ M. Roper, 'Kids first: approaching school safety' in E. Pelsler (ed.), *Crime prevention partnerships. Lessons from practice*, Institute for Security Studies, Pretoria, 2002.
- ⁶⁷ *Johannesburg Central SAPS. Background.* : www.saps.gov.za
- ⁶⁸ M. Roper, "Kids first: approaching school safety" in E. Pelsler (ed.), *Crime prevention partnerships. Lessons from practice*, Institute for Security Studies, Pretoria, 2002, p. 78

-
- ⁶⁹ SAPS- Kiddies Corner: *The Aim of Captain Crime Stop*. www.saps.gov.za/kiddies/info.htm
- ⁷⁰ *South Africa Yearbook 2002/03, Chapter 17: Safety, security and defence*. : www.gcis.gov.za/docs
- ⁷¹ M. Grüner, C. Böhm and P. Kaeding, *Gewalt in der Schule- was ist zu tun? Eine praktische Handreichung für Lehrerinnen und Lehrer*, Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, Hamburg, 2002, p. 38
- ⁷² *Das Präventionsprogramm "Kinder- und Jugenddelinquenz" in Hamburg*. www.fhh.hamburg.de
- ⁷³ N. J. Baas, *Het effect van voorlichting op school. Een literatuurverkenning*, 1997.
- ⁷⁴ See *Inspiring Police Practices*. 2000. ICPC, Montreal.
- ⁷⁵ *Safer School Partnerships, Guidance*. London: Dept of Education and Skills 2002.
- ⁷⁶ J. W. Gillis, "Community Outreach through Police in Schools", *OVC Bulletin*, August 2003, p. 1-4
- ⁷⁷ M. D. White, J. J. Fyfe, S. P. Campbell and J. S. Goldkamp, 'The school-police partnership. Identifying At-Risk Youth Through a Truant Recovery Program', *Evaluation Review*, Vol. 25 No. 5, October 2001.
- ⁷⁸ M. D. White, J. J. Fyfe, S. P. Campbell and J. S. Goldkamp, 2001, op. cit.
- ⁷⁹ J. Audette, *Programme d'Intervention en Milieu Scolaire: Une approche pluridisciplinaire pour contrer la violence, le tabac et les drogues à l'école*, Présentation sur la Conférence Internationale sur la violence dans les écoles, Québec, May 11-14, 2003
- ⁸⁰ Sûreté du Québec, *Document de référence de programme d'intervention en milieu scolaire*, June 1999.
- ⁸¹ J. Audette, 2003 op. cit.
- ⁸² Peel Regional Police, Neighbourhood Policing Unit, *Neighbourhood Policing Unit*.
- ⁸³ Peel Regional Police, Youth Education Bureau, *Program overview. Proactive and intervention services for elementary school children in grades JK to eight*.
- ⁸⁴ Peel Regional Police S.A.F.E. *Schools Against Fearful Environments*.
- ⁸⁵ *Veilig in en om school*. www.vios-amsterdam.nl ; W. Ruisendahl (2003). *The Amsterdam School safety Project*. Paper given at the OECD conference on School Safety and Security, Paris November 2003. www.oecd.org
- ⁸⁶ M. Meggie, S. W. Edwards and K. Gwozdz, *Conflict revolution. A blueprint for preventing school violence*, The Solomon Press, New York, 2001. See also Shaw 2001 op. cit.
- ⁸⁷ M. Meggie, S. W. Edwards and K. Gwozdz, 2001 op. cit.
- ⁸⁸ M. Roper, "Kids first: approaching school safety" in E. Pelsler (ed.), *Crime prevention partnerships. Lessons from practice*, Institute for Security Studies, Pretoria, 2002.
- ⁸⁹ X., *Community Alliance for Safe Schools: CASS*, URL: www.webpro.co.za/clients/ipt/cass.htm
- ⁹⁰ C. Harber, 'Schooling and violence in South Africa: creating a safer school', *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 12, No. 3, 2001.
- ⁹¹ V. Smith, *Final Report to Open Society Foundation: Safe School Project*, URL: www.webpro.co.za
- ⁹² See Shaw 2001 op. cit.