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Abstract

In this chapter the PREPaRE School Crisis Prevention and Intervention Training Curriculum (PREPaRE) is used as a structure for discussing the comprehensive school crisis team’s response to school violence. This chapter includes sections that describe the importance of responding in a comprehensive fashion to school violence, the conceptual basis for PREPaRE and a description of its strategies, evidence of PREPaRE’s effectiveness, and finally, a critique of the model and acknowledgement of its limitations. Implications for practice are discussed, including the importance of establishing a comprehensive school crisis management team.

The School Crisis Team’s Response to Violence

Acts of violence in schools are rare; however, when these events do occur, they affect the physical, emotional, and psychological well-being of students and staff (National Association of School Psychologists [NASP], 2000). Thus, preventing, preparing for, and responding to such events are essential, and each of these activities benefits from the direction of a school crisis team. Ideally, a crisis team involves the collaboration and cooperation of educators, parents, students, law enforcement, community leaders, health care providers, and other professionals serving youth (Hester, 2003). However, the ultimate responsibility for the development and organization of this team belongs to schools and school districts. Selection of the school crisis team members is critical; some staff members may naturally fill certain roles, yet consideration
should be given to the diverse and complementary nature of the different members’ skills, as well as an individual’s ability and willingness to commit the required time and effort (Dwyer & Osher, 2000).

It is also important to acknowledge that crises, such as acts of school violence, are not discrete events. Rather they are processes that evolve over time (Vossekuil, Fein, Reddy, Borum, & Modzeleski, 2002). There is usually a series of events and precursors that lead to school crises. Further, the immediate response to school violence may not resolve all crisis issues for all students and staff. Often the recovery occurs over months, if not years (Brock & Jimerson, 2004). Given this reality, it is essential that comprehensive school crisis teams be prepared for and remain active during all phases of a crisis (not only during the immediate aftermath of violent acts). Figure 34.1 provides an illustration of the phases of a crisis event. It makes use of a chronology that divides crises, including acts of violence, into five phases: (a) the pre-impact phase, which is the period before the crisis; (b) the impact phase, which is the period when the crisis occurs; (c) the recoil phase, which is the period immediately after the crisis event; (d) the post-impact phase, which are the days to weeks after the crisis event; and (e) the recovery and reconstruction phase, which lasts months or years after the event (Raphael & Newman, 2000; Valent, 2000). Comprehensive school crisis teams need to be active during each phase and PREPaRE provides guidance regarding these activities.

**Conceptual Basis of PREPaRE**

PREPaRE integrates guidance and direction offered by the U.S. Departments of Education and Homeland Security. Further, from a careful review of the literature (Brock et al., 2009), PREPaRE advocates for the use of specific prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery efforts that are considered “best practices” and, to the greatest extent possible, are supported by the empirical literature.

Consistent with guidance offered by the U.S. Department of Education (2003), PREPaRE advocates that school crisis teams do more than simply respond to acts of school violence. Obviously, the nature of the incident will determine the type and scope of response; however, in general, specific crisis team activities correspond to the different phases of a crisis event. Research has identified the following critical types of activities in crises: (a) prevention, (b) preparedness, (c) response, and (d) recovery (Brock, 2002). Violence prevention includes activities designed to reduce the incidence of crisis events. Violence preparedness ensures response readiness for crises that are not, or cannot be, prevented. Violence response refers to team activities that minimize crisis damage and facilitate optimal immediate coping (which involves beginning the process of actively returning to pre-crisis levels of functioning). Finally, violence recovery refers to longer-term actions that repair crisis damage and return the school to baseline (or pre-crisis) operation/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crisis Phase</strong> (Raphael &amp; Newman, 2000; Valent, 2000)</td>
<td><strong>Preimpact</strong> The period before crisis</td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong> When crisis occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation and planning</td>
<td><strong>Recoil</strong> Immediately after crisis threats end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threat and warning</td>
<td><strong>Postimpact</strong> Days/weeks after the crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recovery/Reconstruction</strong> Months/years after crisis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PREPaRE:**
*School Crisis Prevention and Intervention Training Curriculum* (Brock et al., 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Prevent and prepare for psychological trauma risk</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reaffirm</strong> physical health and ensure perceptions of security and safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Prevent and prepare for crisis</td>
<td>• Meet basic physical needs (water, shelter, food, clothing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foster student resiliency</td>
<td>• Foster perceptions of safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluate** psychological trauma
- Evaluate crisis exposure and reactions
- Evaluate internal and external resources
- Make psychotherapeutic treatment referrals

**Provide** interventions and **Respond** to psychological needs
- Reestablish social support systems
- Provide psychoeducation: Empower survivors and their caregivers
- Provide classroom-based or individual crisis intervention or both
- Provide or refer for longer-term crisis intervention

**Examine** the effectiveness of crisis prevention and intervention

*Figure 34.2* An illustration of the relationships among specific crisis team activities, the phases of a crisis, and elements of the PREPaRE model. *Note.* Adapted from “School Crisis Prevention and Intervention: The PREPaRE model,” by S. E. Brock, A. B. Nickerson, M. A. Reeves, S. R. Jimerson, R. A. Lieberman, and T. A. Feinberg, 2009, Bethesda, MD: NASP. Reprinted with permission from the National Association of School Psychologists.
functioning. Figure 34.2 illustrates the relationships between these different activities, the phases of a crisis event, and the PREPaRE model.

Consistent with guidance offered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2004), PREPaRE advocates for use of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) as the school crisis team structure. NIMS provides an infrastructure designed to allow emergency response personnel (including school crisis teams) to respond to any crisis event with clear and consistent organizational structures and strategies. Among the elements of NIMS is the Incident Command System (ICS). The ICS has traditionally been used to centralize, organize, and coordinate the emergency response to a critical incident (i.e., crisis response). In the PREPaRE model, the ICS is also used to structure other school crisis team activities (i.e., crisis prevention, preparedness, and recovery). The ICS, which provides overall direction and establishes priorities for use in an emergency, has five functions: (a) management, (b) planning and intelligence, (c) operations, (d) logistics, and (c) finance/administration. Lockyer and Eastin (2000) recommend that school crisis teams pre-assign specific individuals to each of these functions (with such assignment being based on their school job assignments). Figure 34.3 provides a flow chart that illustrates the relationships among the five functions of the ICS.

Further discussion of the conceptual basis and empirical supports for PREPaRE is offered in the book School Crisis Prevention and Intervention: The PREPaRE Model (Brock et al., 2009). From a review of the literature, this book (and the training workshops that accompany it; Brock, 2006; Reeves, Nickerson, & Jimerson, 2006) provides educators with guidance on how best to fill the responsibilities and roles generated by school crisis team membership.

The PREPaRE Model

Designed specifically for use in the school setting, each element of PREPaRE outlines recommended activities for each phase of a crisis. As illustrated in Figure 34.2, each element consists

![An illustration of the Incident Command System (ICS) hierarchy](image-url)
of activities that occur throughout the phases of a crisis (e.g., Prevent and prepare activities span pre-impact, impact, and recoil phases). While much attention is directed to the impact and recoil phases of a crisis, all activities related to prevention, preparedness, response and recovery efforts should be considered equally important. The following summarizes activities that take place within each element of PREPaRE as set forth by Brock et al. (2009).

**Prevent and Prepare (P)**

The first element of PREPaRE is preventing and preparing for crises. The primary task of these efforts is the development of crisis teams. As indicated earlier, the crisis team forms the foundation for all subsequent efforts. Selection of members and delineation of duties at this stage is crucial, and Figure 34.3 illustrates the five essential functions of the ICS (the recommended structure for crisis teams). It is important to note that while there are unique roles within the ICS, this does not mean that different individuals must occupy each role. For example, the school principal may serve as the Incident Commander (IC) and Public Information Officer (PIO). This is particularly relevant to smaller districts and schools, where it may be necessary for one staff member to retain several roles in order to provide comprehensive coverage. Table 34.1 outlines the main crisis team sections, associated duties, and potential staffing considerations.

After the team is organized, these individuals will lead the development or evaluation of a crisis plan. While outside the scope of this chapter, a crisis plan will likely contain information about (a) the crisis team (e.g., members, duties, meetings); (b) the plan itself (e.g., dissemination, review procedures); (c) trainings, exercises, and drills related to crisis efforts; (d) prevention activities (e.g., needs assessment, implementation of curriculum); (e) intervention activities (e.g., initiation of response efforts, evacuation routes, reunification procedures); and (f) recovery activities (e.g., community organizations available to provide ongoing mental health to traumatized students and staff).

**Reaffirm (R)**

This element of the PREPaRE model attends to (a) reaffirming physical health and safety, and (b) ensuring perceptions of security and safety. These activities begin after an event has occurred that is judged to cause a harmful impact on the school and will continue through the days to weeks after the crisis (i.e., postimpact phase). Before any crisis interventions can begin, it is essential that the school community is physically safe (i.e., out of danger and with acute physical needs met) and that basic needs (i.e., water, shelter, food, and clothing) are met. Once safety and physical health have been established, it is also important for the school community to believe it is safe. Considerations to enhance this perception and therefore minimize the deleterious effects of exposure include: (a) containing problematic adult behaviors regarding the crisis (i.e., students often base their responses on the reactions of the adults near them); (b) minimizing exposure to potentially upsetting images and scenes (including those via media coverage); (c) reunifying students with primary caregivers or significant others, or reassuring students of impending reunification and the safety/location of their significant others if known; (d) providing crisis facts and dispelling rumors (e.g., alleviating the anxiety heightened by a rumor that there were two gunmen when there had been only one and s/he was no longer a threat); (e) providing opportunities for constructive engagement (e.g., having students help obtain needed supplies); and (f) providing visual and concrete cues that the environment is safe (e.g., strong police presence after an act of violence on campus).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICS Function</th>
<th>Role &amp; Duty</th>
<th>Potential Staff Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incident Commander (IC):</td>
<td>determine objectives of crisis team, assign roles &amp; responsibilities, initiate, coordinate &amp; manage all crisis efforts</td>
<td>The IC will need to have a position of authority and be able to marshal resources; likely a principal or superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Command (IC &amp; CMT)</td>
<td>Crisis Management Team (CMT): a variety of roles to liaise between the IC and the public the specifics of the crisis (PIO), to assess and coordinate safety efforts (SO), and to liaise between agencies involved in crisis efforts (LO).</td>
<td>These roles may require specific knowledge and experience in public relations, safety, and coordination/liaising between organizations. Particularly in small districts/schools, many of these roles will likely be the responsibility of a principal or superintendent; however, they can also be tasked to teachers, assistant principals, or administrative assistants with the requisite training (at the district level the PIO is likely the responsibility of staff assigned public relations duties).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Intelligence (&quot;thinkers&quot;)</td>
<td>Collect, evaluate, and disseminate crisis information to IC, prepare status reports, identify &amp; monitor crisis resources, develop &amp; document crisis plans, and evaluate prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery efforts.</td>
<td>Staff with good analytic and organizational skills with good follow through. This may be filled by one person or several; however, one individual should serve as the evaluation leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations (&quot;doers&quot;)</td>
<td>Carries out all crisis prevention tasks (e.g., curriculum), addresses immediate needs, and supports longer-term recovery efforts. Areas requiring coordinators include: (a) security and safety, (b) student care, (c) emergency medical, and (d) translation</td>
<td>Specialized staff will likely serve as coordinators. For example, it is likely that the school psychologist will coordinate and lead student care efforts, the school resource officer will be responsible for security and safety issues, the nurse will head the emergency medical staff section, and a community liaison will act as translation coordinator. Most crisis staff will be “doers” in order to be capable of responding to all students’ needs. It is important that these staff have received appropriate training in evaluation and provision of response interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics (&quot;getters&quot;)</td>
<td>Obtains all resources needed to address crises, including personnel, equipment &amp; supplies, and services, as well as liaising between the doers and the payers.</td>
<td>Staff with good coordination and communication skills who can multi-task relatively well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Admin. (&quot;payers&quot;)</td>
<td>Maintains all records of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery expenses.</td>
<td>This role will likely be filled by the principal or superintendent (the IC), that is, someone with authority over finances, although specific tasks related to this section would likely be relegated (e.g., an administrative assistant responsible for collecting any associated expense receipts).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34.1  School-Based Crisis Team Sections/Functions, Associated Roles/Duties, and Potential Staffing Considerations

Evaluate (E)

This element of PREPaRE immediately precedes provision of crisis interventions. Prior to provision of such interventions students must be evaluated for psychological trauma. This is often called psychological triage and is described as a sorting and directing of individuals by immediacy of the treatment needed (NIMH, 2001). Included in this evaluation is the evaluation of risk factors (i.e., variables that predict psychological trauma) and warning signs (i.e., crisis reactions). While risk factors may increase the odds of psychological trauma, warning signs are indicators that trauma may actually have occurred.

Within the PREPaRE model several important risk factors include: (a) physical proximity to the crisis (e.g., witnessing an incident); (b) emotional proximity (e.g., knowing someone who was a crisis victim); and (c) subjective impressions of personal threat presented by the crisis. Additionally, internal (e.g., coping strategies, baseline mental health) and external (e.g., family resources and social support) individual vulnerability factors (variables that help explain the student’s unique circumstance at the time of the crisis) influence a student’s responses.

Warning signs are assessed during the provision of crisis interventions. While some early crisis reactions (e.g., emotional numbing, memory impairment, fatigue, aggression) are common, extreme negative emotional reactions, acute panic and dissociative states, and dramatically increased arousal (e.g., exaggerated startle responses, hypervigilance, irritability, and sleep disturbance) may indicate significant coping challenges and may require immediate and more intensive treatment (e.g., referral to community-based mental health practitioner). Even relatively common (and initially adaptive or protective) crisis reactions (e.g., avoidance) can signal the need for treatment when they last for longer than a few weeks, which is why evaluation activities extend throughout the recovery/reconstruction phase of a crisis. Finally, PREPaRE identifies developmental and cultural variables as critical components in the evaluation of warning signs and psychological trauma.

Provide and Respond (PaR)

This element of PREPaRE includes different crisis interventions, the provision of which are dictated by the “Evaluate” activities previously discussed. These efforts continue throughout the recovery/reconstruction phase of the crisis. Figure 34.4 provides a flowchart for the evaluation of psychological trauma and its relationship with provision of specific crisis interventions. As indicated, there are several strategies that may be universally provided to exposed students, regardless of risk for psychological trauma (e.g., reestablishing social support systems). As students are judged more at-risk (i.e., the presence of risk factors and warning signs increase the level of concern), additional crisis interventions are added to support the student (viz., psycho-educational groups, immediate psychological crisis interventions, and longer-term psychotherapy). The specifics for each of these interventions are detailed in Brock et al. (2009).

Examine (E)

The final element of PREPaRE includes examination of the effectiveness of crisis prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery efforts. The importance of these activities cannot be over emphasized, and examination efforts need to occur throughout all phases of the crisis. The primary goals of this element include: (a) assessing effectiveness; (b) improving implementation and management of likely limited resources (e.g., staff time), thus enhancing effectiveness; (c) documenting accomplishments (e.g., consolidating numbers and results of threat assessments conducted); (d) justifying the need for resources to continue accessing or to gain access to them
(e.g., to school boards or superintendents); and (e) satisfying the ethical responsibility to demonstrate positive and negative effects of program participation.

Three strategies are used to examine the effectiveness of prevention efforts. During each phase of the crisis, the evaluation technique may have slightly different methods and purposes. However, generally speaking, needs assessment identifies areas to address within the local context (e.g., the need for lock-down drills for a school located in an urban area with frequent drive-by shootings). Information for this assessment should be obtained from students, teachers and other staff, parents, and relevant community members (e.g., youth organizations located in the neighborhood), as well as discipline records (e.g., office referrals, suspensions, weapons viola-
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Process analysis is conducted to understand specific prevention, preparedness, response and recovery activities implemented, by whom they were implemented, and to what degree established plans were followed. This information may be obtained via questionnaires, surveys, focus groups, or systematic observations. Finally, outcome evaluation, or summative evaluation, assesses the effectiveness of the crisis plan’s documented objectives for the efforts taking place during each phase of the crisis.

Research Support

PREPaRE has undergone a multi-year mixed-method study to document participant satisfaction and assess the extent to which the training has achieved its objectives (which are two essential aspects of program evaluation; Ingvarson, Meiers, & Beavis, 2005). Each PREPaRE workshop participant completes a pre-test and post-test to assess knowledge about key workshop objectives and attitudes towards providing crisis prevention and intervention services. Participants also complete a workshop evaluation to assess satisfaction. Analyses of workshop evaluation data from over 1,000 participants in Workshops 1 and 2, collected from early 2006 to May of 2008, revealed high participant satisfaction (Brock, Nickerson, Reeves, Savage, & Woitaszewski, 2011). Analyses of pre- and post-test data indicated significant improvements in crisis prevention and intervention knowledge, as well as significantly improved attitudes (e.g., confidence in being a crisis team member, and decrease in anxiety about providing crisis interventions). Qualitative analyses of participant comments about the workshops revealed that the active training methods (e.g., role-plays, discussion), content, and materials were perceived as most helpful in improving crisis preparedness. In addition, 83% of participants said they would recommend the training and 27% reported that all school staff should receive the training due to the critical importance of the topic (Brock et al., 2011).

Recognizing the need to collect information from participants after they have completed the training and have reflected on knowledge and adapt it to their own setting (Guskey, 2000), Bauer and Gurdineer (2010) conducted a follow-up study with a random sample of 1,201 participants. Results from this study revealed that the 222 responding participants (18.5% response rate) reported using the knowledge, materials, and skills acquired from the PREPaRE trainings to a moderate extent in their professional roles, $M = 2.64$, $SD = .85$ for Workshop 1 and $M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.01$ for Workshop 2 on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 4 (extensively). The two most frequently endorsed reasons for using the information and skills from the training included personal motivation and experiencing a crisis event; the two most common barriers to using it were lack of time and lack of administrative support. When asked about the degree to which specific changes had been made as a result of PREPaRE training, participants reported that changes made to their schools’ crisis intervention protocols (e.g., including specific interventions such as student psycho-educational groups) occurred to a moderate degree, whereas changes to school crisis teams and crisis plans (e.g., having more team meetings, improving crisis drill procedures) occurred at a minimal level. Overall, results indicated that participants’ schools are in the process of discussing implementation of crisis prevention measures and including specific crisis intervention to crisis intervention protocols.

Bauer and Gurdineer (2010) also surveyed representatives of schools and agencies that sponsored PREPaRE workshops to assess the extent to which changes were made at the school or district level. Two hundred schools and agencies that sponsored PREPaRE were contacted originally, but only 90 of the e-mails were noted as delivered, with 30 of those individuals responding. Of the responding sponsoring schools and organizations, results suggested that schools have made some changes to district policies and procedures as a result of sponsoring
PREPaRE, but that significant additions or changes to school board policy about crisis prevention and intervention have not been made. In terms of need for additional support, the most strongly endorsed suggestion was to work with administrators, followed by offering consultation and follow-up training (Bauer & Gurdineer, 2010).

Taken together, findings from these studies reveal that PREPaRE results in immediate gains in knowledge and more positive attitudes toward crisis prevention and intervention, as well as having high participant satisfaction. School-based utilization of PREPaRE knowledge and skills is reportedly occurring. This is especially true with regard to professional functions over which school-based mental health professionals may have the most control (e.g., utilizing specific interventions as part of a crisis response protocol). Slower changes are occurring on a more system-wide basis and in terms of changes to school board policy, which may be reflected in participants’ endorsement of the need for more consultation and work with administrators.

**Limitations and Future Research Needs**

Further research will help to better understand the attitudes, knowledge, actions, and outcomes associated with participation in PREPaRE workshops and subsequent use of the PREPaRE materials. Future research designs may include comparison groups and schools so that further information may be ascertained regarding the relative impact on knowledge, actions, and outcomes associated with PREPaRE training. In addition, objective follow-up data yielded through observations or documentation may further contribute to self-report data provided by previous respondents. It will be important to obtain responses from larger samples regarding follow-up information, as the self-selection of previous follow-up respondents may influence the information reported.

Future analyses examining the relative attitudes, knowledge, action, and outcomes associated with various school personnel positions would also be valuable, as school psychologists, school nurses, teachers, administrators, and other school-based professionals have attended the PREPaRE trainings. It would be informative to consider the data relative to the previous relevant training that professionals have received to determine whether persons with previous related training benefit more or less compared to those with no previous training. In addition, it would be valuable for future research to explore how changes in attitudes and knowledge are associated with actions and outcomes.

Overall, there is a notable lack of formal research demonstrating the effectiveness of school crisis intervention and response activities. More systematic research is needed. Granted, there are numerous challenges with systematic data collection to examine school crisis team activities, and it is understood that often school teams face these same challenges, including: (a) the unpredictable and infrequent nature of crises, (b) the naturalistic in vivo contexts of schools (as opposed to more controlled laboratory settings conducive to traditional research), (c) the difficulty developing and implementing analyses that test causal questions regarding specific intervention strategies, given the multi-faceted nature of crisis response, and (d) the ethical and professionals concerns raised by conducting controlled research studies with populations in crisis. Thus, much of the existing scholarship consists of anecdotal accounts describing the steps taken and lessons learned following an actual crisis experience (Pagliocca & Nickerson, 2001; Petersen & Straub, 1992). The follow-up research that has been conducted, including that presented in this chapter, is limited by a low response rate and lack of representativeness to schools across the nation.

As discussed by Brock et al. (2009), the PREPaRE model emphasizes that it is imperative to examine the implementation and effectiveness of crisis prevention, preparedness, and response efforts. The school crisis team must designate a school crisis evaluation leader to provide leader-
ship necessary to successfully design, develop, and collect outcome evaluation information. In turn, these data can be used to provide feedback that will help to refine crisis prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery efforts.

The primary purpose of the outcome evaluation is to examine the effectiveness of the crisis response activities in accomplishing targeted objectives. Outcomes that may be appropriate to examination of effectiveness of the response efforts include students’ return to pre-crisis levels of functioning in terms of attendance, interactions with peers and staff, and time engaged in instruction; school personnel return to pre-crisis levels of functioning in terms of attendance and time spent engaged in instruction, and/or student access to support services (e.g., follow through on referrals for mental health services). It is essential that key objectives and outcomes be identified in advance to build a comprehensive overall crisis model that includes prevention and planning, ongoing school programming, and evaluation design. Brock et al. (2009) offer a sample form to evaluate the effectiveness of school crisis response, including questions about reconnecting students and parents, meeting the needs of students with special needs, and outcomes such as student behavior, attendance, and adjustment. They also provide an example of a teacher survey form to examine the effect of a crisis event on academic functioning. Given the short- and long-term objectives commonly identified, it is advisable to include follow-up assessments to provide further information regarding the long-term outcomes associated with the crisis response activities. Previous scholarship examining outcomes associated with crisis prevention efforts provide additional information regarding potential outcomes and measurements that may be appropriate (see Croft, 2005; Nickerson & Osborne, 2006; Pagliocca, Nickerson, & Williams, 2002, for reviews of related scholarship).

Summary

This chapter has used the PREPaRE School Crisis Prevention and Intervention Training Curriculum as a structure for examination of responding to the problems of school violence. PREPaRE is an empirically informed approach that has begun to obtain some quantitative support for its consumer satisfaction, improving crisis prevention and response attitudes, and improving crisis team knowledge. As advocated for by this model, school crisis teams need to be active at all phases of a crisis and need to engage in violence prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery efforts. PREPaRE is consistent with crisis response protocols offered by the U.S. Departments of Education and Homeland Security. Table 34.2 presents practical implications of this chapter. School violence response requires a coordinated effort that does more than react to acts of school violence. While best practice guidelines have been developed, much more research is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 34.2 Implications for Practitioners Addressing School Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• When addressing the problem of school violence school crisis teams must direct resources toward crisis prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School crisis teams need to be active during all crisis phases (i.e., the pre-impact, impact, recoil, post-impact, and recovery and reconstruction phases).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School crisis team development should make use of the National Incident Management System (NIMS), and employ the Incident Command System’s (ICS) five primary functions: management, planning and intelligence, operations, logistics, and finance/administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation and planning is essential in developing effective comprehensive school crisis teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active training techniques may help school personnel acquire and use the knowledge and skill needed to address the problem of school violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More work is needed with school administrators to make system-wide changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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