

INDIANA SECURED SCHOOL SAFETY BOARD MEETING

September 11, 2017

Indiana Government Center – South, Conference Room D

10:00 a.m.

302 W. Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Members Present:

Eric Bowlen (Martinsville)

Curtis Hill (ATG)

David Murtaugh (ICJI)

Members Absent:

Sup. Douglas Carter (ISP)

Bryan Langley (IDHS)

Scott Mellinger (Madison County Sheriff)

Also in Attendance:

Michelle Allen (IDHS)

Kim Snyder (IDHS)

Tayler Workman (IDHS)

Proxies Present:

Joan Blackwell (ATG)

Jonathan Whitham (IDHS)

David Woodward (IDOE)

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM. Jonathan Whitham, proxy for Director Bryan Langley, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Board Member and Audience introductions were made. Roll call was taken and it was determined that there was a quorum. A motion was made to accept the minutes from the July meeting

Proposed by: David Murtaugh

Seconded by: Eric Bowlen

Vote: carried

The information provided to each Board Member was briefly explained. A spreadsheet was included for each section of schools that were being recommended for either approval or denial of funds.

- The question was raised by David Murtaugh as to if the primary reason for the schools being recommended for denial was based on how they had scored during the grant review process.
 - Tayler Workman responded that, yes that was the primary reason for a recommendation to deny funding. However, many of the schools recommended for denial were due to the school asking for items that are not able to be funded through this grant program.
- Joan Blackwell questioned if schools have applied for items that aren't allowable, are they able to receive partial funding? What were some common unallowable items that were requested?
 - Workman - Yes, in many cases if unallowable items were requested in addition to SRO's or other equipment those items were simply removed from the recommended award amount. The most commonly applied for unallowable item was the Barracuda system products: door locking equipment that also prohibits students from exiting classrooms once in place.

- David Murtaugh inquired as to whether or not it was possible that any of the schools that were being recommended for denial already had an SRO currently employed at their school that was grant funded from last year. Murtaugh is concerned that the gap created by changing performance period dates may cause issues for schools that do already have grant funded staff in place. There is an assumption when starting these programs that at some point the State will be reimbursing the schools for their expenditures.
 - Kim Snyder responded that since the previous grant agreements ended June 30, 2017 and the new grant agreements wouldn't begin until October 1, 2017 so no expenses should have been incurred yet. Information was sent out to schools regarding the update in performance period prior to the expiration of their previous grant agreement and therefor they should not have expected grant funding to cover and expenses outside of that period.
 - David Woodward commented that if a school hired an SRO with the previous year's grant funding and were denied funds for that program this year there could be blowback.
 - Murtaugh explained his concerns given his experience with working with schools and similar entities. He briefly touched on the issues the Board ran into last year when the general assembly cut the appropriation more than half. Recommended getting a game plan together for when schools do have issues with their denials. Some history on the program and how issues have been dealt with in regard to sending grant agreements after the start of the performance period.
- Jonathan Whitham questioned how confident is IDHS that the applicants truly understood the gap in the performance period and how it could affect their schools?
 - Workman commented that all applicants that she had spoken to indicated a full understanding and that their school would make whatever work that they needed to, especially with crucial SRO programs already in place.
 - Eric Bowlen asked how many of the recommended for denial have current SRO programs.

Michelle Allen briefly explained the grant scoring process that was the basis for the recommendations.

- Murtaugh questioned how the schools were supposed to know how to complete these applications without a standard for grading.
 - Allen explained that there is a standard in place now with scoresheets and required questions that have associated points. These are provided to each of the schools in the Notice of Funding Opportunity. However, if the Board wants to assist in setting how the criteria for funding or not is defined then they could be involved in defining those standards.

The information regarding the requests submitted by the private schools was reviewed. A motion was made and approved unanimously to fund all private schools that applied.

Proposed: David Murtaugh

Second: Eric Bowlen

Vote: carried

A motion was made to provide one million dollars to the Indiana University Cybersecurity Program development as required by statute.

Proposed: David Murtaugh

Second: Eric Bowlen

Vote: Carried

A motion was made and for the management and administrations costs associated with this grant program.

Proposed: David Murtaugh

Second: David Woodward

Vote: carried

A conversation was held regarding whether or not partial funding would be an option for the schools with continuing SRO programs.

- Workman indicated that partial funding had been recommended in some cases when schools had applied for both allowable and unallowable items. The unallowable items were removed from the budget and the school was recommended to be awarded the remaining balance.
- Murtaugh discussed the disadvantages of not having a standard for what the Board is looking for in terms of an SRO program. This is something he would like to see the Board accomplish in the future.
 - Curtis Hill commented that he would like to see a standardization of what SRO should be expected to be doing in schools.
 - Woodward added that having a specific job description for SRO's specific to receiving grant funding would be helpful in determining funding in the future.
 - Murtaugh added that ICJI has a set standard for what SROs have to be and an electronic reporting system that they have to report to every day.

Curtis Hill proposed we look at the list of schools recommended for denial that had continuing SRO programs and provide them with an opportunity to provide additional information about their SRO program.

- Tayler Workman added that in doing that, IDHS staff would have time to run an internal risk assessment on each of those schools as well.
- Kim Snyder mentioned that deobligated dollars that could be used to fund these continuing SRO programs if that is what the Board voted to do. We wouldn't need to revise the amounts on the recommended for approval list.
- Eric Bowlen commented that it is extremely difficult for schools to implement new programs (SRO) half way through the year. It is much more powerful to have the program start when the students do.

Curtis Hill commented that the frequency of the meetings should be increased if the kind of changes that the board has discussed are going to be implemented.

- Tayler Workman recommended meeting quarterly.
 - Murtaugh commented that he thought that would be a great idea and recommended a presentation be given at the Indiana School Principals Association Conference.

Hill questioned if the Board determines to fund everyone what is the point of the review process at all. There needs to be a standard application and feedback platform established and poor quality should not be rewarded. If the scores indicate a lack of confidence in the proposed programs why should these programs still receive funding? What does funding these schools do for this program and this application process? The board needs to establish what we want to be reported and how we would like it to be reported.

- Joan Blackwell asked if it had ever been discussed as to whether or not this was intended to be seed money and that eventually schools would no longer be eligible for the funds.
- Murtaugh commented that he believes the legislature's intention was to fund equipment first and then provide money to start SRO programs.

A motion to deny all schools recommended for denial that were requesting equipment or new SRO programs and to table the continuing SRO programs on the denial list until they are given an opportunity to provide additional information and a risk assessment is done.

Proposed by: David Murtaugh

Seconded by: Joan Blackwell

Vote: carried

A motion to approve all schools that were recommended for funding by IDHS at a total of \$7,024,712.64

Proposed by: Murtaugh

Second: lady

Vote: carried; Bowlen abstained from the vote on Martinsville Schools

A motion to have the grant cycle follow the state fiscal year, now and moving forward, with the option for schools to amend their contracts to extend through the September 30 date that was indicated in all grant notices was made.

Proposed by: David Murtaugh

Second: Joan Blackwell

Vote: carried

Michelle Allen added that if anyone in the Board had an idea for questions they would like the schools to respond to please let a member of the grant staff know.

It was proposed the next Board Meeting be held October 26, 2017.

A motion to authorize Chelsea Smith to serve as the administration law judge for the Secured School Safety Board was made:

Proposed by: Bowlen

Second: Joan Blackwell

Vote: Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 11:52 AM.