Green Bay Area
Public School District
Engagement. Equity. Excellence.

To: Board of Education

From: Vicki Bayer, Superintendent
           David Johns, Associate Superintendent
           Chris Collar, Safety and Security Manager
           Cale Pulczinski, Chief Operations Officer

Date: October 13, 2025

RE: Roundtable Discussion Feedback from September 15, 2025

Across the nation, schools are experiencing increases in student fighting and school violence (GAO, 2021; NCES, 2021). While these troubling trends are not unique to Green Bay, the recent discovery of a weapon at Preble High School underscores the urgency of ensuring safety here at home. The purpose of this memo is to share community feedback from the September 15 roundtable, outline the short- and mid-term actions the District is taking to strengthen safety and security, and provide suggestions and recommendations from the participants at the roundtable for the Board of Education to discuss and consider.

The roundtable was scheduled less than one week after a weapon and ammunition were found at Preble High School. CESA 7 administrator, Aaron Malczewski facilitated the event. After brief comments from Chief Davis, Mayor Genrich, and President Lyerly, Superintendent Bayer along with the District's Safety and Security Coordinator, Chris Collar, reviewed current safety measures and practices.

Participants engaged in table top conversations, which were focused around three specific questions. Their responses are summarized and categorized into themes below. To view all comments, visit the [Safety Roundtable webpage](#). Participants were also invited to write down their questions on index cards. The index cards were collected and answered that evening. In addition, the full list of questions and answers are available on the [District website](#).

SECTION 1: TABLE DISCUSSIONS

TABLE QUESTION #1: Share with others at your table your feelings from last week's events and your response to the District's actions that followed.

Based upon the feedback, several key themes emerge regarding reactions to the incident and the District's response. These themes represent the most common feelings, concerns, and suggestions expressed.

1. Communication Concerns
2. Concerns About Safety and Security Measures
3. Student Behavior, Discipline, and Accountability
4. Emotional Reactions and Trauma
5. Need for Mental Health and Relationship Support
6. Desire for Proactive, Not Reactive, Planning

TABLE QUESTION #2: The District has shared its safety protocols and took action last week to implement the change to the clear backpacks. Share with your table what *other* suggestions you have to improve school safety.

1. Enhanced Physical Security Measures
   - Many participants wanted more visible and tangible security at entry points and throughout buildings.
2. Stronger Mental Health and Prevention Supports
   - Many emphasized that safety must also come from addressing root causes of violence, not only catching it at the door.
3. Clearer and Consistent Discipline & Accountability
   - Participants want predictable, firm, and fair consequences for unsafe behavior.
4. Improved Communication and Transparency
   - Participants want faster, clearer, and more direct communication during and after incidents.
5. Structural & Environmental Changes
   - A range of operational suggestions emerged about school design, schedules, and logistics to support safety.
6. Culture, Relationships, and Community Partnership
   - Safety is also about belonging and respect, not just control.

TABLE QUESTION #3: What community resources/strengths do you feel the District is not tapping into or should connect with more that would help improve school safety?

1. Mental Health and Social-Emotional Supports
   - The community sees mental health services as the most critical untapped resource
2. Youth Mentoring and Positive Role Models
   - Students need consistent, caring adult relationships from the community
3. Parent and Family Engagement
   - Families are seen as a key but underutilized safety partner.
4. Community Organizations and Partnerships
   - There are many community groups and businesses willing to help if invited and coordinated
5. Cultural and Community Connections
   - Building a sense of community, identity, and inclusion is part of safety
6. Communication, Coordination, and Visibility of Resources
   - Even when resources exist, families and students don't know about them

SECTION 2: EXISTING SECURITY MEASURES

Our District has invested in proactive, evidence-based protocols to prevent violence and the presence of weapons in our schools. These include:

- **School Safety Assessments:** School Safety Assessments are an important component of any comprehensive school safety plan. These assessments help identify where security practices exist and measures needed to help protect students, staff, and facilities.
- **Comprehensive Threat Assessment Procedures:** Our staff is trained to identify and respond to early warning signs of potential violence using nationally recognized models.
- **Regular Safety Drills and Emergency Preparedness:** We conduct routine lockdown, evacuation, and shelter-in-place drills to ensure readiness in any scenario. This includes utilization of the ALICE Training protocols for staff and students.
- **Centegix Crisis Alert System:** Emergency system that allows staff to notify others in the event of an emergency, including police dispatch.
- **Secure Entrances:** All exterior doors are locked and main entrances have additional security to monitor access.
- **Door Alarms:** Exterior doors that are not considered standard entrance points are equipped with door alarms that alert staff that have access to security cameras.
- **Visitor Protocol:** Each entrance has a location to screen visitors, ensure the visitor has a legitimate reason for their presence, and prevent inappropriate access to children. Visitors must sign in and receive a visitor badge so that staff in the building know they have a reason to be there.
- **Locked Classroom Doors:** Per Board of Education policy all classroom doors should remain locked during class time.
- **Security Cameras:** Each building has multiple cameras that deter inappropriate, criminal, and violent behavior; assist in incident investigation; and provide situational awareness for school personnel who monitor live feeds.
- **Crisis Intervention Team:** These multidisciplinary teams are trained in non-violent crisis intervention and work collaboratively to support students in crisis and intervene before situations escalate.
- **Ongoing Staff Training:** Faculty and staff receive continuous professional development in de-escalation techniques, trauma-informed practices, and violence prevention.
- **Universal Components of School Climate/Culture:** Each school has access to staff that have been trained in areas such as Trauma Sensitive Schools, Social Emotional Learning, Youth Suicide Prevention, Restorative Practices, Bullying Prevention, and Child Abuse and Neglect.
- **Strong Partnerships with Law Enforcement through School Resource Officer Program:** Our collaboration with local police ensures rapid response capabilities and important relationship building strategies with our students and community.
- **Updated Digital Maps for Emergency Responders:** Law Enforcement has access to digital maps of all District buildings.
- **Anonymous Reporting Tools:** We empower students and families to report concerns confidentially through digital platforms and hotlines (Crime Stoppers and Speak Up Speak Out).

We remain committed to fostering a safe, inclusive, and supportive learning environment. Our approach is grounded in research, guided by best practices, and shaped by the values of our community.

SECTION 3: SHORT AND MID-TERM ACTION STEPS

Short and mid-term action steps taken by the District in the immediate aftermath of the incident at Preble include:
- Increased police and District Office personnel presence on campus at all secondary schools
- Clear backpacks at all secondary schools, and search and storage protocols for all other non-clear bags brought by students (i.e., lunch, instruments, sports equipment, etc.)
- Modifications to discipline response for unsafe behavior
- Immediate consequence for students not reporting to class during class time
- Coordination with building leaders, developing a plan to utilize civic partners in potential mentorship programming, in coordination with Green Bay Police Department (in progress)
- Scheduled school security assessments at all four high schools by an outside agency (WSSCA School Security Assessment Protocol is a comprehensive tool that ensures a thorough evaluation of our school's safety measures.).
- Research into development of Student Safety Committee
- Plan to reconvene District Safety Committee
- Review of existing after school activities safety protocols
- Adding an additional Safety & Security position to support the entire District

---

SECTION 4: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ROUNDTABLE

Based upon feedback from the roundtable discussion on September 15, the following recommendations emerged (in no particular order):

PHYSICAL SECURITY
- Weapon Detectors
- Metal Detector Wands
- Exterior door alarms
- Change in dress code/school uniforms
- Closed campus
- Increase in School Resource Officers
- Harsher consequences for unsafe behavior

BUILDING SUPPORTIVE SCHOOL COMMUNITIES
- Build relationships with students
- Mental health services

One of the biggest challenges for increasing the physical security of schools is the requirement to balance physical safety measures with the need to create a positive and welcoming environment. Evidence suggests that coupling these two common approaches (increasing security and building supportive school communities) are essential to reducing the risk of a dangerous situation. While the increase in physical security has grown substantially in our country over the past decade, the evidence of these strategies being effective is not robust.

PHYSICAL SECURITY

WEAPON DETECTORS: Metal detectors can serve a role in school security, but their purpose must be clearly defined, and it is important to understand their limitations. According to the Wisconsin Office of School Safety, metal detectors may assist in finding weapons brought to school, deter students from bringing weapons to school, and increase the perceived safety of the school. They are also expensive, require consistency for best results, and require the appropriate number of qualified and highly trained personnel to run them with consistency and fidelity.

Metal detectors can also make a school feel less welcoming. The National Association of School Psychologies (NASP) recommends schools avoid metal detectors, and instead focus on less invasive measures (i.e., locking doors, monitoring space). Metal detectors are rare in school settings, and existing research on metal detectors and the role in increasing school safety is lacking. As noted by DePaoli and McCombs:

> "Of the two studies examining the relationship between metal detectors and school safety, one found reports of fewer weapons being carried to school; however, neither found that the presence of metal detectors reduced the number of reported threats, physical fights, or student victimization in school"

The pros to metal detectors are that they can be a deterrent to bringing a weapon on campus, safety perception enhancement, and the detection of various weapon types. The cons can be the impact on culture and climate, a delay in school entry, the inability to detect non-metallic weapons (machine dependent), the cost of staffing to appropriately administer the use of metal detectors, human error possibilities, and the potential to contribute to profiling.

Metal detectors should not be used in isolation as a deterrent. Other security components should be included such as mental health services, de-escalation training, and positive student-staff relationships. Installment and utilization of weapon detection systems would require Board Policy (sample).

WEAPON DETECTORS	
Effectiveness & Evidence	
Is there credible data or research showing this reduces risks of violence/weapons?	Reduced risk of weapons - yes.
Does it address specific vulnerability highlighted by recent incidents?	This addresses some of the specific vulnerabilities, but only at entrances where the equipment is used.
Are there measurable indicators to track impact?	You can track how many weapons come in through the entrances with metal detectors, but you can't track what is being brought in through other entrances.
Feasibility & Practicality	
Can this be implemented realistically within facilities and culture?	Yes

Is complexity manageable for staff and students?	Not with current staffing levels
Does it complement existing educational operations?	No
Cost & Sustainability	
What are the initial costs?	Estimated range of $60K-$125K for start-up and initial month.

What are ongoing operating/maintenance expenses?	Equipment
	● Annual subscription costs range from $315K-$450K
	● An optional subscription cost to add weapon detection for bags is not included.
	Staffing
	● Recommended 2-3 staff per lane
	● Staffing during implementation may be higher
	● The estimate does not include residual costs from device alerts (e.g., reasonable suspicion searches and subsequent investigations)
	● Staffing cost does not include setup/tear-down, event use, maintenance, or other hours not associated with a typical school day.
	● Estimate based on 168 hours daily (3 staff per lane)
	● Average annual staffing investment $957,600
	Total
	● Potential annual investment $1,407,600.
	    ○ Subscription terms are typically 3-4 years
	    ○ Assume cost increases after the initial agreement is complete

Is it financially sustainable long-term?	At this time, reductions would need to be made in other areas to incur any additional spending

Notes & Disclaimers	1. Assumes devices at all schools with grades 6-12
	2. Total number of walk-through lanes is 28
	    a. Configurations of systems vary
	3. No weapon detection bag check lane
	    a. Bags to be checked manually
	4. Cost range is estimated using quotes from multiple vendors
	5. Vendor costs are subject to site visits and additional information. These are estimates only.
	6. Does not include anticipated additional capital improvement costs. (Door hardware, bag ramps/tables, cameras, electrical, etc.)

Legal & Compliance Fit	
Does it comply with state and federal laws?	Yes
Does it respect student rights and privacy?	Up for Board discussion

Would it withstand legal scrutiny if challenged?	As long as there is Board policy in place, and it is done in accordance with fidelity and policy.

Community Acceptance & Support

Does this reflect input from students, parents, and staff?	Through roundtable feedback
Is it likely to strengthen community trust?	Unsure
Does it maintain a welcoming environment?	No

Equity & Accessibility

Does this option work equitably across schools?	This is physical plant dependent
Does it avoid disproportionate impact on specific student groups (e.g., low-income, students of color, students with disabilities)?	Yes, as long as there is Board Policy in place, and it is done in accordance with fidelity and policy.

Time to Implement

How quickly can this option be implemented?	Depends upon the model (equipment order/deliver/set up, hiring and training of staff)
Is it short-term, long-term, or both?	Long-term
Can it be phased in strategically?	Yes (EX: larger schools first)

Integration with Existing Plans

Does it align with the District's incident response plan?	There is nothing in the current plan about weapon detection
Does it integrate with current safety measures?	It could
Will it require retraining staff or updating policies?	Yes

Board-Level Relevance

Is this a board-level decision (policy/funding/oversight) or is it operational (administration responsibility)?	Board-level
Is there an existing policy that needs amending?	No
Is there model policy, or guidance from relevant state or national organizations?	Yes

Professional Association Review	
What is the position of the Wisconsin School Safety Coordinators Association and/or Office of School Safety on the option?	Schools that are considering the use of metal detectors should carefully evaluate the benefits, costs, and limitations of metal detector programs. (Wisconsin Office of School Safety)

METAL DETECTOR WANDS: Less intrusive than the full body weapon detectors, the metal detector wands are a more cost-effective solution to concerns about someone being in possession of a weapon. While metal detector wands are intended to enhance school safety, they are not supported by evidence of effectiveness in preventing violence, and can negatively impact students' perceptions of safety, increase anxiety, and create a sense of fear. Many security experts advocate for a more comprehensive approach to school safety that includes mental health support and community engagement, rather than relying solely on metal detectors, which can be costly, disruptive, and inequitably applied.

Metal detector wands can be utilized on an as-needed basis, however, the risk of discriminatory practices increases without clear policy, direction, purpose, and consistency in use.

METAL DETECTOR WANDS

Effectiveness & Evidence	
Is there credible data or research showing this reduces risks of violence/weapons?	No
Does it address specific vulnerability highlighted by recent incidents?	This option may address some vulnerabilities but the effectiveness of this is dependent on the human factor.
Are there measurable indicators to track impact?	You can track the impact of this by seeing how long it takes to wand all students and whether all weapons are located
Feasibility & Practicality	
Can this be implemented realistically within facilities and culture?	Yes
Is complexity manageable for staff and students?	Not with current staffing levels
Does it complement existing educational operations?	No
Cost & Sustainability	
What are the initial costs?	Initial Cost: Wands can cost between $200-$300 for a battery powered unit or $350-$500 for rechargeable units.

What are ongoing operating/maintenance expenses?	Ongoing costs for battery replacement and unit replacement
Is it financially sustainable long-term?	At this time reductions would need to be made in other areas to incur any additional spending
Legal & Compliance Fit	
Does it comply with state and federal laws?	Yes
Does it respect student rights and privacy?	Up for Board discussion
Would it withstand legal scrutiny if challenged?	So long as there is Board Policy in place, and it is used in accordance with the policy, and with fidelity
Community Acceptance & Support	
Does this reflect input from students, parents, and staff?	Through roundtable discussion
Is it likely to strengthen community trust?	Unsure
Does it maintain a welcoming environment?	No
Equity & Accessibility	
Does this option work equitably across schools?	Yes
Does it avoid disproportionate impact on specific student groups (e.g., low-income, students of color, students with disabilities)?	There is risk of discriminatory practices increases without clear policy, direction, purpose, and consistency in use
Time to Implement	
How quickly can this option be implemented?	Depends upon model, and hiring/training of staff
Is it short-term, long-term, or both?	Long-term
Can it be phased in strategically?	Yes
Integration with Existing Plans	
Does it align with the District's incident response plan?	There is nothing in the current plan about metal detection
Does it integrate with current safety measures?	It could
Will it require retraining staff or updating policies?	Yes

Board-Level Relevance	
Is this a board-level decision (policy/funding/oversight) or is it operational (administration responsibility)?	Board-level for long-term use
Is there an existing policy that needs amending?	No
Is there model policy, or guidance from relevant state or national organizations?	Yes
Professional Association Review	
What is the position of the Wisconsin School Safety Coordinators Association and/or Office of School Safety on the option?	Schools that are considering the use of metal detectors should carefully evaluate the benefits, costs, and limitations of metal detector programs. (Wisconsin Office of School Safety)

EXTERIOR DOOR ALARMS: The Wisconsin Office of School Safety recommends that all exterior doors be solidly constructed and fit tightly to the frame. They suggest that door alarms can provide a signal when an exterior door is opened or propped open. Cameras can also be used to monitor the status of emergency exit doors and discourage staff or students from admitting visitors that have not gone through the expected entrance point.

EXTERIOR DOOR ALARMS	
Effectiveness & Evidence	
Is there credible data or research showing this reduces risks of violence/weapons?	No census on this topic
Does it address specific vulnerability highlighted by recent incidents?	Maybe
Are there measurable indicators to track impact?	Maybe
Feasibility & Practicality	
Can this be implemented realistically within facilities and culture?	Each exterior door would need to be evaluated for the ability to add door alarms.
Is complexity manageable for staff and students?	Yes
Does it complement existing educational operations?	Yes

Cost & Sustainability	
What are the initial costs?	Estimates could be $5,000 or less per door depending on what is needed.
What are ongoing operating/maintenance expenses?	Unknown
Is it financially sustainable long-term?	Yes

Legal & Compliance Fit	
Does it comply with state and federal laws?	As long as the device does not impede the means of egress.
Does it respect student rights and privacy?	Yes.
Would it withstand legal scrutiny if challenged?	If it complies with state and federal laws.

Community Acceptance & Support	
Does this reflect input from students, parents, and staff?	Roundtable discussion
Is it likely to strengthen community trust?	Yes
Does it maintain a welcoming environment?	Yes

Equity & Accessibility	
Does this option work equitably across schools?	Yes
Does it avoid disproportionate impact on specific student groups (e.g., low-income, students of color, students with disabilities)?	Yes

Time to Implement	
How quickly can this option be implemented?	Would require physical plant analysis
Is it short-term, long-term, or both?	Long-term
Can it be phased in strategically?	Yes

Integration with Existing Plans	
Does it align with the District's incident response plan?	Yes

Does it integrate with current safety measures?	Yes
Will it require retraining staff or updating policies?	Yes
Board-Level Relevance	
Is this a board-level decision (policy/funding/oversight) or is it operational (administration responsibility)?	Operational
Is there an existing policy that needs amending?	No
Is there model policy, or guidance from relevant state or national organizations?	No
Professional Association Review	
What is the position of the Wisconsin School Safety Coordinators Association and/or Office of School Safety on the option?	Door alarms can provide a signal when an exterior door is opened or propped open (OSS).

REVISE DRESS CODE: Dress codes have been a contentious topic since Tinker v. Des Moines in 1969. Schools should ensure dress code guidelines are grounded in research and focused on creating a safe and supportive learning environment. Dress codes, like all policies, should be reviewed regularly. Green Bay Area Public School District last reviewed our dress code policy (443.1) on November 25, 2024. The current dress code is strong on rights, inclusivity, and dignity. While our policy prohibits headwear being used to conceal items, it does not directly address oversized clothing, multiple layers, or accessories (e.g., coats) that can be used to hide items. The District could consider adding limits on clothing that hides items, aligning dress code with clear backpacks, and strengthening safety-focused language.

REVISED DRESS CODE	
Effectiveness & Evidence	
Is there credible data or research showing this reduces risks of violence/weapons?	No consensus on this topic
Does it address specific vulnerability highlighted by recent incidents?	Maybe
Are there measurable indicators to track impact?	Maybe

Feasibility & Practicality	
Can this be implemented realistically within facilities and culture?	Yes
Is complexity manageable for staff and students?	Depends upon specific policy. Enforcement can be challenging if language is not specific and clear.
Does it complement existing educational operations?	Possibly
Cost & Sustainability	
What are the initial costs?	No cost
What are ongoing operating/maintenance expenses?	None
Is it financially sustainable long-term?	Yes
Legal & Compliance Fit	
Does it comply with state and federal laws?	Yes
Does it respect student rights and privacy?	Board should consider language that respects student rights and privacy, balanced with safety
Would it withstand legal scrutiny if challenged?	So long as there is Board Policy in place, and it is done in accordance to the policy and with fidelity
Community Acceptance & Support	
Does this reflect input from students, parents, and staff?	Through roundtable discussion
Is it likely to strengthen community trust?	Unsure
Does it maintain a welcoming environment?	If it is written with sensitivity to individuality and differences
Equity & Accessibility	
Does this option work equitably across schools?	Yes
Does it avoid disproportionate impact on specific student groups (e.g., low-income, students of color, students with disabilities)?	Dress codes run the risk of disproportionately impacts specific student groups
Time to Implement	
How quickly can this option be implemented?	Immediate

Is it short-term, long-term, or both?	Long-term
Can it be phased in strategically?	It is not recommended to phase in
Integration with Existing Plans	
Does it align with the District's incident response plan?	Yes
Does it integrate with current safety measures?	Yes
Will it require retraining staff or updating policies?	Yes to both
Board-Level Relevance	
Is this a board-level decision (policy/funding/oversight) or is it operational (administration responsibility)?	Board-level
Is there an existing policy that needs amending?	Yes
Is there model policy, or guidance from relevant state or national organizations?	Yes
Professional Association Review	
What is the position of the Wisconsin School Safety Coordinators Association and/or Office of School Safety on the option?	No position on this topic

SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS: The Green Bay Area Public School District funds eleven full-time School Resource Officers to support our schools. The largest study on SROs found that the presence of an SRO increased the number of weapons detected, and reduced the number of fights within schools, but had no impact on gun-related incidents overall (DePaoli & McCombs). As with any successful SRO program, the key is building trusting relationships with the students and families, as well as specialized training in the development of supportive roles within our schools.

The ability to hire more School Resource Officers would be dependent upon adequate funding, and whether the police department has enough officers to allow for additional SROs.

INCREASE NUMBER OF SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS	
Effectiveness & Evidence	
Is there credible data or research showing this reduces risks of violence/weapons?	Yes

Does it address specific vulnerability highlighted by recent incidents?	Yes
Are there measurable indicators to track impact?	Yes
Feasibility & Practicality	
Can this be implemented realistically within facilities and culture?	Yes
Is complexity manageable for staff and students?	Yes
Does it complement existing educational operations?	Yes
Cost & Sustainability	
What are the initial costs?	Annual cost for salary/benefits is between $150,000 - $200,000 per year plus overtime and raises
What are ongoing operating/maintenance expenses?	Overtime and raises are additional expenses
Is it financially sustainable long-term?	At this time reductions would need to be made in other areas to incur any additional spending
Legal & Compliance Fit	
Does it comply with state and federal laws?	Yes
Does it respect student rights and privacy?	Yes. Board policy and state law require this.
Would it withstand legal scrutiny if challenged?	Yes
Community Acceptance & Support	
Does this reflect input from students, parents, and staff?	Roundtable discussion
Is it likely to strengthen community trust?	Unsure
Does it maintain a welcoming environment?	If utilized appropriately, yes
Equity & Accessibility	
Does this option work equitably across schools?	High need can impact utilization

Does it avoid disproportionate impact on specific student groups (e.g., low-income, students of color, students with disabilities)?	The District and GBPD are committed to providing services in our schools "equally, fairly, objectively, and without discrimination toward any individual or group." Additionally, Board of Education Policy 882.1 provides the following: "The Program is committed to anti-discrimination. The District and law enforcement agency providing the Program shall work collaboratively to challenge bias and intolerance and will use compassion when pursuing justice, and will respect the dignity of all individuals at all times. Resource Officers shall discharge their duties with due consideration for the mental health status, racial, cultural, ability or other differences of those they serve."
Time to Implement	
How quickly can this option be implemented?	Determining funding source and hiring process would dictate timeline
Is it short-term, long-term, or both?	Either
Can it be phased in strategically?	Yes, if hiring more than one SRO
Integration with Existing Plans	
Does it align with the District's incident response plan?	Yes
Does it integrate with current safety measures?	Yes
Will it require retraining staff or updating policies?	Yes
Board-Level Relevance	
Is this a board-level decision (policy/funding/oversight) or is it operational (administration responsibility)?	Board-level
Is there an existing policy that needs amending?	Current policy would not require amendment
Is there model policy, or guidance from relevant state or national organizations?	Yes
Professional Association Review	
What is the position of the Wisconsin School Safety Coordinators Association and/or Office of School Safety on the option?	SRO programs are supported by WSSCA and the OSS

CLOSED CAMPUS: While open campuses can be a positive experience for students, they can also pose risks, as schools have less direct supervision over student behavior and whereabouts during lunch periods. Research on closed campuses is limited, but existing studies show that a closed campus policy allows for greater administrative control over who enters the school grounds, enhancing security and providing a safer environment for students. Studies find that conditional open campus policies (meaning that students can earn the privilege to leave campus during lunch) can lead to increased academic performance and behavior management (Lichtman-Sadot, 2016).

CLOSED CAMPUS	
Effectiveness & Evidence	
Is there credible data or research showing this reduces risks of violence/weapons?	Increases control over building access
Does it address specific vulnerability highlighted by recent incidents?	It may restrict access for weapons to be brought in during the school day
Are there measurable indicators to track impact?	Yes - Could track number of fights during lunch
Feasibility & Practicality	
Can this be implemented realistically within facilities and culture?	Yes. It would require a change to the daily schedule, and impact food service
Is complexity manageable for staff and students?	Yes
Does it complement existing educational operations?	Yes
Cost & Sustainability	
What are the initial costs?	Would need to explore food service FTE
What are ongoing operating/maintenance expenses?	Food service FTE
Is it financially sustainable long-term?	Unknown
Legal & Compliance Fit	
Does it comply with state and federal laws?	Yes
Does it respect student rights and privacy?	Yes
Would it withstand legal scrutiny if challenged?	Yes

Community Acceptance & Support	
Does this reflect input from students, parents, and staff?	Roundtable input
Is it likely to strengthen community trust?	Yes
Does it maintain a welcoming environment?	Could be perceived as a punishment initially. Campus culture/climate impacts this.
Equity & Accessibility	
Does this option work equitably across schools?	Yes
Does it avoid disproportionate impact on specific student groups (e.g., low-income, students of color, students with disabilities)?	Yes
Time to Implement	
How quickly can this option be implemented?	2026-27 school year
Is it short-term, long-term, or both?	Long-term
Can it be phased in strategically?	Yes (e.g., freshmen and sophomores first)
Integration with Existing Plans	
Does it align with the District's incident response plan?	Yes
Does it integrate with current safety measures?	Yes
Will it require retraining staff or updating policies?	Yes
Board-Level Relevance	
Is this a board-level decision (policy/funding/oversight) or is it operational (administration responsibility)?	A decision regarding whether students are allowed to leave during lunch time is traditionally an administrative decision. That being said, the Board of Education could create policy to dictate this.
Is there an existing policy that needs amending?	No
Is there model policy, or guidance from relevant state or national organizations?	No, as this is an administrative decision.

Professional Association Review	
What is the position of the Wisconsin School Safety Coordinators Association and/or Office of School Safety on the option?	No opinion

HARSHER CONSEQUENCES FOR UNSAFE BEHAVIOR: Qualitative research suggests that harsher consequences alone are ineffective for long-term behavioral change. Studies on youth fighting indicate that individuals often engage in fighting as a strategy for problem-solving, gaining respect, or self-defense, and may have limited awareness of alternatives (Shetgiri, et al, 2016). Research emphasises the approach our District has adopted in coupling harsher consequences, such as suspension and exclusion, with relationship building opportunities with trusted staff members. Providing students with the opportunity to learn problem-solving skills reduces the risk of repeat behavior.

The District has modified the response to unsafe behavior by adding on consequences such as a gradual release period of time once the student returns from suspension, immediate consequence for wandering in the halls instead of going to class, and revocation of intradistrict transfer, if applicable. See below for a letter that went home to families on September 18, 2025.

Subject: Enhanced Safety Measures at High Schools

Dear GBAPS Families:

Since the events of last week at Preble High School, I have been listening to students, parents, staff and community members, and I have heard your desire for the District to do more to address the unsafe behaviors in our schools. Safe learning environments are essential for students to thrive in schools. In response to where unsafe acts are taking place in our schools amongst students, the following plan*, in addition to the clear backpacks,* will be in effect in the high schools of Green Bay Area Public Schools as of September 22, 2025.

This plan, which clarifies and modifies current protocols, balances consequences and supports creating every opportunity for a student to complete high school successfully. The District has safety protocols and consequences in place for inappropriate behaviors and the following detailed steps will occur.

Removal from School Grounds and Suspension*

- Students who engage in or are contributing to unsafe acts (fighting, assault, possession/use of weapons, etc.) will be *removed from the school and grounds*. Law enforcement will likely be involved.
- Based on witness statements, including the involved student(s), *a school-based consequence* will be determined and communicated to the parent/guardians prior to the next school day. This will always include *a multi-day suspension at minimum*. For the days that a student is suspended, *a no-trespass requirement will be enforced* prohibiting the student from being on <u>any</u> GBAPS school campus during the school day or during any school-sponsored events. Additional charges stemming from police involvement will be communicated through law enforcement.
- If a student is enrolled in the school through intra-district transfer (*IDT*) or an administrative placement (*ATR*), that *enrollment will be officially reviewed and likely revoked* and a transition plan will be developed for the student to attend school in their attendance area or a placement in a virtual or alternative school setting for the duration of the school year. The student will not be allowed to reapply for IDT or ATR for future years.

- These behaviors are a significant *code-of-conduct violation* and will also invoke immediate suspensions from athletic teams and activities.
- For students that engage in *persistent unsafe acts*, *a recommendation for expulsion* will be made. No student who has engaged in persistent unsafe acts will be returning to the school they are currently attending.

Re-entry to High School with Support

Any student suspended for unsafe acts will engage in *a minimum 1-week transition period* after the suspension is served. This transition period will *begin _and_ end with a re-entry meeting* with parents/guardians. At the start of the re-entry period, parents/guardians will be informed of the intent and terms of the minimum 1-week transition and a signed contract indicating these have been reviewed. At the conclusion of the transition period, parents/guardians will also meet to review expectations moving forward.

- This period of transition may be extended by the school team if there is evidence the student needs additional time prior to re-entry. Failure to comply with any steps of the transition period may result in a recommendation for an alternative placement.
- Terms of the 1-week transition period will include:
    - Delayed hall passing with supervision.
    - Supervised lunch in a small setting.
    - Separate Advisory Period.
    - Attendance monitoring resulting in any interruption due to a late arrival, absence, or skipping class will restart the 5-day period.
    - Student day begins in the office.
    - The student will be escorted from the building.
- In recognition that we are serving students and want the student's return to school to be successful, there will be opportunities for the student to continue to build and maintain relationships with staff and students at school.

We believe this plan is responsive to the concerns that we have heard since last week. This plan demands additional accountability of students who engage in unsafe acts, honors our mission of educating all students, requires students to earn lost privileges, and ensures active participation by parents/guardians.

In addition, the Board of Education and administration will continue to discuss the recommendations and solutions proposed by students, families and community members, which ultimately will lead to further action. The Board of Education will receive and review the recommendations at their regularly scheduled Work Session on October 13, 2025.

Families/students who have questions about the clear backpacks, can find information on our Clear Backpacks FAQ webpage. In addition, for families who were unable to attend Monday night's safety roundtable discussion, feedback and questions can be submitted on our website.

I want to thank you for your continued support of the Green Bay Area Public School District. I encourage you to view your school's social media posts to learn more about the wonderful things happening in our schools every day. Together, we can ensure our schools are safe and vibrant learning spaces for all students and staff. As a reminder, if you or your child see or hear anything, you can report it confidentially to Speak Up/Speak Out at 1-800-697-8761 or Crime Stoppers at 920-432-STOP (7867). You may also submit a tip online at www.432stop.com or utilize the "P3 Tips" app for crime tips.

Vicki Bayer
Superintendent of Schools

*Consequences may be modified for students with disabilities to comply with state and federal laws.

BUILD SUPPORTIVE SCHOOL COMMUNITIES

BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS: One of many proven strategies to support Wisconsin students is to be surrounded by supportive adults. Each school holds a period of time in the schedule for advisory, a time to come together and build community and relationships within a classroom. GBAPS intentionally structures this time to promote student agency through meaningful opportunities for community connection, enrichment experiences, and academic support. "Effective advisory can improve academic success, foster social-emotional (SEL) development, foster teacher-student relationships, mitigate the impact of transitions students face, such as transitioning from middle school to high school, improve school climate, and improve postsecondary readiness" (Getting Smart, 2024; Imbimbo, 2009).

While the dedicated time of advisory can be a powerful tool to strengthen relationships, achieving consistent implementation remains a challenge. The District has prioritized advisory in the District strategic plan and is committed to navigating these complexities to ensure effective implementation of advisory as one facet to creating safe, supportive school communities.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES: Research shows that mental health services for youth can reduce disciplinary incidents, improve teachers' perception of school climate and student behavior, and increase academic achievement (DePaoli & McCombs). Although the results of mental health services are positive, access to care is limited. In Wisconsin, nearly 70% of adolescents seeking mental health care between January 2019 and April 2022 did not receive any care on at least one occasion (Sky et al., 2023).

Green Bay Area Public School District is committed to mitigating barriers to access to care by employing licensed student services teams made up of School Counselors, School Social Workers, and School Psychologists. These teams play a critical role in promoting student mental health and overall well-being by providing a comprehensive range of services, including prevention strategies, targeted interventions, and connections to community-based support systems.

Recognizing the vital role of community collaboration, GBAPS has established and nurtured many robust partnerships to increase access to mental health care. Through these partnerships, the District has been able to expand school-based mental health services to more than 20 school sites. Additionally, the District contracts with Care Solace which provides multilingual care coordination by assigning a care companion who provides referrals to families that take into consideration the unique needs of the student or family member including insurance, preferred language, and availability of provider.

COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER OPPORTUNITIES: As a result of the roundtable discussions there was strong support from the community revolving around volunteers to support a safer school environment. The voices of the adults were prominent in this conversation and we now intend to gather the voices of students at all of our high schools. Our questions for students will involve how and in what places they perceive that volunteers would contribute to a greater sense of connection as a school community. These focused conversations with student groups will take place in October with more explicit opportunities presented for volunteers to commit to starting in November. Any volunteers engaging with our students in this capacity will be registered through our volunteer database and participate in our background check process.

SECTION 5: NEXT STEPS

The September 15 roundtable provided valuable insight into the community's concerns and ideas regarding school safety. While the District has already taken immediate steps to enhance security, several recommendations raised by participants require Board of Education consideration and direction before moving forward.

The Board's role is critical in helping to determine which strategies should be prioritized, funded, and embedded into policy. Specifically, Board guidance is needed in the following areas:

- **Weapon Detection Systems (metal detectors, wands):** Whether and how the District should implement these systems, how they would be funded, and balancing safety needs with the importance of maintaining a welcoming school climate.

- **Policy Revisions:** Consideration of updates to the dress code and a closed campus policy (this could be administrative as well).

- **School Resource Officer Staffing:** Determining whether the District should expand SRO staffing levels, if possible, and identifying sustainable funding sources for this expansion.

To assist the Board in its deliberations, the District can provide research summaries, policy models where applicable, and cost projections for options. Board decisions will guide the administration in developing detailed implementation plans that align with community values, research-based best practices, and available resources.

Summary of Roundtable Recommendations & Board Considerations

Recommendation	Requires Board Action?	Type of Decision	Key Considerations
Weapon Detection Systems (metal/weapon detectors, wands)	Yes	Policy & Funding	Cost of equipment and staffing; mixed research on effectiveness; potential impact on school climate; perception of safety vs. actual safety.
Revised Dress Code	Yes	Policy	Align with safety concerns (e.g., oversized clothing) while maintaining inclusivity; balance rights with security.
Closed Campus Policy	Possibly	Policy or Administrative	Impacts supervision, food service, and schedule; may reduce opportunities for weapons entering during lunch; could feel punitive initially.

Increased SRO Staffing	Yes	Funding	$150K–$200K per officer annually; evidence shows SROs reduce fights and detect weapons, but not gun-related incidents overall; effectiveness depends on relationship-building.
Exterior Door Alarms	No	Administrative	Approx. $5,000 per door; improves monitoring of building access; operational feasibility requires facilities analysis.
Expanded Mental Health & Student Supports	No	Administrative	Strong evidence of effectiveness; limited access statewide; requires sustained investment and staffing.
Community Volunteers & Partnerships	No	Administrative	Positive potential for mentoring and presence; requires volunteer coordination, background checks, and student input on best use.

APPENDIX

Ciabarra, Chris (2024, September 27), *Pros and cons of using metal detectors for securing screenings at schools*, Forbes

DePaoli, Jennifer & McCombs, J. (2023, August 9, *Safe schools, thriving students: what we know about creating safe and supportive schools*, Learning Policy Institute

Donnelly, Matt (2024), *Dress codes and uniforms in public schools*, EBSCO

Imbimbo, J., Morgan, S., & Plaza, E. (2009). Student advisory. Center for School Success promising practices series. New Visions for Public Schools.

Jones, Michele (2019, January 1), *Judging the value of metal detectors*, AASA The School Superintendent Association

Lichtman-Sado, Shirlee (2016, October), Improving academic performance through conditional benefits: Open/closed campus policies in high school and student outcomes. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S027277571630348X?via%3Dihub

Schildkraut, J., Grogan, K., & WestEd's Justice & Prevention Research Center. (n.d.). Are metal detectors effective at making schools safer? In *WestEd's Justice & Prevention Research Center* (pp. 1–2). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED595716.pdf

Shetgiri, R., Lee, S. C., Tillitski, J., Wilson, C., & Flores, G. (2015). Why adolescents fight: a qualitative study of youth perspectives on fighting and its prevention. *Academic pediatrics*, *15*(1), 103–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2014.06.020

Sky, J., Wells, L., Yuhas, M., Raines, L., Bowman, B., MBA, Harbin, T., MD, & Bowman Family Foundation. (2023). *Equitable access to mental health and substance use care: an urgent need.*

The Condition of Education 2021. (2021). In *The Condition of Education*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/pdf/2021/a19_508c.pdf

United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) (2021, November), *K-12 education: students' experiences with bullying, hate speech, hate crimes, and victimization in schools*, GAO-22-104341

Wisconsin Department of Justice. (2024). *THE WISCONSIN OFFICE OF SCHOOL SAFETY's COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SAFETY FRAMEWORK 2ND EDITION* (2ND EDITION). https://www.wisdoj.gov/School%20Safety/wi-oss-comprehensive-school-safety-framework-2nd-ed.pdf