

As discussed, here is a snapshot of how the grant money was applied.

Here's breakdown about the history of the Safety and Security grant(s)—keeping in mind that we have summarized the data, given its sensitive nature.

In response to the shootings at Virginia Tech, the S.A.F.E. school grant program was created to help fund safety improvements for schools in CT. Initially, it was intended to award \$10 million in grants over two years, but due to a budget deficit, the second year funding was cut from \$5 million to \$1.8 million.

There were two rounds of awards for school safety/security, both handled by what was (at the time) the Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DEMHS).

This is just an aggregate of the initial round (2008):

- Approximately \$4.8M was paid out.
- There were approximately 1,100 eligible schools. Applications were received for 360 schools. Using a competitive grant process, DEMHS ultimately awarded grants to 203 schools through this program.
- Those 203 schools were located in roughly 60 school districts.
- Per district awards ran from \$2,300 to \$1.3M, with approximately \$86,000 as the average grant per school district.

Work undertaken as part of this grant program included:

- Security Cameras, which could have included recording capability – This was the most common enhancement, undertaken by over 82 percent of the districts.
- Monitors – In many instances installation of monitors was part and parcel of the camera installation. 50 percent of the districts installed monitors.
- ID / Access Systems – After cameras and monitors, the most implemented measure was around access systems, with over 39 percent of districts addressing this area.
- Doors, including locks and hardware – 32 percent of districts made improvements to their internal and external doors, locking systems, and hardware.
- Audio Entry - 29 percent of districts enhanced initial visitor communication through addition of buzzer / intercom or other audio entry systems.
- Alarm systems – 13 percent of districts added an intrusion alarm (passive) or duress system (active).
- Physical structures – 9 percent of districts added fencing or physical barriers to school properties.
- Finally, any number of other, school-specific items were addressed, including but not limited to: lighting, bulletproof windows, remote access to doors, rebuilding of entry ways, etc.

There was a second round of funding (2009), limited to \$1.8M due to budget cuts during the Rell administration. At this time, we not have the sufficient detail to compile statistics for that round.

Best,