


School Threat Assessment Team Recommendations: Surveillance Versus Social Support and Racial/Ethnic Equity

Eric Madfis, Jason R. Silva, Franci Crepeau-Hobson, & Michael L. Sulkowski

To cite this article: Eric Madfis, Jason R. Silva, Franci Crepeau-Hobson, & Michael L. Sulkowski (03 Jan 2025): School Threat Assessment Team Recommendations: Surveillance Versus Social Support and Racial/Ethnic Equity, School Psychology Review, DOI: [10.1080/2372966X.2024.2439240](https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2024.2439240)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2024.2439240>

 View supplementary material [↗](#)

 Published online: 03 Jan 2025.

 Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

 View related articles [↗](#)

 View Crossmark data [↗](#)



School Threat Assessment Team Recommendations: Surveillance Versus Social Support and Racial/Ethnic Equity

Eric Madfis^a , Jason R. Silva^b , Franci Crepeau-Hobson,^c , and Michael L. Sulkowski^d 

^aUniversity of Washington—Tacoma; ^bWilliam Paterson University; ^cUniversity of Colorado—Denver; ^dThe University of Alabama

ABSTRACT

Few studies have examined threat assessment team recommendations and how they vary by race/ethnicity, and none have evaluated the particular two-tiered approach of the Salem-Keizer Cascade Model (SKCTAM). The current study investigates school threat assessment team recommendations related to social support and surveillance and how they vary by student race/ethnicity. All recommendations ($n = 274$) were obtained from one large Northwestern school district (with an enrollment of approximately 40,000 students) between the 2012–2013 and 2018–2019 school years. Results indicate an even distribution of supportive and surveillance recommendations and no discernable pattern across these two categories in the most common recommendations. The most prevalent social support recommendations involved encouraging positive future activities, mentorship relationships, mental health services, and safe means of reporting thoughts and intentions to harm others. The most common surveillance recommendations included monitoring communications at school and home and having intermittent check-ins with students following threats. Overall, few differences in recommendations related to race/ethnicity were found. Accordingly, consistent with existing research, threat assessment practices can potentially address critical student issues and prevent school violence more equitably.

IMPACT STATEMENT

This is one of the first studies to investigate threat assessment team recommendations following a threat. This study is also novel by researching the Salem-Keizer Cascade Model (SKCTAM), which is used widely in schools across the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere. Overall study results indicate a roughly even distribution of supportive and surveillance recommendations and few differences in recommendations related to race/ethnicity.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received January 24, 2024
Accepted December 2, 2024

KEYWORDS

school threat assessment, school violence prevention, school discipline, violence risk assessment, school safety


ASSOCIATE EDITOR


Francis Huang

Threat assessment is a research-based form of school violence prevention. However, many questions remain about its implementation and outcomes. Throughout the Pacific Northwest, the most common form of school threat assessment (also known as behavior threat assessment and management) used is the Salem-Keizer Cascade Threat Assessment Model (hereafter SKCTAM). To date, despite broad acceptance and application, this model has not undergone a rigorous and systemic evaluation of the kind done in Virginia (see Cornell, 2020, for an overview) or in Colorado public schools (see Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a, 2022b). More generally, empirical research examining how schools implement and practice threat assessment and systematically analyzing the racial/ethnic proportionality of threat assessment recommendations and outcomes remains far too scarce. Consequently, much more information is needed to better understand threat assessment outcomes in general and the efficacy of

SKCTAM in particular. Further, because the SKCTAM utilizes a particular two-tiered threat assessment team approach, evaluating the recommendations of a second-tier (Level 2) community-level team (rather than first-tier Level 1 school-based teams) is an especially novel and important contribution to the literature.

This study is the first to utilize data on implementing the SKCTAM (see Jackson & Viljoen, 2024, for a review of scholarship on different threat assessment models). By analyzing 7 years of data on all Level 2 team threat assessments (i.e., considered the most serious incidents) conducted in the district, this study examines the types of threat assessment team recommendations to investigate how often they involve various forms of social support versus surveillance strategies for students. Additionally, the study investigates whether these recommendations are proportionally applied to students independent of their race/ethnicity. Thus, this study investigates how often a

CONTACT Eric Madfis  emadfis@uw.edu  School of Social Work & Criminal Justice, University of Washington Tacoma, 1900 Commerce Street, Box 358425, Tacoma, WA 98402, USA.

 Supplemental data for this article can be accessed online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2024.2439240>

© 2024 National Association of School Psychologists

threat assessment team recommends social support versus surveillance strategies for student threats and whether a threat assessment team is more likely to recommend various forms of social support or surveillance for White students versus students of color.

The implications of this study are crucial for policy-makers, educators, and administrators to make informed decisions regarding school safety and threat assessment protocols and resource allocation. Moreover, understanding if disparities exist—or do not exist—in threat assessment recommendations can help with implementing school discipline practices that are less biased than other forms of school discipline such as zero tolerance policies that tend to discriminate against students of color (Skiba, 2015; Skiba et al., 2018, 2002). In turn, this can contribute to more accurate and culturally responsive approaches and data-driven discussions surrounding school safety and the best ways to foster school environments that are both safer and more respectful of the rights and dignity of all students, regardless of their racial or ethnic backgrounds.

SCHOOL THREAT ASSESSMENT

Public schools across the United States are increasingly utilizing threat assessment teams to identify and assess the behavior of students who threaten other students, staff, and/or school visitors (Wang et al., 2022). These school-based teams typically include representatives from school administration, school-employed mental health professionals, and law enforcement. In potentially dangerous or complex cases, a team may draw upon additional professionals in the local community. Depending on the determined level of concern, teams develop and implement intervention strategies to manage threatening behavior by students in ways that promote a safe, supportive educational environment without unnecessarily excluding the student from school (Cornell, 2013; Cornell et al., 2004).

The threat assessment approach differs from problematic forms of violence risk assessment and prediction currently used in schools, such as zero tolerance and profiling strategies (Cornell et al., 2021). Threat assessment focuses on the substantive analysis of existing threats rather than attempts to predict future behavior based on surface-level and aggregate characteristics (Madfis, 2020). This approach emphasizes that people who perpetrate targeted violence lack a homogeneous profile (Vossekuil et al., 2002). However, if a threat is made, then the evaluation of a person's contextual factors, such as background, lifestyle, behaviors, and access to weapons, helps with determining whether the threat is credible and may lead to violence. Essentially, as a general process, threat assessment involves (a) identifying student threats of violence, (b) determining the seriousness of threats, and (c) developing intervention

plans that protect potential victims and address the underlying problems or conflicts that contributed to the threatening behavior. Thus, threat assessment distinguishes between making a threat and posing a threat. Many people who make threats do not pose a serious risk of harm to a target. Further, not all threats are equivalent—how direct, detailed, developed, and actionable the threat is helps to assess its seriousness (Cornell, 2013; Cornell et al., 2004; O'Toole, 2000).

Given that empirical evidence demonstrates that many of the most common forms of school violence prevention are ineffective and even counterproductive (King & Bracy, 2019; Madfis et al., 2021), threat assessment can be viewed as one of the most reliable and evidence-based forms of school violence prevention. For example, Madfis (2020) investigated averted incidents of school rampage attacks and discovered that the proper utilization of threat assessment was often crucial in preventing the perpetration of mass killings. More generally, school threat assessment has been found to reduce bullying (Cornell et al., 2011) and levels of peer victimization (Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015). Studies by Dewey Cornell and colleagues have repeatedly found that threat assessment is an effective approach for managing threats and maintaining school safety, while also keeping students in school and reducing school exclusions (such as suspensions, expulsions, and arrests) that are common with harsh and rigid forms of school discipline such as zero tolerance policies (e.g., Cornell, 2020; Cornell et al., 2004, 2012). As an additional benefit to students and schools, research suggests that threat assessment can diminish the school-to-prison pipeline and unnecessarily harsh punishment for students of color (Cornell et al., 2018; Maeng et al., 2020, 2023). Though questions remain about the best methods for implementing and supporting threat assessment practices to fidelity, it is a crucial approach with promising potential to improve school safety and increase positive school climates and equity in school disciplinary practices.

The Salem-Keizer Cascade Threat Assessment Model

The SKCTAM is a form of behavioral threat assessment created by school psychologists working for Salem-Keizer Public Schools in Oregon. First developed shortly after the Columbine High School shooting, this model was one of the first to be adopted for school-based application, and it is currently used throughout all public schools in Oregon and Washington State as well as in numerous other states across the United States (Van Dreal et al., 2022).

The SKCTAM is unique in several ways. Perhaps because it was developed by school psychologists, it is practitioner-focused in its development and application,

with particular emphases on trauma-informed practices, checks against inequity and bias, and key links between restorative practices and creating positive school climates (Van Dreal et al., 2022). The SKCTAM also employs a two-tiered approach to evaluating threats with two distinct multidisciplinary teams. Level 1 teams are site-based school teams made up of administrators, counselors, school psychologists, social workers, and/or school resource officers or local law enforcement personnel. A school administrator leads this team to interview students, teachers, parents, and anyone else with pertinent information about the student threat. Following interviews, the Level 1 team then determines a course of action for the student and generates various interventions, resources, and supports for the student of concern and the school community. Once the immediate threat has been mitigated, the team moves forward with less supervision and intervention or refers the case to the Level 2 team if additional assessment and support is necessary. Level 2 teams are community collaborations consisting of public agencies that serve youth. This may include members of local law enforcement, juvenile legal systems, child protective services, mental health service agencies, and specific case workers and licensed professionals as appropriate (e.g., juvenile probation counselors, case managers, therapists; Van Dreal et al., 2022).

A key goal of school threat assessment is not merely the assessment of threats but also addressing student issues and conflicts and providing support services to prevent future student problems and concerning behaviors. Similarly, an explicit goal of the SKCTAM is to keep students in school and limit school exclusions to the greatest extent possible (Van Dreal et al., 2022). Accordingly, this model, and threat assessment more generally, has important potential for handling student threats and conflicts while also being consistent with nonpunitive forms of school discipline. That said, prior successful attempts to reduce school exclusions (such as through restorative practices) have not always simultaneously reduced racial/ethnic disparities (see, for example, Davison et al., 2022), and, as such, this pressing issue is worthy of considerably more empirical investigation.

Threat Assessment and Race/Ethnicity

Decades of scholarship demonstrate profound racial and ethnic disparities in student discipline and punishment, as well as in various school violence prevention practices. For example, it is well documented that African American youth are considerably overrepresented in school suspensions and expulsions (Casella, 2001, 2003; Civil Rights Data Collection, 2012; Skiba et al., 2018), even when

socioeconomic indicators are held constant (Skiba, 2015; Skiba et al., 2002) and when their punishments are compared directly to White students who committed identical infractions (Fenning & Rose, 2007). Crenshaw et al. (2015) found that Black girls were disciplined at rates at least 10 times greater than those of White girls and expelled at rates between 10 and 53 times higher. Although the research examining such disparities for Latinx students has been mixed, there is some evidence that these students are also suspended and expelled at disproportionate rates (e.g., Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a; Gage et al., 2021). Even zero-tolerance policies, formed at least in part with the rhetorical goal of uniformity of punishment in mind, have resulted in disproportionate application toward students of color (Kupchik, 2010; Robbins, 2005). Further, predominantly White, affluent communities tend to utilize less invasive forms of school violence prevention, such as design features with enhanced visibility, gates, specialized door locks, and surveillance cameras, compared to far more intrusive security measures, such as the daily use of metal detectors and random weapon searches that are found almost exclusively in urban schools with predominantly students of color (Hirschfield, 2010; see also Addington, 2019).

In contrast, the threat assessment approach has been shown to reduce school exclusions, such as suspensions, expulsions, and arrests, as well as protect against the disproportionate application of disciplinary practices against students of color (Cornell, 2020; Cornell et al., 2018; Maeng et al., 2020). Notably, a study by Cornell et al. (2018) found “no disparities among Black, Hispanic, and White students in out-of-school suspensions, school transfers, or legal actions” (p. 183) in public schools in Virginia, the first state to mandate threat assessment teams. Similarly, in studies of Colorado public schools, research by Crepeau-Hobson and Leech (2022b) found disparities in terms of who is referred to threat assessment teams, though not in outcomes (Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a). Study results revealed that males, students in special education, and African American and Native American students were overrepresented in threat assessment referrals (Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022b). Similarly, findings from a study by Burnette et al. (2020) identified Black students as being more likely to undergo threat assessment, and a study by Maeng et al. (2020) found students in special education were almost four times more likely to undergo a threat assessment and somewhat more likely to be suspended as part of this process when compared to their general education peers. In a later Florida study, however, Maeng et al. (2024) found “students receiving or not receiving special education services ... received comparable disciplinary and law enforcement outcomes” (p. 186).

However, in addition to disciplining or surveilling students, schools implement a variety of nondisciplinary actions in response to threat assessment, including mental health services, behavior support plans, and referrals for a special education evaluation. Crepeau-Hobson and Leech (2022a) found no disparities in 253 threat assessment cases in Colorado schools, including disciplinary actions among Black, Latinx, and White students receiving a threat assessment. Recent research in Florida indicated statistically significant differences in disciplinary actions between White students and students of color (Maeng et al., 2023). However, the differences were quite small in magnitude and well below disparities in school discipline observed in the general school population.

THE CURRENT STUDY

This study examines differences in threat assessment recommendations based on race/ethnicity. As discussed above, prior studies have investigated the disciplinary outcomes of schools practicing threat assessment, but few have analyzed threat assessment team recommendations specifically. The school threat assessment team under investigation in this study made a wide variety of recommendations to address students of concern, some of which qualify as forms of surveillance, others qualify as forms of social support, and some have features of both. Socially supportive threat assessment team recommendations entailed a wide range of mental health, educational, familial, or other social forms of assistance for the student(s) in question. These included everything from social skill building and anger management programs to staff mentorship and revisions of individual educational plans and student schedules. In contrast, many threat assessment team recommendations involved the use of various forms of surveillance for students. These entailed a wide range of suggestions for additional behavioral scrutiny, including monitoring communications, backpack or locker checks, alerting staff and warning potential victims, and notifying or engaging law enforcement of perceived risks.

Certainly, surveillance is warranted as a safety precaution in some cases, but social support is also vitally preventative for mitigating strains, conflicts, and potential acts of violence, while concomitantly fostering prosocial behaviors and a healthy school climate (Forster et al., 2020; Lazarus & Sulkowski, 2023; Levin & Madfis, 2009; Malecki & Demaray, 2002). In a larger social context in which surveillance and social control in school settings are typically exerted in racially biased ways (Hirschfield, 2010; Kupchik, 2010; Kupchik & Ward, 2014; Morris, 2016; Muñoz, 2021), it is vital to assess whether (and to what extent) threat

assessment teams exhibit racial or ethnic bias in their decision making.¹ There are important implications for policy and practice related to increasing equity in school systems around this issue. Thus, it is also important to assess whether racially disproportionate outcomes are absent in the recommendations of SKCTAM threat assessment teams consistent with threat assessment studies in Virginia and Colorado.

Prior scholarship suggests that school threat assessment can reduce or erase racially disproportionate disciplinary consequences for students of color (Cornell et al., 2018; Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a; Maeng et al., 2020). However, very little research has examined how threat assessment team recommendations vary by race/ethnicity (see Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a, for a notable exception), and none have evaluated SKCTAM's particular two-tiered approach. School psychologists developed this model; thus, it has a particular practitioner-focused lens. Further, the distinction between Level 1 and Level 2 threat assessment teams is also novel to this model, so it typically entails more involvement from community members and organizations (such as juvenile legal systems professionals and mental health providers outside of the school setting, etc.) when compared to other models (Van Dreal et al., 2022).

Previous studies investigating school threat assessment have studied schools in Virginia, Colorado, and Florida (Cornell, 2020; Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a, 2022b; Maeng et al., 2023), but there have been none in places like the Pacific Northwest, where the SKCTAM has been adopted. The current study adds to prior scholarship by investigating school threat assessment team recommendations in a Northwestern school district and how they vary by the race/ethnicity of students. This research examines all Level 2 threat assessment team recommendations (which were considered the most severe and serious incidents) made by the Level 2 team in the school district between the 2012–2013 and 2018–2019 school years. This study aims to assess how often recommendations involved various forms of social support versus various forms of surveillance for students in the wake of potential threats to determine whether these decisions entailed disproportionate scrutiny or punitiveness toward students of color. To address this, we examined the following research questions:

RQ1: How often did the school threat assessment team recommend social support versus surveillance for student threats?

RQ2: Are there differences in school threat assessment recommendations for various forms of social support and surveillance based on race/ethnicity?

METHOD

Participants

Participants were largely male (85%) and an average age of 12 years old. There was a relatively even distribution between students in elementary school (34%), middle school (36%), and high school (30%). The race/ethnicity variables were obtained directly from Student Threat Assessment and Management System (STAMS²) investigations and the district's categorization of participating students by race/ethnicity. Most students are White (57%), followed by Hispanic (27%). Students were less commonly American Indian/Native Alaskan (4%), Black (3%), Native Hawaiian/Asian or Pacific Islander (2%), or two or more races/ethnicities (7%).

This somewhat aligns with the general racial/ethnic student populations in the school district: White (46%), Hispanic (42%), American Indian/Native Alaskan (2%), Black (1%), Native Hawaiian/Asian or Pacific Islander (3%), or two or more races/ethnicities (6%).³ However, it is noteworthy that White students more commonly received threat assessments than the general population, and Hispanic students less commonly received threat assessments than the general population. Additionally, though Black students only accounted for 1% of the general population, they accounted for 3% of the students who received threat assessments. However, this was not a statistically significant difference.

Procedure

Data were obtained from all threat assessment records conducted in a relatively large Oregon school district (with an enrollment of approximately 40,000 students) between the 2012–2013 and 2018–2019 school years. The data were coded from the Risk Level 2: STAMS for all students during these years. Level 2 team recommendations were chosen for analysis because these assessments were utilized for the most serious and severe threats during the aforementioned 7-year window. The Level 2 team maintains hard copies and an electronic database of Level 2 records operated by the district.

A total of 297 Level 2 STAMS investigations that resulted in recommendations were included in the current study.⁴ However, the number of included investigations was reduced for two reasons. First, 20 students had more than one investigation over the analyzed time period. Therefore, only the most recent investigation was included because the recommendations were identical (or almost identical), and an effort was made not to inflate findings. Second, two cases were excluded because of missing information: One investigation did not provide

recommendations, and another did not provide the student's race/ethnicity. In total, 274 STAMS investigations were examined.

These investigations include recommendations generated through the efforts of the school district's Student Threat Assessment Team.⁵ This consultation team assesses the risk of potential violence and assists case managers in applying resources to manage and decrease the possibility of attack and protect potential victims. It also helps students to develop and employ healthy and safe coping strategies.

Recommendation Variables

Each STAMS investigation includes a numeric list of recommendations. Lists were used to develop a codebook capturing all recommendations, resulting in a total of 67. All recommendations were binary coded: Not recommended = 0; recommended = 1. There were no major discrepancies in coding, because all information is delineated and outlined in the list of recommendations. However, two coders coded all cases for verification to ensure correspondence and data integrity. Any discrepancies from coder error were fixed after review and cross-comparison.

Though we originally coded all 67 variables, this produced an overwhelming amount of data. Each student received an average of 17 recommendations. Therefore, to address this issue, recommendations for less than 40 students were excluded. To this end, the current study examines the 33 most common recommendations (see Appendix Table A1). These recommendations were then categorized into one of three categories: Supportive recommendations, surveillance recommendations, and multipurpose recommendations (i.e., supportive and surveillance). For 7 variables, the recommendations involved both supportive and surveillance functions, and they were thus categorized as multipurpose recommendations. After assigning these recommendations into three categories, to establish content validity, the school district was consulted to confirm that each recommendation aligned with these categorizations.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics (v23) (IBM Corp., 2020). The first research question (RQ1) was addressed using a descriptive table to determine how often the school threat assessment team recommended social support recommendation variables versus surveillance recommendation variables for student threats (see Table 1). Two approaches were used to address the second research question (RQ2).

Table 1. Most Common Supportive and Surveillance Student Recommendations ($N = 274$)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%	Measure
Communications monitor	251	91.6	Surveillance
Inhibitors	234	84.5	Supportive
Mentor	231	84.3	Supportive
Monitor home	215	78.4	Surveillance
Interventions	208	75.9	Supportive
Mental health	208	75.9	Supportive
Intermittent check	175	63.9	Surveillance
Staff alert	168	61.3	Surveillance
Safe home	164	59.9	Surveillance
Behavior skills	138	50.3	Supportive
Education plan	137	50.0	Supportive
Daily check	136	49.6	Surveillance
Safety plan	135	49.2	Surveillance
Individual accountability plan	133	48.5	Multipurpose
Behavior team	123	44.9	Multipurpose
Special education	123	44.9	Supportive
Community programs	122	44.5	Supportive
Victim	118	43.1	Surveillance
Unsupervised time	115	42.0	Surveillance
Youth services team	113	41.2	Supportive
Social media	103	37.6	Surveillance
Social work	89	32.5	Supportive
Record release	82	29.9	Multipurpose
Schedule modification	73	26.6	Multipurpose
Family support	62	22.6	Supportive
Suicide assessment	61	22.3	Multipurpose
Parent gun statement	59	21.5	Surveillance
Courses	51	18.6	Supportive
Law	46	16.8	Surveillance
Parent training	44	16.1	Supportive
Transport	41	15.0	Multipurpose
Parent statement	40	15.0	Multipurpose
Probation/parole officer	40	15.0	Surveillance

These include chi-square tests of independence and logistic regressions analyzing the 33 recommendation variables.

Chi-square tests of independence were used to determine differences between recommendations for White students and students of color (see Table 2). As a commonly used measure of association between two nominal variables, Cramer's *V* was applied to measure the magnitude of these respective differences (McHugh, 2013). For in-depth insight, descriptive tables also outline the differences in recommendations across the six race/ethnicity categories (see Online Appendix Tables A3–A5). However, given the small number of students with certain racial/ethnic backgrounds, the comparative analyses combined all non-White racial categories ($n = 118$; 43%) to determine whether the threat assessment team was more likely to recommend various forms of surveillance for students of color. Nonetheless, due to the high rate of Hispanic students in the non-White comparison group, we also tested for respective group differences in recommendations using chi-square tests of independence (see Online Appendix Table A6).

Thirty-three independent logistic regression models were specified with race as the independent variable and the various recommendations as the dependent variable (see Table 3). Because the dependent variable was binary coded for each recommendation (0 = no recommendation,

1 = recommendation), logistic regression was the appropriate statistical method (Hosmer et al., 2013). Odds ratios were calculated to illustrate the robustness of findings. Additionally, to protect against false-discovery results or Type 1 errors, we also applied Benjamini-Hochberg corrections with race/ethnicity predicting recommendations (see Online Appendix Table A7).

To provide further insight, a logistic regression test was used to assess differences in recommendations by race/ethnicity in a single model (see Table A2). We took a somewhat unique approach that would allow for all recommendation variables in a single analysis, using the recommendations to predict race. In other words, we reversed the initial logistic regression model: the independent variables were types of recommendations, and the dependent variable was students' race/ethnicity. Sensitivity checks were also conducted with student sex, age, and grade-level control variables (see Online Appendix Tables A8–A10).

RESULTS

Across the 33 variables included in this study, there was an even distribution of supportive ($n = 13$) and surveillance ($n = 13$) recommendations, as well as seven multipurpose recommendations. As shown in Table 1, there was no

Table 2. Differences between Recommendations for White Students and Students of Color

Variables	White students (n = 156)		Students of color (n = 118)		χ^2	Cramer's V
	n	%	n	%		
Surveillance						
Communications monitor	144	92.3	107	90.7	0.232	0.029
Daily check	80	51.3	56	47.5	0.393	0.038
Intermittent check	101	64.7	74	62.7	0.120	0.021
Law	26	16.7	20	16.9	0.004	0.004
Monitor home	118	75.6	97	82.2	1.712	0.079
Parent gun statement	38	24.4	21	17.8	1.712	0.079
Probation/parole officer	18	11.5	22	18.6	2.721	0.100
Safe home	96	61.5	68	57.6	0.428	0.040
Safety plan	74	47.4	61	51.7	0.488	0.042
Social media	58	37.2	45	38.1	0.026	0.010
Staff alert	96	61.5	72	61.0	0.008	0.005
Unsupervised time	64	41.0	51	43.2	0.133	0.022
Victim	67	42.9	51	43.2	0.002	0.003
Supportive						
Behavior skills	81	51.9	57	48.3	0.533	0.036
Community programs	63	40.4	59	50.0	2.515	0.096
Courses	34	21.8	17	14.4	2.421	0.094
Education plan	78	50.0	59	50.0	0.000	0.000
Family support	36	23.2	26	22.0	0.054	0.014
Inhibitors	133	85.3	101	85.6	0.006	0.005
Interventions	118	75.6	90	76.3	0.015	0.007
Mental health	118	75.6	90	76.3	0.015	0.007
Mentor	130	83.3	101	85.6	0.259	0.031
Parent training	25	16.1	19	16.1	0.000	0.001
Social work	53	34.0	36	30.5	0.368	0.037
Special education	80	51.3	43	36.4	5.982*	0.148*
Youth services team	61	39.1	52	44.1	0.683	0.050
Multipurpose						
Behavior team	83	53.2	40	33.9	10.123***	0.192***
Individual accountability plan	74	47.4	59	50	0.177	0.025
Parent statement	21	13.5	19	16.1	0.376	0.037
Record release	48	30.8	34	28.8	0.123	0.021
Schedule modification	48	30.8	25	21.2	3.157	0.077
Suicide assessment	36	23.1	25	21.2	0.139	0.023
Transport	31	19.9	10	8.5	6.858**	0.158**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

discernable pattern in the most common recommendations across these three categories. Of the top 10 most common recommendations, five were surveillance and five were social support. The most common supportive recommendations included inhibitors (84.5%), mentors (84.3%), interventions (75.9%), and mental health (75.9%). *Inhibitors* refers to identifying and further developing hopeful future options (e.g., activities, relationships, or experiences of value) that inhibit the possibility of acting out. *Mentor* refers to identifying and assigning staff or community members to build trusting relationships through check-in or mentorship. *Interventions* refers to providing means by which students may safely report and discuss thoughts or intentions to harm others and receive

Table 3. Individual Logistic Regressions With Race Predicting Recommendations

Outcome	Coefficient (B)	SE	Wald	p Value	Odds ratio
Communications monitor	0.210	0.437	0.231	.630	1.234
Daily check	0.153	0.244	0.393	.531	1.165
Intermittent check	0.088	0.254	0.120	.729	1.092
Law	-0.020	0.326	0.004	.951	0.980
Monitor home	-0.397	0.304	1.701	.192	0.672
Parent gun statement	0.397	0.304	1.701	.192	1.487
Probation/parole officer	-0.564	0.344	2.676	.102	0.569
Safe home	0.163	0.249	0.427	.513	1.176
Safety plan	-0.170	0.244	0.487	.485	0.843
Social media	-0.041	0.252	0.026	.871	0.960
Staff alert	0.022	0.250	0.008	.930	1.022
Unsupervised time	-0.090	0.247	0.133	.716	0.914
Victim	-0.011	0.246	0.002	.964	0.989
Behavior skills	0.145	0.244	0.352	.553	1.156
Community programs	-0.389	0.246	2.506	.113	0.677
Courses	0.504	0.326	2.391	.122	1.656
Education plan	0.000	0.244	0.000	1.000	1.000
Family support	0.060	0.292	0.042	.838	1.062
Inhibitors	-0.027	0.346	0.006	.938	0.973
Interventions	-0.035	0.286	0.015	.904	0.966
Mental health	-0.035	0.286	0.015	.904	0.966
Mentor	-0.172	0.339	0.259	.611	0.842
Parent training	-0.006	0.332	0.000	.986	0.994
Social work	0.159	0.262	0.368	.544	1.172
Special education	0.608	0.249	5.930	.015*	1.836
Youth services team	-0.205	0.248	0.683	.409	0.815
Behavior team	0.796	0.252	9.973	.002**	2.217
Individual accountability plan	-0.103	0.244	0.177	.674	0.902
Parent statement	-0.210	0.343	0.375	.540	0.811
Record release	0.094	0.267	0.122	.726	1.098
Schedule modification	0.503	0.284	3.127	.077	1.653
Suicide assessment	0.110	0.295	0.139	.710	1.116
Transport	0.985	0.387	6.492	.011*	2.678

Note. Coefficients shown are for White students (vs. students of color) predicting the outcome.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

appropriate intervention. *Mental health* refers to pursuing crisis and/or mental health services either within the school system or externally.

The most common surveillance recommendations included communications monitor (91.6%), monitor home (78.4%), and intermittent check (63.9%). In other words, enhanced monitoring and supervising students' behaviors (*communications monitor*) and randomly searching students (e.g., their backpack, locker, pocket, or purse) in the school setting, as well as enhanced monitoring and supervising students' behaviors in the home setting (*monitor home*), were the primary forms of recommended surveillance.

Multipurpose recommendations were less common overall. Nonetheless, the two most common multipurpose recommendations were individual accountability plans (48.5%) and behavior teams (44.9%). An *individual accountability plan* refers to modifying or establishing a

specialized plan to review elements of a student's day, behavior, and goals for which the student will be responsible and accountable for managing. The *behavior team* recommends a referral to a team of specialists to support school staff in understanding and responding to challenging student behavior.

As shown in [Table 2](#), the chi-square analyses reveal limited differences in student race/ethnicity recommendations. Of the 33 variables, only three significantly differed, including one social support variable and two multipurpose variables. Specifically, White students were significantly more likely to receive a special education recommendation ($\chi^2 = 5.982, p < .05, V = 0.148$). This includes a 504 evaluation (to provide support for children with disabilities) and an autism specialist recommendation, as well as psychoeducational evaluations. White students were also more likely to receive behavior team ($\chi^2 = 10.123, p < .001, V = 0.192$) and transport ($\chi^2 = 6.858, p < .01, V = 0.158$) recommendations. The latter includes changes to parent drop-off/pick-up and bus transportation, as well as transportation resources to other appointments.⁶

We conducted 33 individual logistic regression analyses using race to predict recommendations (see [Table 3](#)). Significant findings were consistent with the chi-square analyses (see [Table 2](#)) finding that White students were more likely to receive special education, behavior team, and transport recommendations than students of color.⁷

The chi-square and individual logistic regression analyses (see [Tables 2](#) and [3](#)) provide consistent results showing only three differences in recommendations between White students and students of color. To offer further insight into other potential differences, we took an approach enabling all recommendation variables in a single analysis, using the recommendations to predict race (see [Appendix Table 2](#)). Only three variables were statistically significant when comparing White students and students of color, including one surveillance recommendation variable, one supportive recommendation variable, and one multipurpose recommendation variable. Like the initial analyses (see [Tables 2](#) and [3](#)), White students were more likely than students of color to receive a transport recommendation ($b = -1.351$; odds ratio [OR] = 3.862; $p < .01$). However, using this alternative approach two new findings emerged: White students were less likely than students of color to receive a probation/parole officer recommendation ($b = -0.892$, OR = 0.410, $p < .05$), as well as a community programs recommendation ($b = -0.997$, OR = 0.369, $p < .01$). *Probation/parole officer* refers to notifying or engaging the parole or probation office about student problems. *Community programs* refers to engaging in programs and resources (e.g., government, nonprofit, and faith-based)

that can offer a positive experience and outlet in a student's life. No statistically significant differences between White students and students of color were observed for the most common recommendations.

Sensitivity checks were also conducted with student sex, age, and grade-level control variables. The full logistic regression (from [Table A2](#)) with control variables found that the three statistically significant results (i.e., probation/parole officer, community programs, and transport) remained significant and no new recommendation variables were statistically significant (see [Online Appendix Table A8](#)).⁸ A logistic regression model that only includes the five statistically significant variables (from [Tables 2, 3](#), and [A2](#)) and the control variables found that transport (significant in [Tables 2, 3](#), and [A2](#)), behavior team (significant in [Tables 2](#) and [3](#)), probation/parole officer (significant in [Table A2](#)), and community programs (significant in [Table A2](#)) remained statistically significant, whereas special education (significant in [Tables 2](#) and [3](#)) was not statistically significant (see [Online Appendix Table A10](#)).

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to understand the prevalence of the school threat assessment team's recommendations for social support versus surveillance for student threats. Prior studies have investigated the disciplinary outcomes of schools practicing threat assessment (e.g., Cornell et al., 2018; Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a; Maeng et al., 2020, 2023). However, this is one of the first to specifically analyze threat assessment team recommendations and potential disparities and the first to examine the SKCTAM. SKCTAM is unique in its particular two-tiered approach to threat assessment. Though other schools and districts utilize two or multiple tiers, SKCTAM is the only recognized "model" that specifically utilizes a second-tier interdisciplinary community level team.

Three categories of recommendations for Level 2 threats (those that are considered the most serious) were examined: Supportive recommendations, surveillance recommendations, and multipurpose recommendations (i.e., supportive and surveillance). Findings illustrate an even distribution of supportive and surveillance recommendations, and there was no discernable pattern in the most common recommendations across these two categories. In general, the threat assessment team made multiple recommendations for both social support and surveillance for each student of concern. This aligns with best practice recommendations that discourage blanket approaches to school discipline (NASP School Safety and Crisis Response Committee, 2020), as well as findings from other studies (e.g., Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a; Maeng et al., 2023).

The most common supportive recommendations made by the threat assessment team were geared toward (a) identifying and further developing positive future activities to inhibit the possibility of acting out, (b) fostering the development of trusting relationships through check-ins or mentorship with supportive adults, (c) opportunities to safely report and discuss thoughts or intentions to harm others and receive appropriate intervention, and (d) pursuing crisis and/or mental health services either within the school system or externally. Such recommendations are consistent with outcomes of threat assessments in Colorado (Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a) and align with best practices: Fostering strong student–teacher relationships and positive peer interactions are key components of promoting school safety and preventing school violence (Coyle et al., 2022). Positive student–teacher relationships are important for students from minoritized backgrounds. Previous research found that strengthening student–teacher relationships improved school belonging, decreased problem behaviors, and increased grade point average and emotional regulation (Gaias et al., 2020). Indeed, there is evidence that schools that provide multiple opportunities for students to feel a sense of belonging are generally much safer than those that do not (Brookmeyer et al., 2006).

Surveillance recommendations included enhanced monitoring and supervising students’ behaviors and randomly searching students in the school setting, as well as enhanced monitoring and supervising students’ behaviors in the home setting. Such strategies may be warranted as a safety precaution but should be paired with social support to mitigate conflicts and prevent acts of violence effectively (Forster et al., 2020; Lazarus & Sulkowski, 2023; Levin & Madfis, 2009; Malecki & Demaray, 2002). Study findings provide evidence that the threat assessment team recommended a variety of both surveillance and supportive strategies for students of concern.

Given that surveillance and social control in school settings are typically exerted in a manner that reflects structural racism (Hirschfield, 2010; Kupchik, 2010; Kupchik & Ward, 2014; Morris, 2016; Muñiz, 2021; Payne & Welch, 2023), this study also aimed to understand whether school threat assessment teams were more likely to recommend various forms of surveillance for students of color. The results illustrate that only a handful of recommendation differences were associated with race/ethnicity. Specifically, White students were consistently identified as more likely to be recommended for a special education evaluation, a behavior team referral, and transportation adjustments (e.g., bus transportation). Importantly, initial study findings revealed no significant differences in the surveillance recommendations between

White students and students of color. This finding is important because the oversurveillance of racially minoritized youth often contributes to their overrepresentation in the criminal legal system (Crutchfield et al., 2009; Gase et al., 2016). The parity in surveillance recommendations for White students and students of color supports the utility of behavior threat assessment and management in reducing racial and ethnic disparities in the use of surveillance and social control in school settings.

These findings differ from a previous study in Colorado, in which racial/ethnic differences were not observed in any threat assessment outcomes (Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a). Additionally, multipurpose recommendations were less common in our sample than what Crepeau-Hobson and Leech (2022a) found in Colorado. That said, two multipurpose strategies were most recommended in the current study. These included modifying or establishing a specialized plan to review elements of a student’s day, behavior, and/or goals and making referrals to a team of specialists.

To offer further insight into potential student race/ethnicity differences in recommendations, this study also subverted the traditional analytic approach used in previous studies in Colorado, Virginia, and Florida (Cornell et al., 2018; Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a; Maeng et al., 2023). Using this somewhat unique approach, findings illustrate two additional significant differences. Students of color were more likely to be recommended for a referral to a community program, perhaps in recognition of the lower re-offense rates observed in juvenile legal systems–involved youth who are supported by community-based services compared with those who are not (Cuellar et al., 2006). Recommendations related to contacting the parole or probation office about student problems were also made more often for students of color. This difference is likely related to preexisting inequities as minoritized youth are more likely than their White peers to be arrested and subsequently go deeper into juvenile legal systems (Puzzanchera, 2021; Sickmund et al., 2021). Thus, this finding suggests that students of color were more likely to have preexisting involvement with juvenile legal systems, so the team recommended consultation with their probation/parole officer. Consistent with established threat assessment guidelines (see Cornell, 2013, and Cornell et al., 2018), there is no compelling reason to involve a probation/parole officer if the student is not already in the system. This finding then speaks to the overrepresentation of students of color in juvenile legal systems as a broader issue beyond the threat assessment process.

Ultimately, using a variety of analytic approaches and sensitivity tests, this study only identified five (out of 33 total) recommendations with differences between White

students and students of color. This emphasizes the value of threat assessment in providing equitable recommendations for students from minoritized backgrounds. Though this study largely focused on White students versus all students of color, when looking specifically at differences between White and Hispanic students, two additional significant differences emerged: White students were more likely than Hispanic students to be recommended for a schedule modification and training for their parents. Explaining the causes and implications of these differences is beyond the scope of the current study; however, this is an area that warrants further research. Regardless, these supplementary findings again provide no evidence of differences in surveillance, because these two recommendations fall within the social support and multipurpose categories.

Limitations

Despite the value of this study, there are inherent limitations based on the available information provided by the school district. First, given that records were provided by the school district, researchers had no control over the accuracy of the data in those records, and some of the data may not accurately reflect the students who received a threat assessment or the recommendations that resulted. Additionally, due to issues with data availability, this study only examines the recommendations provided by the STAMS investigations. The school district records major updates but does not keep track of whether all recommendations were implemented. Thus, though previous research (Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a) has used recommendations to conclude that there was a lack of racial/ethnic disproportionality, we cannot conclude that all students were treated equitably in practice. It is also important to note that the Level 2 team is a consultation team that makes recommendations but cannot mandate that they occur. Thus, it would be beneficial for both future research and threat assessment practice if school districts maintained more complete records and included the extent to which team recommendations are actually carried out. Also, it would be beneficial if, going forward, schools would record the race/ethnicity of people threatened and the racial/ethnic composition of threat assessment team members, because this would enable greater insight into the question of racial disproportionality at the heart of this study. Nonetheless, the data included in this study offer uniquely valuable insight for understanding the type of recommendations students receive.

Second, in this study, we do not include the circumstances and level of risk surrounding the incidents that initiated the threat assessment, which may have

contributed to differences in race/ethnicity recommendations. Nonetheless, this study only includes the Risk Level 2: STAMS Investigations, which are used during the most severe cases of students of concern—where the initial internal school threat assessment team deemed it necessary to convene an additional community-level team. In other words, all incidents included in this study would be considered relatively high risk (in relation to incidents only examined by Level 1 teams internal to the school). That said, it would be valuable for future research to explore the patterns and outcomes of SKCTAM Level 1 teams, because these have yet to be empirically evaluated. Likewise, it would be beneficial for future scholarship to examine transfers from Level 1 to Level 2 teams and investigate, for example, differences in transfer decisions among various cases and between different teams or schools. Additionally, future research should examine the nature of the threat assessment plans developed by teams. Such research could provide valuable information and guidance to school psychologists and others who serve on such teams regarding how best to intervene and support students who make serious threats.

Third, although the present study was diverse in terms of ethnicity, there was limited diversity in terms of race, with 3% of the sample identifying as Black. Further, all participants attended a single school district in the Northwestern United States. As such, caution should be used in generalizing the findings from this district to others in terms of the demographics of students assessed. The conclusion regarding the apparent parity in surveillance recommendations for White students and students of color was based on the absence of statistically significant findings. Further, in the current study, no large effects were identified between recommendations between demographic variables. Thus, future research should utilize additional methodologies and larger sample sizes to examine the process that threat assessment teams use to generate plans for students from different racial and ethnic groups.

Finally, the data provided by the school district did not include student disability status and thus any potential differences between students with disabilities and those without could not be examined. Given that previous research has found some disparities in threat assessment referrals and outcomes in this regard (e.g., Cornell et al., 2018; Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022b), this is an additional limitation of the present study.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The benefits of using threat assessment in schools have been well established. Some of these include reducing rates

of bullying (Cornell et al., 2009) and aggressive behavior in students (Nekvasil & Cornell, 2015). There is also evidence that the use of threat assessment can impact school discipline practices, including a reduction in the use of school suspension (Cornell et al., 2009, 2011; Cornell & Lovegrove, 2015), racial disparities in long-term suspensions and expulsions (Cornell et al., 2018; Crepeau-Hobson & Leech, 2022a), and referrals to law enforcement (Maeng et al., 2023). Consistent with previous research, findings from the present study provide further support for using threat assessment to address student issues and preventing violence more justly and equitably than strictly punitive and exclusionary disciplinary practices. Given that school psychologists are expected to promote equity and social justice in educational programs and in service delivery (National Association of School Psychologists, 2020), increased research is needed on threat assessment recommendations that can lead to greater equity in school discipline and support.

NOTES

1. Racial disproportionality does not necessarily indicate racial bias (if, for example, rates or types of substantive threats are actually different across racial/ethnic groups), but if threat assessment practices can reduce or eliminate racial disproportionality, this represents a significant improvement over many more problematic practices.
2. STAMS is the system used to maintain the SKCTAM records in this school district.
3. The general student populations are based on available 2015–2019 school district records. Official general student population records for 2012–2014 were not provided by the school district. Nonetheless, an examination of the STAMS investigation students, as well as the general student populations, by year, found that these proportions were relatively consistent during each school year.
4. For comparison's sake, this amounts to roughly 42 Level 2 cases annually, though there were roughly 172 Level 1 cases per year.
5. We have not identified the specific school district to help maintain student confidentiality. All identifying information (such as student/parent names) was removed by the district before researchers gained access to the data. The recommendations were made by a single community-based team. This includes members from the school district but also community agency partners. The size of the team varies over time but tends to be around 20 to 25 people. The membership is fairly stable but varies case to case depending on attendance at the meeting and retirements/job transitions over time.
6. Due to the high rate of Hispanic students in the non-White comparison group, we also compared White and Hispanic students (see Online Appendix Table A6). The three significant findings from Table 2 were the same. White students were also more likely to receive parent training and schedule modification recommendations.
7. We also ran the individual logistic regressions using Benjamini-Hochberg corrections (see Online Appendix Table A7). Again, significant findings were consistent with those in Tables 2 and 3.
8. A logistic regression model (see Online Appendix Table A9) with only the three significant variables (from Table A2) and the control variables found that the three variables remained significant and no control variables were significant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Eleanor (Heath) Beauchamp, Melissa Edmiston, and James Pyle for their research support for this project.

DISCLOSURE

The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

FUNDING

This work was supported by funding from the Vatheuer Family Foundation and the Koshka Foundation for Safe Schools.

ORCID

Eric Madfis  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7475-3465>
 Jason R. Silva  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9544-9780>
 Franci Crepeau-Hobson,  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3696-0981>
 Michael L. Sulkowski  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3943-9136>

REFERENCES

- Addington, L. A. (2019). Black girls doing time for White boys' crime? Considering Columbine's security legacy through an intersectional lens. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 35(3), 296–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10439862198402>
- Brookmeyer, K. A., Fanti, K. A., & Henrich, C. C. (2006). Schools, parents, and youth violence: A multilevel, ecological analysis. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 35(4), 504–514. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp3504_2
- Burnette, A. G., Konold, T., & Cornell, D. (2020). Grade-level distinctions in student threats of violence. *Journal of School Violence*, 19(3), 323–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2019.1694031>
- Casella, R. (2001). *Being down: Challenging violence in urban schools*. Teachers College Press.
- Casella, R. (2003). The false allure of security technologies. *Social Justice*, 30(3), 82–93.
- Civil Rights Data Collection. (2012). *U.S. Dept. of Education Office for Civil Rights*. Department of Education. <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-2012-data-summary.pdf>
- Cornell, D. G. (2013). The Virginia student threat assessment guidelines: An empirically supported violence prevention strategy. In N. Böckler, W. Heitmeyer, P. Sitzer, & T. Seeger

- (Eds.), *School shootings: International research, case studies, and concepts for prevention* (pp. 379–400). Springer.
- Cornell, D. G. (2020). Threat assessment as a school violence prevention strategy. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 19(1), 235–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12471>
- Cornell, D. G., Allen, K., & Fan, X. (2012). A randomized controlled study of the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines in grades K-12. *School Psychology Review*, 41(1), 100–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2012.12087378>
- Cornell, D. G., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2011). Reductions in long-term suspensions following adoption of the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines. *NASSP Bulletin*, 95(3), 175–194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636511415255>
- Cornell, D. G., & Lovegrove, P. (2015). Student threat assessment as a method of reducing student suspensions. In D. J. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 180–191). Teachers College Press.
- Cornell, D. G., Maeng, J., Huang, F., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2018). Racial/ethnic parity in disciplinary consequences using student threat assessment. *School Psychology Review*, 47(2), 183–195. <https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2017-0030.V47-2>
- Cornell, D. G., Mayer, M. J., & Sulkowski, M. L. (2021). History and future of school safety research. *School Psychology Review*, 50(2-3), 143–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2020.1857212>
- Cornell, D. G., Sheras, P., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2009). A retrospective study of school safety conditions in high schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines versus alternative approaches. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24(2), 119–129. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016182>
- Cornell, D. G., Sheras, P. L., Kaplan, S., McConville, D., Douglass, J., Elkon, A., McKnight, L., Branson, C., & Cole, J. (2004). Guidelines for student threat assessment: Field-test findings. *School Psychology Review*, 33(4), 527–546. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2004.12086266>
- Coyle, S., Weinreb, K. S., Davila, G., & Cuellar, M. (2022). Relationships matter: The protective role of teacher and peer support in understanding school climate for victimized youth. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 51(1), 181–203. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-021-09620-6>
- Crenshaw, K. W., Ocen, P., & Nanda, J. (2015). *Black girls matter: Pushed out, overpoliced and underprotected*. Center for Intersectionality and Social Policy Studies.
- Crepeau-Hobson, F., & Leech, N. (2022a). Disciplinary and nondisciplinary outcomes of school-based threat assessment in Colorado schools. *School Psychology Review*, 51(5), 609–618. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2020.1842716>
- Crepeau-Hobson, F., & Leech, N. (2022b). An exploratory investigation of threat assessment practices in Colorado schools. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 26(4), 458–468. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-021-00356-7>
- Crutchfield, R. D., Skinner, M. L., Haggerty, K. P., McGlynn, A., & Catalano, R. F. (2009). Racial disparities in early criminal justice involvement. *Race and Social Problems*, 1(4), 218–230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-009-9018-y>
- Cuellar, A., McReynolds, L., & Wasserman, G. (2006). A cure for crime: Can mental health treatment diversion reduce crime among youth? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 25(1), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20162>
- Davison, M., Penner, A., & Penner, E. (2022). Restorative for all? Racial disproportionality and school discipline under restorative justice. *American Educational Research Journal*, 59(4), 687–718. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312211062613>
- Finning, P., & Rose, J. (2007). Overrepresentation of African American students in exclusionary discipline: The role of school policy. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 536–559. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085907305039>
- Forster, M., Grigsby, T. J., Gower, A. L., Mehus, C. J., & McMorris, B. J. (2020). The role of social support in the association between childhood adversity and adolescent self-injury and suicide: Findings from a statewide sample of high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 49(6), 1195–1208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01235-9>
- Gaias, L. M., Cook, C. R., Nguyen, L., Brewer, S. K., Brown, E. C., Kiche, S., Shi, J., Buntain-Ricklefs, J., & Duong, M. T. (2020). A mixed methods pilot study of an equity-explicit student-teacher relationship intervention for the ninth-grade transition. *The Journal of School Health*, 90(12), 1004–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12968>
- Gage, N. A., Katsiyannis, A., Carrero, K. M., Miller, R., & Pico, D. (2021). Exploring disproportionate discipline for Latinx students with and without disabilities: A national analysis. *Behavioral Disorders*, 47(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0198742920961356>
- Gase, L. N., Glenn, B. A., Gomez, L. M., Kuo, T., Inkelas, M., & Ponce, N. A. (2016). Understanding racial and ethnic disparities in arrest: The role of individual, home, school, and community characteristics. *Race and Social Problems*, 8(4), 296–312. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-016-9183-8>
- Hirschfield, P. (2010). School surveillance in America: Disparate and unequal. In T. Monahan & R. D. Torress (Eds.), *Schools under surveillance: Cultures of control in public education* (pp. 38–54). Rutgers University Press.
- Hosmer, D. W., Jr, Lemeshow, S., & Sturdivant, R. X. (2013). *Applied logistic regression*. John Wiley & Sons.
- IBM Corp. (2020). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows (Version 23.0)* [Computer software]. IBM Corp.
- Jackson, J., & Viljoen, J. (2024). Preventing school violence: A review of school threat assessment models. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*, 11(1), 48–65. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tam0000204>
- King, S., & Bracy, N. (2019). School security in the post-Columbine era: Trends, consequences, and future directions. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 35(3), 274–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986219840188>
- Kupchik, A. (2010). *Homeroom security: School discipline in an age of fear*. NYU Press.
- Kupchik, A., & Ward, G. (2014). Race, poverty, and exclusionary school security: An empirical analysis of US elementary, middle, and high schools. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 12(4), 332–354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204013503890>
- Lazarus, P. J., & Sulkowski, M. L. (2023). *Leadership for safe schools: The three pillar approach to supporting students' mental health*. Routledge.
- Levin, J., & Madfis, E. (2009). Mass murder at school and cumulative strain: A sequential model. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(9), 1227–1245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764209332543>
- Madfis, E. (2020). *How to stop school rampage killing: Lessons from averted mass shootings and bombings*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Madfis, E., Hirschfield, P., & Addington, L. (2021). School securitization and its alternatives: The social, political, and contextual drivers of school safety policy and practice. *School Psychology Review, 50*(2-3), 191–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2020.1855063>
- Maeng, J., Cornell, D., & Edwards, K. (2024). Threat assessment and disparities in school discipline. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management, 11*(3), 186–196. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tam0000213>
- Maeng, J., Cornell, D., & Huang, F. (2020). Student threat assessment as an alternative to exclusionary discipline. *Journal of School Violence, 19*(3), 377–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2019.1707682>
- Maeng, J., Cornell, D., Kerere, J., Huang, F., Konold, T., & Afolabi, K. (2023). *School threat assessment in Florida* (Technical report of 2021–2022 case data).
- Malecki, C. K., & Demaray, M. K. (2002). Measuring perceived social support: Development of the Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale (CASSS). *Psychology in the Schools, 39*(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t57891-000>
- McHugh, M. L. (2013). The chi-square test of independence. *Biochimica Medica, 23*(2), 143–149. <https://doi.org/10.11613/bm.2013.018>
- Morris, M. (2016). *Pushout: The criminalization of Black girls in schools*. The New Press.
- Muñiz, J. O. (2021). Exclusionary discipline policies, school-police partnerships, surveillance technologies and disproportionality: A review of the school to prison pipeline literature. *The Urban Review, 53*(5), 735–760. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-021-00595-1>
- NASP School Safety and Crisis Response Committee. (2020). *Behavior threat assessment and management: Best practice considerations for K-12 schools, Brief overview*. National Association of School Psychologists.
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2020). *The professional standards of the National Association of School Psychologists*.
- Nekvasil, E. K., & Cornell, D. G. (2015). Student threat assessment associated with positive school climate in middle schools. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management, 2*(2), 98–113. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tam0000038>
- O'Toole, M. E. (2000). *The school shooter: A threat assessment perspective*. Critical Incident Response Group, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime.
- Payne, A. A., & Welch, K. (2023). Minority threat in schools and differential security manifestations: Examining unequal control, surveillance, and protection. *Crime & Delinquency, 68*(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00111287231194718>
- Puzzanchera, C. (2021). *Juvenile justice statistics: Juvenile arrests, 2019*. U.S Dept of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/publications/juvenile-arrests-2019.pdf>
- Robbins, C. (2005). Zero tolerance and the politics of racial injustice. *The Journal of Negro Education, 74*(1), 2–17. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40027226>
- Sickmund, M., Sladky, A., & Kang, W. (2021). *Easy access to juvenile court statistics: 1985–2019*. National Center for Juvenile Justice. <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezajcs/>
- Skiba, R. J. (2015). Interventions to address racial/ethnic disparities in school discipline: Can systems reform be race-neutral?. In R. Bangs & L. E. Davis (Eds.), *Race and social problems: Restructuring inequality* (pp. 107–124). Springer Science + Business Media.
- Skiba, R. J., Arredondo, M. I., Gray, C., & Rausch, M. K. (2018). Discipline disparities: New and emerging research in the United States. In J. Deakin, E. Taylor, & A. Kupchik (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of school discipline, surveillance, and social control* (pp. 235–252). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Source of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *The Urban Review, 34*(4), 317–342. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021320817372>
- Van Dreal, J., McCarthy, C., & Van Dreal, C. (2022). *Youth violence prevention: The pathway back through inclusion and connection*.
- Vossekuil, B., Fein, R. A., Reddy, M., Borum, R., & Modzeleski, W. (2002). *The final report and findings of the safe school initiative: Implications for the prevention of school attacks in the United States*. United States Secret Service, United States Department of Education.
- Wang, K., Kemp, J., & Burr, R. (2022). *Crime, violence, discipline, and safety in U.S. public schools in 2019–20: Findings from the school survey on crime and safety*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubinfo.asp?pubid=2022029>

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENTS

Eric Madfis, PhD, is a professor of criminal justice at the University of Washington Tacoma, where his research focuses on the causes and prevention of school violence, hate crime, and mass murder. He also serves as director of the Violence Prevention and Transformation Research Collaborative.

Jason R. Silva, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at William Paterson University. His research examines media and crime, school violence, mass shootings, and terrorism.

Franci Crepeau-Hobson, PhD, is a professor and school psychology program director in the School of Education & Human Development at the University of Colorado–Denver. Her research focuses on youth suicide prevention, crisis response and intervention, school violence prevention, and psychological assessment.

Michael L. Sulkowski, PhD, is an associate professor at the University of Alabama. His research focuses on school safety, violence prevention, and supporting at-risk and vulnerable students.

APPENDIX**Table A1.** Recommendations Codebook.

Variable	Description
Surveillance recommendations	
Communications monitor	Recommendations for thoroughly monitoring communications and behavior for an escalation of risk
Daily check	Includes daily checks of student entry/exit, searching of backpack, locker, pocket, or purse. Also includes daily checks at home before leaving for school
Intermittent check	Includes intermittent and/or random checks of student entry/exit, searching of backpack, locker, pocket, or purse
Law	Engagement of legal system, including juvenile justice or juvenile department; notifying law enforcement of potential concerns; school resource office/security engagement with law enforcement. Excludes probation/parole officer, which is coded as a separate variable
Monitor home	Recommendations for increased supervision and monitoring in the home setting or group home. Parent(s) should be contacted and given a statement of the school district's expectation to provide increased supervision and vigilance. Includes supervised contact with siblings or pets
Parent gun statement	Recommendation for making the following firearms admonition to guardians: "Firearms are the responsibility of the owner: Do not assume a child/student/adult has not learned the combination to a gun safe or the location of the key. Keys can be removed and duplicated, and combinations have been discovered through a variety of means. Consider changing keys or combinations or removing firearms from the home." Documents the date, time, and place of the admonition as well as the guardian's response. Requests that parent(s) find gun and report on safety. Asks parent(s) directly about access to firearms in the home or community
Probation or parole officer	Recommendations to notify or engage probation or parole officer
Safe home	Recommendations to safety proof the home and remove certain potential weapons (firearms, sharp objects, chemicals, or bomb-making materials)
Safety plan	Design and implement a safety plan for identified targets/victims, including potentially notifying law enforcement, further assessment through the STAT team, and other supports from the school, community, family, and/or law enforcement
Social media	Monitor social media activity for concerning statements, agitators, triggers, threats, or behavior related to the preparation of an attack and/or self-harm. Applies to recommendations for both home and school monitoring
Staff alert	Recommendations for alerting staff and teachers on need-to-know basis. Alert staff regarding the need to monitor communications and behavior for indications of escalation of risk of targeted aggression
Unsupervised time	Recommendations to decrease or eliminate unsupervised time in the school setting
Victim	Recommendations related to warning victims and their guardians as well as actions to reduce contact or interaction with victims or targets
Supportive recommendations	
Behavior skills	Recommendations for social skill-building programs, anger management programs, and/or sensory strategies. Participation in problem-solving and coping skills instruction
Community programs	Recommendations related to engaging in community programs and resources (e.g., government, nonprofit, and faith-based). This includes the Boys and Girls Club, Early Assessment & Support Alliance, New Solutions, and Youth Era
Courses	Recommendations for specialized class options—either inclusion in or removal from certain classes. Includes school-specific extracurricular activities and summer school
Education plan	Recommendations to review educational plans, provide tutors, or structure reentry into school settings
Family support	Referral to Oregon Family Support Network, which provides mental, behavioral, and emotional wellness support, education, and advocacy for youth and families. Also includes check-ins with siblings to address concerns or needs
Inhibitors	Includes identifying and further developing hopeful future options, such as activities, relationships, or experiences of value that inhibit the possibility of acting out. Includes exploring funds for assistance with inhibitors and specific activities such as art and sports
Interventions	Provide means by which the student may safely report and discuss thoughts or intentions to harm others and receive appropriate intervention. Other interventions or supervision strategies that will directly address the triggers and agitators identified in this assessment
Mental health	Recommendations related to pursuing crisis and/or mental health services either within the school system or externally. This includes the psychiatric crisis center, school counselor, district-referred mental health evaluation, play therapy, and/or parent/child interaction therapy
Mentor	Recommendations to identify/assign staff or community members to build trusting relationships through check-in or mentorship
Parent training	Recommendations for a parent support group or parent-specific training
Social work	Recommendations related to referral, support, or coordination with school or district social worker
Special education	Referral to appropriate special education. Includes 504 evaluation (to provide support for children with disabilities) and autism specialist recommendations as well as psychoeducational evaluations
Youth services team	Referral to the youth services team, which consists of staff from schools, social service agencies, law enforcement agencies, and other related community service providers to coordinate integrated services to students and their families
Multipurpose recommendations	
Behavior team/consultation team referral	Referral to a team of specialists to support school staff in understanding and responding to challenging behavior of students. Includes behavior management plans to identify multiple ways to support students in replacing challenging behavior with more functional/appropriate ways of responding
Individual accountability plan	Modify or establish a specialized plan to review elements of a student's day, behavior, and/or goals for which the student will be responsible and accountable for managing
Parent statement	Inform the guardian that the school must call the guardian when the child is in a dangerous situation or causing considerable disruption to the milieu. If the guardian is nonresponsive or refuses to assist, school staff, as mandatory reporters, must inform the Department of Human Services regarding a potential neglectful situation. Provide information regarding concerns for the family and potential safety issues. Notify parents of the district's expectations regarding safety and weapons management at home
Record release	Recommendations to obtain release of information from medical or mental health services as well as recommendations to increase or maintain communication between the school and these specific services
Schedule modification	Recommendations related to schedule modifications such as limited days, breaks, and alternate passing periods, to limit contact with potential targets or better meet student needs
Suicide assessment	Initiate suicide assessment or suicide watch/monitoring
Transport	Recommendations related to transportation include changes to parent drop-off/pick-up and bus transportation. Can also include transportation resources to other appointments

Table A2. Logistic Regression Predictors of Recommendations for White Students and Students of Color.

Variable	Coefficient (B)	SE	Wald	p Value	Odds ratio
Communications monitor	0.134	0.533	0.063	.802	1.143
Daily check	0.024	0.320	0.006	.940	1.024
Intermittent check	-0.191	0.344	0.310	.578	0.826
Law	-0.078	0.374	0.044	.835	0.925
Monitor home	-0.436	0.391	1.245	.265	0.647
Parent gun statement	0.307	0.411	0.559	.455	1.360
Probation/parole officer	-0.892	0.450	3.926	.048*	0.410
Safe home	0.187	0.346	0.292	.589	1.205
Safety plan	-0.429	0.323	1.768	.184	0.651
Social media	0.036	0.352	0.011	.917	1.037
Staff alert	0.338	0.373	0.824	.364	1.402
Unsupervised time	-0.118	0.323	0.132	.716	0.889
Victim	0.173	0.320	0.290	.096	1.188
Behavior skills	-0.087	0.351	0.061	.805	0.917
Community programs	-0.997	0.345	8.356	.004**	0.369
Courses	0.651	0.406	2.573	.109	1.918
Education plan	-0.181	0.314	0.333	.564	0.834
Family support	0.022	0.382	0.003	.955	1.022
Inhibitors	0.451	0.494	0.836	.361	1.570
Interventions	-0.350	0.403	0.751	.386	0.705
Mental health	-0.025	0.431	0.003	.953	0.975
Mentor	-0.129	0.496	0.067	.795	0.879
Parent training	-0.190	0.409	0.217	.641	0.827
Social work	-0.033	0.346	0.009	.923	0.967
Special education	0.584	0.322	3.300	.069	1.794
Youth services team	-0.246	0.310	0.631	.427	0.782
Behavior team	0.580	0.348	2.773	.096	1.787
Individual accountability plan	0.056	0.304	0.034	.853	1.058
Parent statement	-0.563	0.438	1.651	.199	0.569
Record release	0.123	0.341	0.130	.719	1.131
Schedule modification	0.580	0.361	2.580	.108	1.785
Suicide assessment	-0.217	0.357	0.370	.543	0.805
Transport	1.351	0.485	7.770	.005**	3.862
Constant	-0.813	0.864	0.884	.347	0.444
Cox and Snell r^2	0.149				
Chi-square	44.044				
N	274				

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.