



# Annual Report 2024-2025

## School Safety and Security in Texas

---

## Executive Overview

The Office of School Safety and Security (OSSS) Annual Report fulfills the legislative mandate under Texas Education Code §37.1083, §37.1084, and §37.1088 requiring the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to provide an annual statewide report on school safety. This report delivers deidentified results from Intruder Detection Audits (IDAs) conducted at each eligible campus in the state and District Vulnerability Assessments (DVAs) conducted at approximately **30%** of school districts across the state during the preceding year. The report also contains recommendations for corrective actions addressing recurring deficiencies in campus security.

The purpose of this report is to inform the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House, and legislative committees overseeing education, finance, and appropriations of the current status of school safety across Texas. It provides a comprehensive analysis of district and campus-level compliance, highlights systemic gaps, and identifies actionable steps to strengthen security measures statewide.

The findings serve as a foundation for policy development, resource allocation, and operational planning, ensuring that safety practices remain aligned with statutory requirements and best practices. Looking ahead, TEA will continue to refine audit methodologies, expand training for district safety teams, and enhance statewide coordination to advance a culture of preparedness and resilience in Texas schools.

## Table of Contents

<b>Intruder Detection Audits .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Background .....	4
Overview of 2024-2025 IDAs.....	6
Statewide Summary .....	7
<b>District Vulnerability Assessments .....</b>	<b>16</b>
Background .....	16
Overview of 2024-2025 DVAs .....	17
Safety Sectors.....	18
District Level Review.....	19
Campus Level Review .....	28
<b>Suggested Corrective Actions.....</b>	<b>35</b>

# Intruder Detection Audit Report for 2024-2025


## Background

In response to a directive from the 88<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) initiated Intruder Detection Audits in 2023 to strengthen campus security.

This initiative is part of a broader effort to strengthen physical security and emergency preparedness in educational institutions statewide. Under this statute, the Office of School Safety and Security, established by Texas Education Code (TEC) §37.1083, coordinates with Regional Education Service Centers to manage School Safety Review Teams. These teams conduct unannounced, on-site audits designed to assess a campus's vulnerability to unauthorized entry. The audits follow a standardized rubric developed in collaboration with the Texas School Safety Center, ensuring consistency and rigor across all evaluations.

## INTRUDER DETECTION AUDIT PHASES

- Inspectors evaluate campuses in three phases, each focused on assessing critical aspects of access control. Phases 1 and 2, along with the Weekly Exterior Door Sweep Log, are aligned with the requirements outlined in Texas Administrative Code (TAC), §61.1031. Deficiencies identified during these audits result in formal findings and require corrective action remediation.
- For Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with local policies requiring classroom doors to remain closed and locked, the agency conducts random checks of doors to verify compliance. Deficiencies found during these checks are flagged as a notice to the superintendent but do not require corrective actions or further district response.
- Additionally, as part of the inspection process, inspectors document the method of identification used by the school when checking in at the front office.



## **CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUIREMENTS**


LEAs must take corrective actions within 60 calendar days following a finding on a campus audit. This includes:

- Submit a copy of the school board meeting agenda summarizing findings from the Intruder Detection Audit.
- Address and correct mechanical deficiencies on exterior doors as found in the audit.
- Conduct live training for campus staff and substitutes on securing exterior doors.
- Create and implement a safety improvement action plan to address audit findings and submit the plan to TEA.
- Review findings at the next Safety and Security Committee meeting; retain meeting minutes for year-end compliance.

## Overview of 2024-2025 IDAs

The 2024-2025 Intruder Detection Audit (IDA) cycle marked the second full year of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) overseeing campus security audits statewide.


Enhancing inspector training was a key focus throughout the 2024-2025 cycle. The TEA School Safety Readiness Team provided both classroom instruction and live audit demonstrations for inspectors across Texas, ensuring a standardized and consistent approach to the audit process.



## Statewide Summary

Audit schedules are developed with the goal of maintaining steady month-to-month activity. This approach helps distribute audits evenly throughout the school year, allowing campuses to be assessed under a range of operational conditions. The graph below shows the number of audits completed each month.

**Intruder Detection Audits Completed by Month**



## REVIEW OF STATEWIDE FINDINGS

Findings from the 2024–2025 school year show a total of 86.83% of campuses had no findings identified in Phase 1, Phase 2, or the Door Log Review. Among the 13.17% of campuses where findings were recorded, most were cited during Phase 2, the exterior door audit.

### Data Highlight

**86.83%**

Campuses Identified  
with No Findings During  
Phase 1, Phase 2, and  
the Door Log Review

## FINDINGS AND FLAGS BY AUDIT PHASE

Figure 1 shows all audit phases maintained compliance rates above 90%. Phase 2 had the lowest rate at 90.10%, while the other phases exceeded 97% with no findings or flags.




Figure 1. Phase by Phase Findings Rate






Figure 2 indicates that most findings occurred in Phase 2 (65.35%), followed by Door Sweep Log (12.44%) and Phase 1 (11.71%). Combined findings across phases made up the remainder: Phase 1 and Phase 2 (5.81%), Phase 2 and Door Sweep Log (3.50%), Phase 1 and Door Sweep Log (0.65%), and all three phases combined (0.55%).

Figure 2. Distribution of Multi-Phase Findings

## PHASE 1: ACCESS CONTROL

### Unauthorized Access Point

Figure 3 shows inspectors could not gain unauthorized entry in 97.54% of the audits. In the 2.46% of audits where inspectors were able to gain unauthorized entry into the facility, 88.67% of the time was through a secondary entrance.




Figure 3. Point of unauthorized entry

## Time to Achieve Unauthorized Access

In the event of unauthorized campus access, the inspector records the duration of time required to breach entry, measured in minutes. Table 1 below shows the average time it takes to gain unauthorized entry is 3.54 minutes.

Table 1. Time to Achieve Unauthorized Entry

Metric	Time (Minutes)
Average time to gain access when unauthorized entry is successful	
Median number of minutes it took for the inspector to gain unauthorized access	
Most commonly observed time interval for an inspector to achieve unauthorized access	

Figure 4 shows unauthorized access was not gained in 97.54% of audits, leaving 2.46% where access occurred. Among those, 27.59% of successful entries happened within 2 minutes, followed closely by 26.11% within 1 minute. Longer times were less common, with 12.32% taking 6–10 minutes and only 3.45% exceeding 10 minutes.




Figure 4. Distribution of Minutes to Gain Access for Audits with a Phase 1 Finding

## PHASE 1: ACCESS INTERVENTION

In audits where unauthorized access was gained, inspectors record whether anyone approaches them before they reach the front office, and if so, that individual's role. The following graph is a breakdown of the category of individuals that stopped the inspector once they gained unauthorized entry into the building.

### Key Observation Access Intervention Results

**51.23%**

Audits with Phase 1 findings in which the inspector was not approached by any individual prior to reaching the front office.

Figure 5 shows that inspectors were not able to gain access in 97.54% of audits. For the 2.46% of audits where they did gain access, 51.23% resulted in the inspector reaching the office without being stopped or approached. When stopped, it was most often by a campus staff member, accounting for 38.92% of those interactions. In the remaining 9.85% of audits, the inspector was approached by law enforcement (3.45%), other individuals (3.45%), safety and security personnel (1.48%) or students (1.48%).




Figure 5. Roles That Stopped the Inspector After Gaining Unauthorized Access

## Phase 1: Visitor Identification

After completing Phase 1, the inspector checks in at the campus office before beginning Phase 2. During check-in, they document which identification methods, if any, the campus uses. This process does not result in a finding or flag but provides LEAs with a reference point to ensure required identification methods are being followed.

### Key Data

- **96.48%** – percentage of audited campuses that utilized at least one visitor identification process.
- **93.28%** – percentage of audited campuses that utilized more than one identification process.

Figure 6 highlights the most common visitor identification practices used by campuses during inspector visits. In 94.52% of audits, inspectors were asked to present identification. The next most frequent method was issuing a visitor badge (87.48%), followed by verifying identity through a database system (85.21%). Lastly, 62.25% of campuses used a sign-in sheet as part of their visitor protocols.




Figure 6. Visitor Identification Processes Utilized at Campuses

## PHASE 2: EXTERIOR DOOR AUDIT

Phase 2 consists of two parts, and each part can result in a finding.

### Phase 2a

The inspector gains a campus escort and checks all exterior doors to ensure that each one is closed, latched, and locked. Any doors that are found unlocked, propped open, improperly secured, or broken are documented and result in a Phase 2 finding.

### Phase 2b

Inspectors review the most recent six consecutive weeks of door sweep logs to verify that weekly checks are being consistently conducted. If the logs are inaccessible or show gaps in documentation, a finding is issued, and corrective actions are required.

#### Phase 2a Overview

**91.10%**

Campuses with all exterior doors closed, latched, and locked at the time of the audit.

## PHASE 2A: EXTERIOR DOOR CHECKS

During the exterior door audit, inspectors document both the door's location and the reason cited. The most frequent Phase 2 finding occurs when a door is left unlocked in an unsecured exterior area.

Figure 7 illustrates that 90.10% of audits did not result in a Phase 2a finding. For the remaining 9.90% of door audits, the figure outlines the specific types of door-related issues that resulted in a Phase 2a finding. Among these findings, the most frequently cited issue was an unlocked exterior door (42.02%), followed by broken doors (35.87%). Propped doors accounted for 15.02% of Phase 2a findings, while improperly secured doors made up the remaining 7.09%.




Figure 7. Phase 2a Findings Broken Down by Door Concern

## PHASE 2B: DOOR SWEEP LOG REVIEW

Campuses are required to conduct and document weekly checks of all exterior doors. These checks help identify doors that are not securely closed, latched, or locked—allowing districts to quickly address issues through repairs or retraining of staff and students.

As part of the audit, inspectors review the most recent six consecutive weeks of door sweep logs to verify that checks are being consistently conducted.

### Impact of Door Sweep Logs

<b>97.74%</b>	Campuses with completed door sweep logs available for inspector review.
<b>2.47</b>	The number of times more likely a campus is to have a Phase 2 Finding if they have a Door Sweep Log Finding.

#### *Proper Use of Door Sweep Logs Reduces Phase 2 Exterior Door Findings*

24% of audits with a door sweep log finding also had a Phase 2 exterior door finding, compared to just 10% when no door sweep log finding was noted.

Figure 8 illustrates that 97.74% of audits found that campuses had door sweep logs from the previous six weeks readily available for inspector review. In contrast, 2.26% of audits revealed that campuses either lacked logs, did not have access to them, or failed to maintain a complete set covering six consecutive weeks.




Figure 8. Phase 2b Findings

## PHASE 3: CLASSROOM DOOR AUDIT

Phase 3 of the IDA is conducted if the district has a classroom door policy or directive in place. In this phase, the inspector checks a sample of classroom doors for compliance. Any door found in violation is flagged, and the district Superintendent is notified. No corrective action is required; the findings are informational and intended to support district-level awareness.

### Key Data

- **44.31%** – percentage of audited campuses that had a District-Level classroom door policy or directive in place (decrease of 2.61% from SY 23-24).
- **13.66%** – percentage of audited campuses with classroom door policies that received a Flag for having a classroom door open or unlocked (decrease of 1.72% from SY 23-24).

Figure 10 shows that 44.31% of audited campuses have a district-level directive or policy requiring teachers to keep classroom doors closed and locked. Among those with policies, 86.34% of audits found all inspected doors properly secured. Of the remaining 13.66% audits with a Phase 3 flag, 4.85% had both open and unlocked doors, 4.57% had unlocked doors, and 4.24% had open doors. 55.69% of audited campuses did not have a district-level directive or policy to keep classroom doors closed and locked.




Figure 10. Proportion of Audits with a Classroom Door Policy or Directive



# District Vulnerability Assessments 2024-2025

---

## Background

In accordance with Texas Education Code (TEC) §37.1083, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Office of School Safety and Security is responsible for monitoring school district safety and security requirements, which includes conducting District Vulnerability Assessments (DVAs) on a random basis determined by the agency once every four years. The 2024-2025 District Vulnerability Assessment (DVA) Cycle marked the first full year of statewide implementation. **This annual report reflects the results of approximately 30% of all Texas school districts.**

## THE PROCESS

The DVA process is designed to evaluate the safety and security posture of districts, campuses, and instructional facilities based on requirements outlined in Texas Education Code and Texas Administrative Code.

The assessments are conducted by TEA School Safety Agents. DVA results are recorded in Sentinel, TEA's school safety management system, and shared with the district superintendent to support collaboration on timelines for addressing identified deficiencies. School districts are required to report completed corrective actions to TEA for final review and approval within the specified timelines.

## THE ASSESSMENT

Safety Agents conduct assessments of the district's written and implemented school safety policies and procedures. The district-level review focuses on evaluating the district's implementation of safety policies and procedures. Implementation and understanding of the state and district emergency policies and procedures are also reviewed at the campus level with security inspections of the instructional facilities, and the level of staff knowledge and preparedness in various emergency scenarios.




The district-level review includes eight components based in statute that focus on policies, procedures, and preparedness across the following areas:

- Multihazard EOP Implementation
- Safety Committee
- SSSP Team
- First Aid
- Communications
- Facility Standards
- School Security
- Policy & Procedure

The campus-level review includes items in the following categories:


- Drill Schedule
- First Aid
- Silent Panic Alert Technology
- Maps and Master Key Box
- (SPAT)
- Facility Access Points
- Exterior Windows

## Overview of 2024-2025 District Vulnerability Assessments



## Safety Sectors

The Office of School Safety and Security has established seven Safety Sectors and stationed School Safety Agents in each sector where they collaborate directly with school districts to provide technical assistance, training, monitoring, and conduct District Vulnerability Assessments (DVAs).



	Districts Assessed	Campuses Assessed
Central Sector	48	279
East Sector	58	211
Gulf Coast Sector	59	447
North Sector	65	537
Panhandle & West Sector	95	330
South Sector	51	431

## District-Level Review

The district-level review outlines clear, measurable criteria across key areas of school safety and operations. The categories below are assessed.

### **Multihazard EOP Implementation**

A review of the implementation of the district's Emergency Operations Plan for alignment with relevant Texas Education Code and Texas Administrative Code.

### **Safety Committee**

Committee composition, documented meeting cadence and notification, and performance of committee duties with respect to reporting requirements.

### **SSSP Team**

Committee composition, documented training, policies & procedures, reporting requirements, and document retention.

### **First Aid**

A review of policies & procedures, training for staff and students, and opioid antagonist program policies, procedures and training.

### **Communications**

Communications and silent panic alert technology infrastructures, telephone system functionality, and responder radio functionality.

### **Facility Standards**

A review of campus maps, twice-yearly maintenance checks, reporting & repair procedures; weekly door inspections.

### **School Security**

A review of the state requirement for armed security on every campus, or implementation of a good cause exception as determined by the board of trustees, peace officer training requirements, and duties outlined in district policies.

### **Policy & Procedure**

A review of policy and procedures regarding student safety education, gang-free zone awareness, dating violence and bullying policies, education on the consequences of sharing explicit materials, and training and practices for mental health, substance abuse, and trauma-informed support.

## 1: DISTRICT MULTHAZARD EMERGENCY OPERATIONS PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

The district's Multihazard Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) is reviewed to ensure the district is implementing all requirements for emergency preparedness, including staff training, communication access, safety audits, coordinated response plans, emergency drills, policies for specific hazards like active shooters and train derailments, provisions for students and staff with disabilities, real-time notifications to parents, and maintaining safety and security committees.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Multihazard Emergency Operations Plan Implementation

**70.67%**

Of Districts Assessed Met All  
Criteria of the Multihazard  
Emergency Operations Plan

- **98.93%** of districts had provisions in their emergency operations plan to ensure staff receive training to effectively respond to emergencies.
- **98.93%** of district EOPs contained a chain of command for final decision making during a disaster or emergency situation.
- **12.27%** of districts did not establish and implement a policy ensuring substitute teachers have access to buildings and instructional materials during emergencies or drills.
- **12.53%** of districts did not conduct all of the required safety and security audits for their facilities.

## 2: DISTRICT SAFETY COMMITTEE

The requirements for school safety and security committees are reviewed, including details on committee composition, meeting frequency, responsibilities for report review, and adherence to open meeting laws.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Safety Committee

**82.13%**

Of Districts Assessed Met All  
Criteria of the Safety Committee  
Review

- **96.53%** of districts have established a school safety and security committee and have members from each of the nine (9) discipline categories identified in TEC §37.109.
- **12.27%** of districts did not publicly post safety and security committee meetings in the same manner as they do for school board meetings.

### 3: DISTRICT SAFE AND SUPPORTIVE SCHOOLS TEAM

District requirements for threat assessment and safe and supportive school teams include forming appropriate teams, providing training, establishing confidentiality policies, ensuring necessary expertise, implementing assessment procedures, offering guidance to staff and students, obtaining parental consent for services, following reporting protocols, maintaining records, and delivering mental health training to staff.

#### KEY FINDINGS

##### Safe and Supportive Schools Team

**67.73%**

Of Districts Assessed Met All  
Criteria of the Safe and Supportive  
Schools Team Review

- **96.00%** of districts comply with the requirement to retain materials and information related to student threat assessments in the student's school record until their 24<sup>th</sup> birthday.
- **95.47%** of districts ensure staff who regularly interact with students complete evidence-based mental health training.
- **22.93%** of districts had not ensured each team completed training provided by the Texas School Safety Center or a regional education service center on evidence-based threat assessment programs.

## 4: DISTRICT FIRST AID REQUIREMENTS

District requirements for first aid and emergency medical preparedness include agency-approved training on traumatic injury protocols for law enforcement and security personnel; offer annual instruction for students in grades seven and above on the use of bleeding control stations; policies for maintaining, administering, and disposing of opioid antagonists at campuses serving grades 6–12; and procedures to ensure trained personnel can administer opioid antagonists during school hours, with secure storage and adequate dosage availability at each campus.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### First Aid

**74.13%**

Of Districts Assessed Met All  
First Aid Requirements

- **92.80%** of districts have a policy allowing trained personnel to administer an opioid antagonist to individuals reasonably believed to be experiencing an opioid-related overdose. The districts also ensure a trained staff member is present during school hours at each campus and has a policy ensuring availability of doses and access to the medication.
- **19.73%** of districts did not offer or provide annual instruction to students in grade seven or higher on the use of bleeding control stations by trained school resource officers or other qualified personnel.

## 5: DISTRICT COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE

District requirements for emergency communications infrastructure include panic alert systems with automated emergency response features, compliance with state and federal 9-1-1 regulations for school telephone systems, and reliable two-way radio coverage for law enforcement.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Communications Infrastructure

**80.00%**

Of Districts Met All  
Communications Infrastructure  
Requirements

- **95.73%** of districts comply with requirements for school telephone systems to meet state and federal standards under Kari's Law and the RAY BAUM's Act, including regulations for 9-1-1 service and multi-line systems.
- **10.13%** of districts' communication infrastructure did not have a panic alert system that meets all requirements for staff activation, automatic 9-1-1 activation, location identification, administrator and emergency notifications, and automatic locking of exterior doors, if the district is equipped with that capability.
- **12.27%** of districts have not documented successful functionality testing of law enforcement and emergency responder two-way radios within district buildings.



## 6: DISTRICT FACILITY STANDARDS

District requirements for facilities include ensuring compliance with facility standards, conducting regular maintenance checks, reporting and addressing deficiencies, completing campus mapping and first responder walk-throughs, and providing emergency responders with access to site plans.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Facility Standards

**67.73%**

Of Districts Met All Facility  
Standards Requirements

- **92.27%** of school districts and open-enrollment charter schools provided the Department of Public Safety and all appropriate local law enforcement agencies and emergency first responders an accurate map of each district campus and an opportunity to conduct a walk-through of each district campus using the provided map.

- **19.20%** of school systems did not meet the requirement to perform and document twice-yearly maintenance checks to ensure facility components function properly, including the eight (8) items specified in statute.
- **10.13%** of school systems did not have procedures in place to require that staff who become aware of a facility component functionality deficiency that would be identified during the twice-yearly maintenance review immediately report the deficiency to the school system's administration, regardless of the status of the twice-yearly maintenance review.
- **9.33%** of districts have not shared electronic copies of exterior and interior door numbering plans with the local 9-1-1 administrative entity so campus maps can be made available to emergency responders by 9-1-1 dispatchers.

## 7: DISTRICT SCHOOL SECURITY

The school security review evaluates the district's requirements for law enforcement and security staff, including active shooter training, training for school resource officers, and clearly defined responsibilities for security personnel.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### School Security

**63.47%**

Of Districts Met All  
School Security Requirements

- **94.13%** of districts meet the requirement for school peace officers and resource officers to complete approved active shooter response training at least once every four years.
- **86.40%** of the boards of trustees of each school district have determined the appropriate number of armed security officers for each district campus with a minimum of one officer per campus during regular school hours and have properly documented the board determination.
- **43.20%** of assessed districts report full compliance with Armed Security requirements, while **55.47%** have adopted a Good Cause Exception, which may include School Marshals, School Guardians, peace officers serving as security personnel, or a hybrid model of security personnel authorized by statute.
- **21.60%** of districts did not have clearly defined roles for law enforcement officers, school resource officers, and security personnel.

## 8: DISTRICT POLICY AND PROCEDURES

The district's policy and procedures are reviewed to confirm compliance with state requirements. These requirements cover student safety education and prevention policies, including gang-free zone awareness, dating violence and bullying policies, education on the consequences of sharing explicit materials, and training and practices for mental health, substance abuse, and trauma-informed support.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Policy and Procedures

**69.33%**

Of Districts Met All  
Policy and Procedures  
Requirements

- **98.40%** of districts have adopted a bullying policy, including provisions for cyberbullying.
- **94.93%** of districts include information in their student handbooks about gang-free zones and the consequences of engaging in organized criminal activity within those zones.
- **18.40%** of districts had not adopted and implemented a dating violence policy in the district improvement plan.
- **16.00%** of districts did not annually provide or make available to parents and age-appropriate students information on the Texas School Safety Center programs about the legal and other unintended consequences of sharing visual material depicting a minor in sexual content.

## **Campus-Level Review**

The district's campus-level review sets measurable standards across core areas of school safety and operations. The categories below summarize the key topics it addresses.

### **Drill Schedule**

A review of campus emergency drills including fire, evacuation, lockdown and shelter drills.

### **First Aid**

An inspection of bleeding control stations, automated external defibrillators and Narcan, and training for response personnel.

### **Silent Panic Alert Technology and 9-1-1**

A review of classroom silent panic alert technology (SPAT). Each classroom must be equipped with SPAT, and alerts must allow for immediate contact with the 9-1-1 dispatch center, district or school emergency services, law enforcement agencies, health departments and fire departments.

### **Facility Access**

Inspection of access point functionality, door entry resistance including reinforcement of glass and door construction, visual identification requirements, access controls, visitor processing and roof access.

### **Exterior Windows**

Inspection of exterior windows adjacent to and near exterior doors; ground level window status when capable of opening.

### **Maps and Master Key Box**

Inspection of facility numbering requirements for exterior doors, accurate maps with interior and exterior door numbering, and availability of campus maps for first responders.

## 10: CAMPUS DRILL SCHEDULE

The campus drill schedule review evaluates whether district campuses are conducting all required emergency drills. These include fire drills, non-fire evacuation drills, secure drills, lockdown drills, and shelter drills addressing severe weather or hazardous materials.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Campus Drill Schedule

**95.21%**

Of Campuses Met All  
Criteria of the Drill  
Schedule Review

- **99.82%** of campuses conduct at least one secure drill per year.
- **99.73%** of campuses conduct at least one shelter drill for severe weather or hazardous materials each school year.
- **99.69%** of campuses conduct at least one evacuation drill (excluding fire drills) each school year.
- **99.64%** of campuses conduct at least two lockdown drills each school year (one per semester).
- **99.55%** of campuses conduct drills in accordance with Texas Administrative Code or as otherwise required by the local authority having jurisdiction (e.g., fire marshal).

## 11: CAMPUS FIRST AID REVIEW

The first aid review ensures compliance with campus standards for life-saving equipment and maintenance. This includes confirming that bleeding control stations are fully stocked and strategically placed, and automated external defibrillators are properly maintained with documented monthly inspections in accordance with manufacturer guidelines.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Campus First Aid

**91.54%**

Of Campuses Met All  
Criteria of the First Aid Review

- **99.73%** of campuses have bleeding control stations.
- **97.85%** of campus bleeding control stations have all required materials.
- **97.18%** of campuses conduct and document maintenance inspections on their automated external defibrillators.
- **95.48%** of campuses have their bleeding control stations in easily accessible areas.

## 12: SILENT PANIC ALERT TECHNOLOGY AND 9-1-1

Silent panic alert technology (SPAT) and 9-1-1 notification requirements are reviewed for emergency communication systems, including having SPAT in each classroom for immediate contact with emergency services, access to communication devices for all staff including substitutes, panic alert systems capable of location identification and automated activation when dialing 9-1-1.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Campus Silent Panic Alert Technology and 9-1-1

**84.42%**

Of Campuses Met All  
Silent Panic Alert Technology  
and 9-1-1 Requirements

- **98.43%** of campus employees, including substitutes, have classroom access to a telephone or other communication device for immediate contact with emergency services, law enforcement, health departments, and fire departments.
- **97.76%** of campuses have telephone systems that comply with state and federal Kari's Law and the RAY BAUM's Act, including 9-1-1 service requirements for multi-line systems.
- **13.47%** of campuses did not have SPAT systems capable of being activated by staff, activate automatically when 9-1-1 is called, identifies the location of the alert, and notifies the designated administrators and staff of the emergency.

## 13: FACILITY ACCESS

The campus facility review checks compliance with physical access and door security standards. This includes verifying that exterior doors remain closed, latched, and locked by default; ensuring visibility of individuals seeking entry; confirming intrusion-resistant door construction and reinforced glass; validating master key access systems; evaluating visitor check-in areas have physical barriers; confirming locked roof access; reviewing weekly exterior door inspections; and ensuring emergency responders have access through secure key boxes or direct key entry.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Campus Facility Requirements

**24.13%**

Of Campuses Met All  
Facility Requirements

- **99.28%** of campuses conduct weekly inspections of exterior doors during regular school hours to ensure they remain closed, latched, and locked, and cannot be opened from the outside without a key.
- **98.79%** of campuses ensure all exterior doors that are keyed for re-entry can be unlocked with a single master key or a small set of master keys.
- **98.48%** of campus primary entrances have a visitor check-in and check-out area with a physical barrier preventing unassisted access to the facility.
- **41.85%** of campuses had one or more exterior doors that were not built or modified to resist forced entry and/or have glass panels that are not reinforced against easy breakage.
- **38.85%** of campuses had one or more doors that did not have a way to visually identify an individual seeking access to the building or classroom with an exterior door.
- **36.57%** of campuses had one or more exterior access points that were not closed, latched, and locked, and/or the exterior door did not function properly to automatically close, latch, and lock.



## 14: CAMPUS EXTERIOR WINDOWS

The campus exterior window assessment verifies compliance with security requirements for windows near exterior doors, focusing on intruder-resistant construction and secure locking mechanisms. These measures ensure vulnerable windows are reinforced and remain locked when staff are absent, reducing the risk of unauthorized access.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Campus Exterior Windows

**75.47%**

Of Campuses Met All  
Exterior Window Requirements

- **99.42%** of campuses with ground-level windows ensure they have functional locking mechanisms and, if large enough for entry, are closed and locked when staff are not present.
- **22.56%** of campuses have windows adjacent to exterior doors that are not constructed or modified with intruder-resistant material preventing an intruder from gaining entry by reaching in and unlocking the door if the glass was broken.
- **13.12%** of campuses have windows near exterior doors that are large enough for entry and are not constructed or modified with intruder-resistant material preventing an intruder from gaining entry if the glass was broken.

## 15: CAMPUS SITE MAPPING

The campus site mapping review evaluates standardized door identification and accurate site documentation across instructional facilities. This includes clearly labeling exterior doors with alpha-numeric characters per Texas Administrative Code and ensuring accurate campus maps are accessible in main offices to support emergency response.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### Campus Site Mapping

**45.57%**

Of Campuses Met All  
Campus Site Mapping  
Requirements

- **45.52%** of campuses did not have proper alpha-numeric labeling on all exterior doors.
- **28.60%** of campuses did not have an accurate campus map depicting interior and exterior doors with alpha-numeric labels on a floor plan per Texas Administrative Code or did not have an accurate map readily available in the campus main office.

## Suggested Corrective Actions

### Progress:

- Increased funding for school safety passed in the 88<sup>th</sup> and 89<sup>th</sup> Legislative Sessions totaling \$2.1B in school safety grants and increased school safety allotments provided essential funding for the school districts to meet school safety requirements.
- Texas Administrative Code 19 (TAC) §61.1031 School Safety Facility Standards set clear statewide requirements for all K-12 educational campus facilities. This uniform approach closed safety gaps and positioned Texas as a leader in proactive school security.
- Sentinel - an innovative and comprehensive system designed to enhance the safety and security of students, faculty, and staff in schools across Texas, provides school districts with robust monitoring for the implementation and operation of safety and security procedures. Sentinel is provided by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and is utilized by all schools in the state at no charge to the districts.
- Behavioral Threat Assessments (BTAs) in Sentinel – in the 25-26 SY all school districts will utilize Sentinel to assess and manage BTAs in a standardized state format. This easy to use and interactive system ensures quality BTAs in accordance with Texas statute and facilitates the timely and secure transfer of records between school districts when a student transfers.
- Districts have achieved high rates of compliance in critical safety areas, specifically in preventing unauthorized access and increased emergency preparedness.
- On-site audits and assessments completed by TEA School Safety Agents ensure school districts are implementing safety and security procedures and policies required by Texas statute.

### Challenges:

- Gaps continue in exterior door security, window reinforcement, threat assessment training, and facility maintenance.
- The availability of law enforcement for hire by school districts.
- Staff training in Standard Response Protocol (SRP) and reunification procedures.
- Ineffective communication procedures for threats or emergency situations with parents, local law enforcement/first responders, staff, and community.

### Recommendations:

- Expand School Marshal and School Guardian programs and training opportunities.
- Enhanced monitoring, technical support, and training for districts with campuses having recurring deficiencies pertaining to access control issues.
- Centralized state repository for campus maps.
- Increase training opportunities for threat assessment teams.
- Required reporting of School Safety Allotment expenditures.

The above recommendations are based upon a limited sample size, approximately **30%** of all Texas school districts.