

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

September 6, 2023

Honorable Judge Michael D. Coughlan
Presiding Judge of the San Joaquin County Superior Court
180 E. Weber Avenue, Suite 1306J
Stockton, CA 95202

RE: Grand Jury Report: “School Safety in San Joaquin County: Developing a Culture of Safety”: Case No. 0322

Dear Judge Coughlan:

The Lodi Unified School District (“District”) has reviewed the Facts, Findings and Recommendations in the Grand Jury Report “*School Safety: Developing a Culture of Safety*” filed on June 13, 2023. Pursuant to California Penal Code section 933(c), the following constitutes the response of the District and its Governing Board (“Board”) to the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the District.

2.0 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SAFETY PLAN

Findings:

F2.1 A review of CSSPs demonstrated many districts have failed to create a CSSP that addresses safety issues unique to the individual school sites, and rather use a template and/or boilerplate language, leaving the school site unprepared in an emergency.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Although our CSSPs may use a consistent format that appears to be boilerplate, our CSSPs include an area where school sites address the safety issues unique to the site. We do not believe the use of templates leaves a school site unprepared in an emergency. Rather, we believe the use of consistent language and format can be appropriate and beneficial. For example, it helps to ensure that the various Education Code requirements are met and could ease the review process for outside agencies, such as local law enforcement. Further, language in the plans is often consistent because it is a best practice for schools to respond to like incidents in a like manner.

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

F2.2 Many districts have not involved teachers, support staff, students, and parents/guardians when updating each school site's CSSP, missing an opportunity to create a culture of school safety.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: The process of CSSP approval in the District includes the following; the plan is reviewed by each school campus administration, law enforcement, classified and certificated staff, parents and, in some cases, students. The plans are reviewed with each school staff at the beginning of the school year. It is reviewed and approved by a parent group at each school site. District office staff reviews each school campus plan in preparation for the plans to be reviewed by Lodi Unified Unified Board of Education Trustees at a regular board meeting. Plans are posted with the board agenda and board trustees have the opportunity to review the plans prior to Board of Education meeting. Staff members and members of the public are also able to review the plans.

F2.3 Many districts have not collaborated with local law enforcement and other first responders during the annual process to update the CSSP, which could result in a prolonged and inefficient emergency response.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: The District is pleased and proud to work together with our first responders in the areas in which our school's operate (City of Lodi, City of Stockton and San Joaquin County). They help to ensure the safety, security and well-being of our schools and the citizens of the District. School safety and security issues are regularly discussed at district leadership team meetings as well as at principals meetings. Schools located within the City of Lodi have four School Resource Officers assigned to them. Until Spring of 2023, the schools located in Stockton had two School resources Officers assigned to them. Staff shortages within Stockton Police Department have reduced that number to one. Schools located outside of the city limits of both Stockton and Lodi have a School Resource Officer from the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department. The approval of each law enforcement agency is required as part of our process for the approval of each school site safety plan. The police and fire departments are available to us to review and make recommendations to our plans at any time.

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

F2.4 Many district CSSPs show a lack of meaningful collaboration between districts and local law enforcement agencies, causing confusion and chaos during an emergency.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: The District maintains a close and collaborative partnership with law enforcement agencies and fire departments that operate within the District's boundaries. All parties have worked together in concert to address various matters regarding the safety of our students and families within the community. This collaboration encompasses assessments of administrative procedures and school site security, offering recommendations and engaging in discussions. Additionally, the partnership involves active participation in the formulation and implementation of the District's overall safety plans, as well as those specific to individual school sites. As a culmination of these efforts, staff development training sessions and practical exercises are conducted jointly by multiple organizations.

F2.5 Many districts do not offer an opportunity for public input during the drafting or approval stages of the annual CSSP, which renders the districts out of compliance with State law.

F2.5 Response: The District disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor

*Explanation: Each school site is required to complete a comprehensive annual safety plan. The Process includes the following: the plan is reviewed by each site's principal and/or members of the administrative team, law enforcement and fire department. The comprehensive annual safety plan is shared with the staff and the staff has the opportunity to provide input. The comprehensive annual safety plan is required to be signed by the site Principal, a representative from the school site council, a teacher, a classified staff member, a parent of a student that attends, a school resource officer and a representative from the fire department. The District acknowledges that more can be done to solicit input from parent groups. We are responsive to parent concerns; it is an ongoing process.

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- F2.6 Most districts do not include an assessment of the status of crime at the school and school- related functions in their CSSPs, which renders the districts out of compliance with State law and causes potential harm and liability.**

F2.6 Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Each school's comprehensive school safety plan includes an assessment of status of crime at each school and related school functions. This information can be found in each school's comprehensive school safety plan.

- F2.7 Many districts do not adequately address the unique needs of students with disabilities during emergencies. The lack of planning for the most vulnerable students can cause harm during a time of confusion and crisis.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: The unique needs of students with disabilities may not be addressed in every school's comprehensive school safety plan Lodi Unified School District ensures the safety of students with disabilities in a variety of ways. Individual school sites will assess the needs of students with disabilities and plan accordingly.

- F2.8 A few districts do not make any part of the CSSPs available to the public, withholding important information about steps taken by the district to reduce the probability and impact of safety risks. Other districts post the CSSPs in their entirety, failing to keep confidential information about tactical responses, potentially revealing sensitive information to the public.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: The District safety measures are referred on the Business Services page on the district's website . Each school site has a SARC (School Accountability Report Card) that is posted and addresses their safety measures. Our school board policies are accessible to the public on our website. Within those is our policy and administrative regulation regarding the Comprehensive Safety Plan (CSSP). Parents may contact their school principals for specific questions regarding safety measures unique per campus and to see the CSSP document (minus any confidential information). Families may also

INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

contact our Business Services department via our website under the department page. Each school site CSSP (minus confidential information) is also available for viewing any time at the District Office.

F2.9 Many districts have CSSPs that fail to identify incident command roles and the individuals who are to perform those roles in case of an emergency, exposing students and staff to the potential for confusion and increased risks during an emergency.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Our schools and District CSSPs each have an identified incident command and crisis notification structure in place including the roles and the individuals who are to perform specific assigned duties in the event of an emergency.

F2.10 Many districts have CSSPs that fail to describe the system to reunite parents/guardians with their children in the event of a campus-wide evacuation, creating confusion and additional anxiety in the event of a safety emergency.

Response: The District agrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Individual comprehensive school safety plans do not contain a system to reunite parents and/or guardians with their children; however, this issue has been addressed by site principals and their respective leadership teams. A reunification plan will be added to each site's Comprehensive School Safety Plan.

F2.11 Many schoolsite CSSPs do not account for specific dangers unique to the school site (e.g., train tracks, flooding, freeways).

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: There is a well-defined process that engages partners in the development of each school site's comprehensive school safety plan so that each school's individual unique safety needs are met. As the District and school site administrators review the CSSPs, we will continue to refine the details of each plan specifically to meet the needs of the staff and students at each campus.

CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE/ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendations:

- R2.1 By March 1, 2024, the annual updates for each school site's CSSP address safety issues unique to the site,**

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: The District will continue to utilize its well-defined process that engages partners in the development of each school site CSSP, so that each school's unique individual safety needs are met. As the District and school site administrators review the CSSPs with our partners (including emergency responders), we will continue to refine the details of each plan specifically to meet the unique needs of the staff and students at each campus.

- R2.2 By December 15, 2023, while updating the school's CSSP, each school site collaborate and receive input from representatives of teachers, support staff, students, and parents/guardians.**

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: We plan to continue the current process of CSSP approval in Lodi Unified School District which includes the following; the plan is reviewed by each school campus administration, law enforcement, classified and certificated staff, students (in some cases) and various parent groups. The plans are reviewed with each school staff at the beginning of the school year. It is also reviewed and approved by a parent representative.

- R2.3 By December 15, 2023, while updating the school's CSSP, each school site collaborates and receives input from the appropriate emergency response agencies.**

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: The District will continue to maintain a close and collaborative partnership with law enforcement agencies and fire departments that operate within the District's boundaries. All parties have worked together to address various matters regarding the safety of our students and families within the community. This collaboration encompasses assessments of administrative procedures and school site security, offering recommendations and engaging in discussions. Additionally, the partnership involves active participation in the formulation and implementation of the

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

District's overall safety plans, as well as those specific to individual school sites. As a culmination of these efforts, staff development training sessions and practical exercises are conducted jointly by multiple organizations.

- R2.5 By February 1, 2024, each school site council or safety planning committee hold an advertised public meeting at the school site to allow members of the community an opportunity to express an opinion about the school's proposed CSSP as required by California Education Code Sections 32288(b)(1) and (2).**

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented, by the implementation date of February 1, 2024. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(2).).

Explanation: The Comprehensive School Safety Plans are presented to parent groups and are required to be signed off by a representative from that group. There is however, not formal process for holding an advertised public meeting at each school site designed to allow members of the community an opportunity to express an opinion about the school's proposed CSSP as required by California Education Code Sections 32288(b)(1) and (2).

- R2.6 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSP includes the State mandated assessment of the status of crime at the school and school-related functions.**

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Lodi Unified School District will continue to include the assessment of the status of crime in its CSSPs in accordance with Education Code requirements.

- R2.7 By March 1, 2024, each school site consult with the appropriate professionals to address the unique needs of students with disabilities when updating the CSSP.**

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Procedures for students with special needs are addressed in the CSSPs. Principals will continue to meet individually with staff (teachers), as well as other school professionals such as the psychologist, nurse or mental health clinician when a student has specific needs or accommodations to ensure that the unique needs of students with disabilities are met during an emergency. Individual Educational Plans and 504s are reviewed for pertinent information in conjunction with outreach to students' parents or

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

guardians. Additionally, information may be found in the section for evacuating students with special needs.

R2.8 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSP be available to the public with the exception of confidential information about tactical responses.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Currently the Lodi Unified Unified School Site and District CSSPs are available to the public with the exception of confidential information.

R2.9 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSP identify the incident command roles and the individuals who are to perform those roles and their alternate in cases of an emergency.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Our schools and District CSSPs already have an identified incident command structure in place including the roles and the individuals who are to perform specific assigned duties in the event of an emergency.

R2.10 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSP describe the system to reunify parents/guardians with their student in the event of a campus-wide evacuation, including how parents/guardians are informed of reunification details.

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented, by the implementation date of March 1, 2024. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: The issue of reunification with parents/guardians has been addressed by site principals and their respective leadership teams: however, it has not been part of each school's CSSP. District leadership will work with school site principals to ensure that their respective reunification plans are part of their CSSP by March 1, 2024.

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

R2.11 By March 1, 2024, each school site's CSSPs account for dangers unique to the specific school site (e.g., train tracks, flooding, freeways).

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: The District will continue to utilize its well-defined process that engages partners in the development of each school site CSSP so that each school's unique individual safety needs are met. As the District and School Site administrators review the CSSPs with our partners (including emergency responders), we will continue to refine the details of each plan specifically to meet the unique needs of the staff and students at each campus.

3.0 TRAINING

Findings:

F3.2 Some of the districts failed to send representatives to the 2022 School Safety Summit, thereby missing an opportunity to work together to make schools safer.

Response: The District agrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: The District did not send any representatives to the 2022 School Safety Summit.

F3.3 The Grand Jury learned through interviews, surveys, and site tours that many districts fail to include safety topics during regular meetings with teachers and support staff throughout the school year, minimizing the importance of safety.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Safety drills are regularly practiced by teachers and support staff at each school. At scheduled monthly staff meetings safety topics including drill procedures, are placed on the agenda and continue to be analyzed and reviewed.

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- F3.4 The Grand Jury learned through interviews, surveys, and site tours that many school sites fail to assure substitute staff receive the information they will need in the case of a school safety emergency, leaving the substitute staff ill-prepared for an emergency.**

Response: The District disagrees wholly or partially with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: More than 85% of the District's school sites provide substitute staff with the pertinent information regarding emergency procedures.

- F3.5 Many districts fail to include the utilization of communication and incident command protocols (ICS-100) during safety drills throughout the school year, causing miscommunication in an emergency.**

Response: Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Lodi Unified School District agrees that schools do not execute incident command protocols during safety drills because we do not believe it is appropriate to do so. Drills typically last only a few moments and are designed for practicing immediate responses to incidents. We believe practicing incident command systems and protocols is appropriate for more prolonged events or exercises. We also do not believe that the process we use has caused miscommunication in an emergency in Lodi Unified School District.

- F3.6 Many district cabinet-level positions (e.g., Superintendent, Chief Business Officer) are not trained in ICS protocols (ICS-402), causing a lack of unified response to districtwide emergencies.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: We disagree with the finding as it pertains to Lodi Unified School District because all of its Cabinet members have been trained in ICS-402.

- F3.7 Many school sites do not vary the time of day when routine safety drills are conducted or when students are not in classrooms, making drills predictable and leaving students unprepared for emergencies that may occur at any time.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Explanation: Principals will continue to schedule varied types of routine safety drills throughout the year. These drills are conducted on different days and times and at different locations as well as when students are in classrooms and other locations on campus. Details of safety drills including variety of times conducted, are maintained and reported by each site to District office personnel.

F3.8 Many school sites fail to include support staff (classified personnel) in probable real-life roles during safety drills, leaving them unprepared to assist students in emergencies.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Classified staff is required to participate in safety drills and trainings to ensure preparedness for potential real life safety issues. Both school site and District office administrators are responsible for ensuring that all support staff “classified” personnel participate in probable real life safety drills.

F3.9 Most school sites fail to conduct a post-incident report after drills analyzing what went well, what went wrong, and what needs to be changed in the future to improve plans and drills, undermining the effectiveness of drills.

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: After a drill is executed principals discuss the drill with their respective leadership teams and identify aspects of the drill that worked well and aspects of the drill that did not. In addition, details of the drill are recorded in the Comprehensive School Safety Plan. In addition, Lodi Unified School Districts works with an outside consultant who meets with each principal annually and, when possible, observes a “lock down” drill and conducts an after action discussion with a team from the site. Information from site reviews may be reported to the district leadership team, office of Maintenance and Operations Department and or The Superintendent’s Office.

Recommendations:

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- R3.2 By December 1, 2023, each school district send one or more representatives to the annual School Safety Summit hosted by the San Joaquin County Office of Education.**

Response The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented by December 1, 2023. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(2).)

Explanation: The District will send representatives to the 2023 School Safety Summit.

- R3.3 By September 1, 2023, safety topics be an agenda item at all school site staff meetings with teachers and support staff throughout the school year.**

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Safety drills are regularly practiced by teachers and support staff at each school. At scheduled monthly school site staff meetings safety topics including drill procedures, are placed on the agenda and continue to be analyzed and reviewed.

- R3.4 By September 1, 2023, districts develop, adopt, and implement written procedures for school sites to provide substitute staff with the information they will need in case of a school emergency.**

Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented by September 1, 2023

Explanation: Currently, more than 85% of the schools in Lodi Unified School District provide substitutes with written procedures for school site emergencies. All schools will provide written procedures by September 1, 2023

- R3.5 By October 1, 2023, personnel identified in the school CSSP for incident command roles be trained and certified in ICS-100 protocols.**

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: All of our leadership (personnel) members have been identified for incident command roles and have received the training well in advance of October 1, 2023.

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

R3.6 By October 1, 2023, ICS-402 training will be completed for all district-level executive leadership.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: All District-level executive leadership and Board of Education members have completed the ICS-402 training.

R3.7 By October 1, 2023, scheduled safety drills be conducted on different days throughout the school year and at various times throughout the school day, including when students are not normally in their classrooms.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Principals will continue to schedule varied types of routine safety drills throughout the year. These drills are conducted on different days, times and locations as well as when students are in classrooms and other locations on campus.

R3.8 By October 1, 2023, scheduled safety drills include support staff (classified) in probable emergency roles during the year and document their participation.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Classified staff is required to participate in safety drills and trainings to ensure preparedness for potential real life safety issues. Both school site and District office administrators are responsible for ensuring that all support staff “classified” personnel participate in probable real life safety drills.

R3.9 By October 1, 2023, administrators create a post-incident report after all safety drills.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: After a drill is executed, principals will continue to report the information in their Comprehensive School Safety Plan.

CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE/ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.0 SCHOOL SITE VISITS

Findings:

- F4.1 Not all school sites have check-in procedures in place that were followed consistently, posing serious security threats.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Each school in the District has a designated access point for entry to the school where visitors are required to identify themselves, sign-in and receive a visitor badge. Schools utilize the Raptor system, which requires visitors to have their ID scanned and runs a check to determine if the visitor has any legal issues that would prohibit them from being on a school campus. Upon leaving the school, visitors are required to sign out and return their visitor badge.

- F4.2 Perimeter fencing or an “open” campus each pose security challenges and require careful consideration to mitigate security shortcomings.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: Each school in the District has perimeter fencing that increases the security of our campuses.

- F4.3 Evacuation maps that are posted inconsistently or do not adequately illustrate evacuation routes cause confusion and prolonged evacuation times, making staff and students vulnerable to harm in both classrooms and common areas.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: Every classroom has posted an evacuation map next to the door, or in the vicinity of the entrance and/or exit utilized during drills with updated information pertaining to each class/area.

- F4.4 Inconsistent door-locking policies and failure to follow policies create opportunities for perpetrators to enter classrooms and common areas.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Explanation: The District follows a policy of locking classroom doors when school is in session.

- F4.5 Most school sites utilized flip charts that identify steps to be taken in case of emergencies, however, none of the sites posted them in all rooms used by students, staff, parents/guardians, and the general public.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: Every classroom, school district department, and multi-use room has a copy of the Lodi Unified School District Emergency Response Procedures, Guidelines in a flipchart format. This information is posted on the wall and utilized during drills with updated information pertaining to each class. Lodi Unified School District's Risk Management Department is in the process of updating the flip charts.

- F4.6 Insufficient window coverings give perpetrators a clear line of sight, creating risk for students and staff.**

Response: The District disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Our goal is to provide a safe environment for students and staff, therefore by limiting the risks to all. School windows have been assessed for vulnerability and shades or coverings are in place. The District will continue to weigh this suggestion against other risks to student safety.

- F4.7 Most school sites, regardless of age, were well maintained and showed school pride. One school site demonstrated multiple maintenance shortcomings, which can negatively impact safety.**

Response: The District agrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: The District takes great pride in their well-maintained campuses throughout the district. Our school and District leaders meet and discuss facility needs proactively.

- F4.8 Good relationships among administrators, certificated and classified staff, parents, and students are vital to promptly identify and address areas of concern,**

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

particularly regarding student behavior. Relationships varied greatly from campus to campus.

Response: The District agrees with this finding. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(1).)

Explanation: Our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework enhances evidence-based practices to achieve important outcomes for every student. This includes services provided by counselors, mental health clinicians, and psychologists, as well as Social Emotional Learning curriculum at the elementary level and the use of restorative practices across all levels. .

F4.9 The culture of safety is best developed by public transparency and involvement by all parties. Few of the school sites visited by the Grand Jury demonstrated meaningful public engagement in safety planning.

Response: Response: The District agrees and disagrees with this finding as it applies to the District. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(a)(2).)

Explanation: Our culture of safety is transparent and does encourage involvement. Each school site is required to complete a comprehensive annual safety plan with the opportunity for public input. The process includes the following: the plan is reviewed by each school campus administration, law enforcement, staff, and various parent groups. District office staff reviews each school campus plan in preparation for the plans to be reviewed by the Board of Education at a regular board meeting. The plans are posted with the Board Meeting agenda and, at the time, Board Members, along with members of the public have an opportunity to review the plans

Recommendations:

R4.1 By October 1, 2023, each school site implements an access control program that consistently includes verifying visitors' identity and collection of any issued badge before the visitor leaves the school site.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Each school in the District has a designated entry point for visitors and utilizes the Raptor system to verify that visitors are legally permitted to be on a school campus. Visitors who are cleared are provided with a visitors badge. Upon leaving the school, visitors are required to sign out.

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

R4.2 By March 1, 2024, districts develop, adopt, and implement a plan for effective perimeter control of access at all school sites.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Schools in Lodi Unified currently have perimeter fencing in place.

R4.3 By September 1, 2023, all school sites post evacuation maps clearly showing routes from the “You Are Here” perspective be prominently posted at each entry or exit door location in both classrooms and common areas.

Response: This recommendation has not been fully implemented, but the “You Are Here” notes will be added to the Emergency Map. (Pen. Code § 933.05(b)(2).)

Explanation: Every classroom and school district department has a copy of the Lodi Unified School District Emergency Response Procedures, Guidelines Flipchart and Emergency Map. This information is posted in the classroom and on walls common areas, next to the door and utilized during drills with updated information pertaining to each class. The District will ensure that the evacuation route is clearly marked in each designated classroom/area with the “You Are Here” notation on each map.

R4.4 By March 1, 2024, districts develop, adopt, and implement a plan for door-locking policies to secure classroom and common area doors.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: The District follows a policy of locking classroom doors when school is in session.

R4.5 By March 1, 2024, all school sites post flip charts or similar summaries of emergency procedures be posted in all classrooms and common areas.

Response: This recommendation was implemented at all times prior to the Grand Jury Report and will continue to be implemented in the future. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(1).)

Explanation: Every classroom, school district department, and multi-use room has a copy of the Lodi Unified School District Emergency Response Procedures, Guidelines in a flipchart format. This information is posted on the wall and utilized during drills with updated information pertaining to each class. Lodi Unified School District’s Risk Management Department is in the process of updating the flip charts.

**INITIAL RESPONSES TO GRAND JURY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

R4.6 By March 1, 2024, all school sites ensure window coverings are provided for all windows, thereby not allowing a perpetrator a clear line of sight into a classroom or common area.

Response: The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

Explanation: Our goal is to provide a safe environment for students and staff, therefore by limiting the risks to all. School windows have been assessed for vulnerability and shades or coverings are in place. The district will continue to weigh this suggestion against other risks to child safety.

R4.7 By October 1, 2023, the Board of Trustees, during a public meeting, review and discuss the findings and recommendations of the 2022-2023 San Joaquin County Civil Grand Jury report, Case #0322 – School Safety in San Joaquin County: Developing a Culture of Safety.

Response: This recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented. (Pen. Code, § 933.05(b)(2).)

Explanation: The Board of Education will review and discuss the findings and recommendations of the 2022-2023 San Joaquin County Civil Grand Jury report, Case #0322 – School Safety in San Joaquin County: Developing a Culture of Safety at the first public meeting after the District has filed its response to this report.

CONCLUSION

On behalf of the Board of Education of the Lodi Unified School District, we appreciate your concern for our District.

Respectfully,


Neil Young
Superintendent