DEVELOPING A JUSTIFICATION
FOR THE INCLUSION OF A
COMPREHENSIVE SAFETY
EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF
NEW YORK STATE

THESIS FOR THE DEGREE
OF PH. D

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

ROBERT ALBERT ULRICH

1970

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Developing a Justification
For The Inclusion of a Comprehensive
Safety Education Program in the Public
Schools of New York State

presented by

Robert Albert Ulrich

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

Robert O Nolan

Major professor
Robert O. Nolan

Date October 15, 1970

ABSTRACT

DEVELOPING A JUSTIFICATION FOR THE INCLUSION OF A COMPREHENSIVE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK STATE

By

Robert Albert Ulrich

The purpose of this study was to survey safety education programs existant in selected New York State Public Schools to develop a rationale for a comprehensive Safety Education Program, and to recommend a model organizational pattern to permit the inclusion of a Safety Education Program in any New York Public School System.

Literature was reviewed concerning recommendations for safety programs, suggested personnel requirements, and the philosophical value of the program in school curricula. Existing state department of education safety publications and curriculum guides from school systems reputed to have successful programs were also reviewed.

A questionnaire was designed to gather data concerning the state-of-the-art of safety education in selected New York Public Schools. School systems were stratified for a random sampling which would include a ten percent representation of city superintendencies, village superintendencies, and central school districts.

Data were gathered to show whether or not school systems employed safety supervisors and/or school coordinators, the qualification, and preparation recommended for these persons, whether safety courses were required in the preparation of teachers, and whether in-service meetings or training programs were held for instructional and other staff persons.

Data were also sought concerning whether safety education was taught at elementary, junior high, senior high, and adult education levels. The methods of instruction, types of programs, and amount of time spent in safety education were also requested.

Finally, information concerning whether or not the school had plans and policies for a number of emergencies, special programs and events in the school was sought, as well as evidence concerning a safety inspection program and an accident reporting system being in operation.

## The Findings of the Study

1. Very few school systems have complete safety education programs on a K-12 basis.

2. Few school systems employ safety personnel on the coordinator or supervisory level.

3. Only about one-fourth of the school systems reported having a safety administrative handbook for teachers, and very few schools had any curricular guides available for teachers.

4. The majority of schools reported offering safety education programs in their schools. In these cases the most often used method of safety education programming was its integration into other subjects and programs. Often in many cases one or two assembly programs are used.

5. In schools with coordinator and/or supervisory personnel, more thorough safety programs were in evidence.

# DEVELOPING A JUSTIFICATION FOR THE INCLUSION OF A COMPREHENSIVE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK STATE

By

Robert Albert Ulrich

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary School Curriculum

1970

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to take this opportunity to express his thanks and appreciation to the many people who have contributed time and effort to the completion of this investigation.

Special appreciation is extended to Dr. Robert O. Nolan, his advisor, and to Dr. Charles A. Blackman, whose guidance and help have been a constant source of inspiration. The other members of his committee, Dr. William A. Mann, and Professor Gordon Sheehe have provided valuable assistance throughout the writer's doctoral program.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Robert L. Marshall and Dr. Robert L. Baldwin at Central Missouri State College for their valuable advice and cooperation during this study.

Personnel from the responding school systems have aided the successful completion of this study.

A very special note of thanks is due the investigator's wife and family who offered unending cooperation and encouragement for the completion of this study.

R.A.U.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

## LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER I

## THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

### INTRODUCTION

Historically, accidents have substantially contributed to society's death and injury rate. Recently, accidents have taken the fourth position on the death causal scale when all ages are considered.

Accident data on death rate show a steady increase each year. Between 1958 and 1968 the number of accidental deaths annually rose 27 percent.[1] Between 1967 and 1968 a 2 percent increase was evident in number of deaths.[2] In 1968, more than 113,000 persons died as a result of accidents.[3] Accidents are the leading cause of death for the age groups of 1 year through 44 years.[4]

In 1968, accident costs to the citizens of our society reached the astronomical figure of nearly 23 billion dollars.[5]

---

[1]National Safety Council, Accident Facts (Chicago: National Safety Council, 1969), p. 13.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. 8.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid., p. 4.

Safety Education has been proposed and included in school curricula for many years. As early as 1919, a comprehensive safety education program was initiated in the Detroit Public Schools.[6] This program included: (1) a study of traffic accidents among school age children, (2) construction of a course of study for elementary schools, (3) instruction of a class at Detroit State Teacher's College, and (4) school cooperation with all civic agencies concerned with public safety.[7] Kansas City launched a program in its schools, in the early 1920's.[8] Since these first programs, other schools have initiated programs of safety education to prepare young citizens for safe living.

It would appear that educational programs for accident prevention have not adequately met the needs of today's youth and adults. A realistic program must be developed and aimed directly at the needs of citizens to attack the problem of accidents and their resulting upward spiral of death and injury. While the accidental death rate in New York State per 100,000 population is lower than many other states, there remains evidence that the rate is climbing. Accident Facts from 1966, 1968, and 1969 show a steady

---

[6]Herbert J. Stack and J. Duke Elkow, Education For Safe Living (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 9.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid.

increase.[9,10,11] A twenty year summary of motor vehicle accidents alone in New York State shows the number of people killed increased from 1,848 in 1948 to 2,935 in 1967.[12]

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to survey safety education programs existant in selected New York State public schools, to develop a rationale for a comprehensive safety education program, and to recommend a model organizational pattern to permit the inclusion of a safety education program in any New York Public School System.

More specifically, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What provisions are made in New York public schools for safety education on a kindergarten through grade 12 basis?

2. What specific topics are a part of the New York schools' curriculum which could be utilized in a total safety program?

---

[9]National Safety Council, Accident Facts (Chicago: National Safety Council, 1966), p. 19.

[10]National Safety Council, Accident Facts (Chicago: National Safety Council, 1968), p. 19.

[11]National Safety Council, Accident Facts (Chicago: National Safety Council, 1969), p. 19.

[12]New York State Department of Motor Vehicles, Accident Facts (New York: Department of Motor Vehicles, 1968), p. 8.

3. How do administrators, supervisors, and teachers view safety related subjects as a part of the school curriculum?

4. How might a comprehensive safety program be implemented into the curriculum of New York public schools?

## Need for Study

Man's efforts in the world have centered themselves around a need to conquer the world in which he lives. As his work became more diversified and complex, and with the pressures to develop more and more goods and to live with others, his psychological pressures led to imbalance, and more accidents causing injury and death seemed to become prevalent. Sternberg indicated that at the bottom of the problem is man's inability to better manage (a) himself, (b) his behavior, (c) inter-personal relationships, (d) knowledge, (e) the products and his technology.[13]

To develop a sound economic and social program for man, it is necessary to reduce the backward force of the loss of time and life that hampers the progress of society.

As accident records are checked, it is noted that accidents causing death and injury happen to people of all ages, from infancy through adulthood.

---

[13]Robert Sternberg, "Traffic Safety Education in Michigan," Michigan Challenge (Michigan State Chamber of Commerce, November 1963), p. 17.

Many of the accidents that happen could have been avoided had the person been aware of the know-how to deal with dangers around the home, in traffic as pedestrians or cyclists, at school, at play, around water, concerning poisons and firearms to name just a few.

This information, carried forward and expanded as their lives become more complex, will serve to provide the foundation for a safer and more abundant life.

Therefore, a comprehensive safety education program is needed to prepare people of all ages to live safely in today's modern society.

While difficult to prove empirically, it is felt that safety programs in the public schools of New York State are sporadic in nature. Visitations to many schools throughout the state over a number of years tended to strengthen this feeling. During several terms of office in the New York State Driver Education Association, opportunity was afforded to visit many schools and to discuss existing programs with numerous teachers.

Safety programs in elementary schools either seemed to flourish or be near non-existent with the interest or lack of interest on the part of the individual teacher. A few school systems had outstanding programs, due largely to the broad planning done by interested persons. Generally, however, there were only sporadic programs, and there was no evidence of continuing programs being conducted. In most cases, there was no general broad

curriculum planned from which teachers could work. In addition, only a very few schools had administrative or supervisory personnel assigned to handle or develop programs in this area.

Safety Education is included in the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education in New York State. Section 153 of the Commissioner's Regulations states, in part:

> Instruction in Safety Education, including highway and traffic safety, shall be given to all pupils in both elementary and secondary grades; such instruction shall be made a definite part of the school program either as a special subject or in connection with instruction in other subjects; comprehensive plans for safety education shall be organized by local school authorities including highway and traffic safety, home safety, recreational safety, industrial and occupational safety, and school safety to insure the development of safety habits in all the varied activities of everyday life; . . .[14]

It was found by personal experience that often this regulation is regarded only as strong suggestion, and that in actual practice, little evidence is available of program existence.

It seems strange that with existing educational regulations, and the evidence of concern for safe living from industry and interested civic and service organizations and groups, that a lack of safety education programs still exists in many schools today. It seems true, then, that the solution to the accident problem and to the safety

---

[14]University of the State of New York, Regulations of the Commissioner of Education of the State of New York (Albany, The State Education Department), Section 153, Safety Education, mimeographed.

education problem will depend upon the ability of Safety Education leaders to bring about the needed change and redirection in educational programs.

> But change is never easy, since it threatens the pattern of life and work of many. Most persons either consciously or unconsciously resent indications of the need for change. Probably the most common response is to ignore the facts which indicate the need for change and to continue traditional patterns of conduct. This is true of individuals; it is true of institutions.
>
> Other forces that impede change include lack of funds, gaps in knowledge, legislative limitations, and outmoded administrative patterns. However, the forces which hinder change in . . . education can be overcome as the leadership in this field is able to create a program (of . . . education) to serve society more effectively.[15]

It is hoped, through education, to develop effective and efficient citizens, well prepared in the art of problem solving so they can make sound decisions as to their future well being. To be successful, safety education must be well grounded in this philosophy.

If we are to question the need for a Comprehensive Safety Education Program, one needs only look at the accident records to see that our educational programs are not meeting the needs in the state and nation.

Educational programs are needed on all levels--elementary, Junior High, Senior High, and Adult Education.

A rationale for the establishment of a Comprehensive Safety Education Program is needed which is based on a sound

---

[15]United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Education for a Changing World of Work (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 218.

philosophy of education that can serve as the basis for the development of programs and policy at the state and local levels.

This rationale is further needed to present a program model that can be used to develop safety education programs in keeping with other education programs in New York State, and to determine that such a program is within the philosophical and economic realm of possibility.

## Definition of Terms

Safety supervisor or director. A person responsible for the development or determination of administrative policy and procedures regarding the over-all safety education program for the entire school system. Directs the activities for the safety coordinators in each school building and receives reports from them.

Safety coordinator. A person in a particular school building responsible for carrying out the policies and procedures of the supervisor or director. He works with the principal and teachers in his building to encourage, develop, improve, and analyze safety instruction at all grade levels. He organizes "in-service" safety programs and activities for faculty and students, is responsible for uniform accident reporting and study, and serves as a contact person for the supervisor or director.

Safety education. The process of using administrative practices, instructional techniques and protective features in a comprehensive program designed to reduce accidents, conserve human and material resources, and to make it possible for students to participate in additional activities. This covers all phases of Safety Education including traffic safety.

School accident. A recordable accident is one which results in pupil injury severe enough to cause the loss of one-half day or more of school time, or requires medical attention.

In-service education. Educational programs conducted at the local school district level to provide instruction and information vital to the local staff and administrative personnel, for the purpose of upgrading knowledge and background in any subject area, activity or program.

Safety education program. Those activities and practices that tend to be presented and entered into by the staff and students to prepare them to do safely those things that they will be doing anyway. Driver Education is included in this type of program, but is only a part of the total safety education program of the school.

Full-time supervisor. A person hired by the Board of Education who devotes 100% of his time to supervising,

directing, and administering the total school safety education program.

Part-time supervisor. A person hired by the Board of Education who devotes any set portion of his time to supervision, directing, and administering the total school safety education program.

## Delimitations of Study

1. The study will be limited to data drawn from New York State public education. No attempt will be made to use data from non-public schools.

2. An analysis will be made of data from selected educational personnel, supervisory personnel, educational data, safety related organizations, and accident record facts.

3. The study will limit its application to public schools in New York State.

## Basic Assumptions Upon Which Study is Based

1. That Safety Education is necessary as a part of the public educational experience.

2. That a Safety Education program should be integrated into the general curriculum offerings in the New York public schools.

3. That a workable program model for New York's schools can be developed by an analysis of relevant literature and data.

This study reviewed ideas, or philosophies utilized as bases for curricular inclusion. Since the rationale for inclusion of safety in a curriculum seemed inherent to the general educational philosophy of a school system, it seemed necessary to review a philosophy of education as well as a philosophy of safety education.

## A Philosophy of Education

Whitehead stated "There is only one subject matter for education, and that is life in all its manifestations."[16] Very basically, the main purpose of education is to prepare the individual for life. Throughout this process, each person is encouraged to develop to his fullest potential to take his place in society. Therefore, the educational process must include not only a means of personal growth and development, but also a realization of the societal environment in which he is to live. This further task for education is that of providing a person the necessary tools to deal with his personal and social needs.

Growth and development of the individual was fundamental to John Dewey's educational philosophy.

> Since growth is the characteristic of life, education is all one with growing; it has no end beyond itself. The criterion of the value of school education is the extent in which it creates

---

[16] A. N. Whitehead, The Aims of Education and Other Essays (London: Williams and Morgard Ltd., 1932), p. 10.

> a desire for continued growth and supplies means for making the desire effective in fact.[17]

Dewey's philosophy was also concerned with the interpersonal relationship of man's development and his social needs.

> The social environment consists of all the activities of fellow beings that are bound up in the carrying on of the activities of anyone of its members. It is truly education in its effect in the degree in which an individual shares or participates in some conjoint activity.[18]

Man is constantly learning, changing, developing and becoming. This happens as a result of his reactions to the society around him. Henderson stated:

> No one is born with the self he becomes already predetermined[19] . . . Because a human being is so dependent upon society for his development, individual welfare and societal welfare are inter-dependent. Since man's nature is fundamentally social, it would seem to be a mistake to think of education exclusively in terms of individual growth without reference to society and social needs.[20]

Education, as Peters suggests, should be concerned with intrinsic values, to prepare a person fully so that he can use his knowledge to help himself make sound decisions.[21]

---

[17]John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1916), p. 62.

[18]Ibid., p. 26.

[19]Stella Van Petten Henderson, Introduction to Philosophy of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), p. 33.

[20]Ibid.

[21]R. S. Peters, Ethics and Education (New Jersey: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1966), p. 84.

Our schools, then, must provide the climate and atmosphere in which growth and development can take place. Experiences which allow the student to examine his environment, physical and social needs are of utmost importance.

> The significant role of the school is to accept children, to understand their circumstances, and upon this acceptance and understanding to create an environment which complements the rest of their living.[22]

The goal of education is the personal growth of the learner, helping him achieve a richer and more fulfilled life.[23]

Thus, education must concern learners with examining life, weighing evidence, determining what is of value, developing goals, and working toward the fulfillment of a rich and satisfying life.

## Philosophy of Safety Education

Safety education shares the same general goals as general education. In fact, it is an integral part of the total education process. Education, as presented earlier, is preparation for a meaningful and satisfying life. Albert W. Whitney said "The very most right thing about safety is that it leads to the more abundant life."[24]

---

[22]Howard Lane and Mary Beauchamp, Human Relations in Teaching (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 6.

[23]Samuel Tenenbaum, "Selected for Review" in Educational Leadership (Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, October, 1969), p. 97.

[24]Stack, op. cit., p. 14.

For one to have the opportunity to take full advantage of what life may provide, and to develop himself fully, one must remain alive and free from the damaging effects of accidents. There are many definitions of the term "accident". Perhaps one definition that would be most complete is that by William Tarrants:

> An unplanned, not necessarily injurious or damaging event, which interrupts the completion of an activity, and is invariably preceded by an unsafe act and/or an unsafe condition, or some combination of unsafe acts and/or unsafe conditions.[25]

Life in our modern, complex civilization is constantly faced with numerous risks. How well man functions in this environment is closely related to the degree of risk he is willing to take to accomplish that which he has set out to do. The good life is filled with adventure, excitement and risk. As man develops his place in society, and strives for that good life, he is constantly faced with new and changing hazards. In order to live safely, one must (1) understand the many hazards that a person must encounter in his various daily activities, (2) develop attitudes that predispose him to adjust properly to his environment, and (3) master those skills that enable him to cope with potentially dangerous situations.[26] This seems to give purpose and direction to the fight for the good

---

[25] Ibid., p. 293.

[26] A. E. Florio, and G. T. Stafford, Safety Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1969), p. 26.

life. These suggestions are not at all brand new. In 1919, in an address to the N.E.A. Convention, A. W. Whitney stated:

> It cannot be given to all of us to fight for freedom, but the fight for safety, the fight for real adventure, the fight for a life that shall be the measure of a purpose instead of the marred result of purposeless chance is within the right of all of us.[27]

Man is able to use his intelligence to probe the mysteries of science, and to develop more and more instruments of technology to advance modern culture. These new developments must be used with prudence, for tied to these advances and new inventions are new and unforeseen risks. Because the benefits of the new inventions are so exciting, and so desired, the risks involved must be assumed. Therefore, the concept of safety in the modern world should be: "Safety for essential adventures."[28] It seems more and more apparent then, that the key to this safety for essential adventures must, in fact, be the task of education--education for progress, safety education.[29]

---

[27]Stack, op. cit., p. 15.

[28]Don Cash Seaton, et al., Administration and Supervision of Safety Education (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1969), p. 15.

[29]Stack, op. cit., p. 17.

# PROCEDURES

## Preparation of a Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed to examine the safety education offerings in selected public school systems in New York State. Information was sought to ascertain the administrative and supervisory structures in effect in these schools with regard to safety, school safety policies and procedures available, types of programs offered, techniques of presentation, and related activities conducted in the field of safety education.

The data provided a picture of the state of the art of safety programs being conducted in the public schools of New York State.

## Revision of Questionnaire

Following the development of the questionnaire, a small group of experts in the field of safety education was selected to review and evaluate the questionnaire. After their critical analysis of the instrument was received, and reviewed, the questionnaire was revised to be more clear, concise, and meaningful.

## Other Data Requested

Curriculum guides, references, and administrative policies were requested from several selected school systems in the United States, regarded as having successful Safety Programs.

## Scope of the Study

Public school systems in New York State were stratified to provide a listing of centralized school districts, city school superintendencies and village superintendencies. Eighty school systems were randomly selected from these lists. This represented ten percent of the total number of public school districts in New York State. Within this number, ten percent of each stratified group was also represented. The school districts used in this study are listed in Chapter III, Table 1.

## Treatment of Data

Following receipt of returned questionnaires, the data were analyzed. These data were combined with those gained from the literature review, and additional information submitted by schools contacted for the purpose of explaining their Safety Education programs. Conclusions and recommendations were formulated as all information and data were critically reviewed and analyzed.

## SUMMARY

Chapter I developed the need for the public schools in New York State to be concerned with safety education programs. A philosophy of education was reviewed, and a philosophy of safety education presented. The problem statement, assumptions under which the study was performed,

together with a brief overview of procedures used in the study were reviewed.

An extensive review of the literature related to the study will be found in Chapter II.

Chapter III discusses the procedures used to conduct the study.

Data gathered are presented and analyzed in Chapter IV.

Chapter V contains a summary of the study together with conclusions and recommendations gathered from the literature and data analysis. Implications for further research are also presented.

# CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An extensive study was made into literature related to this study. Little literature was found that would relate directly to the form that this study is attempting to develop. There are various materials, reports, and studies done by the National Education Association, National Safety Council, boards of education of individual school systems, state departments of education, and individuals which related to portions of this study. Information was also received from school districts considered to have outstanding safety education programs. These materials had been developed through trial and refinement as the result of a district's experience dealing with items relative to safety.

It is not the intention of this project to recommend the adoption of every item, process, or action recorded or mentioned in the reports of school systems. However, this project examined and studied these existing successful programs, noted similarities and differences, and attempted to develop a basic foundation upon which to build a rationale for a comprehensive safety education program for New York's public schools.

No attempt was made in this study to review all of the materials in any area. Rather, an attempt was made to look at the report information that was most representative and pertinent to this study.

As early as 1940, the American Association of School Administrators in their Eighteenth Yearbook published a list of practical suggestions that dealt with safety education in schools. Many of these same suggestions still permeate the present field of procedures and policies. These suggestions included:

1. Experience shows that many accidents are preventable through a program of education.

2. Instruction in safety is an essential part of the modern school's program of producing good citizens.

3. The determination of the character and the extent of the school safety program and the selecting of teaching methods to be used are professional responsibilities of educators.

4. Rural schools operating under numerous conditions specifically different from those of urban schools should make an effort to adjust their safety programs to the special conditions of their environment.

5. Safety education for adults is a primary responsibility of the community and the state.

6. In each community it is the responsibility of the board of education and its executive staff to build and to maintain school buildings which are safe.

7. Responsibility for areas of safety education not designated specifically by law should be assigned by agreement to the agency or agencies most competent to achieve the desired goal.

8. Teaching youth to be safe and intelligent operators of motor cars is a responsibility of the community.

9. The school has a responsibility for systematic instruction in all aspects of safety.

10. School systems embracing several schools should organize safety coordinating agencies.

11. A formal or informal safety council or committee, or other liaison among safety agencies, should be established in every community.

12. In their efforts to advance the safety movement, educators should recognize the need for appraisal and research.

13. It is remarkable how much can be accomplished if no one is too anxious about who receives credit.

14. Effective programs of safety education should be adequately financed.

15. The time has come for educators to prepare themselves for leadership in safety education.[30]

Several years later, the National Safety Council, published the results of a study committee from the Safety Education Supervisors Section of the National Safety Council. This report recommended among other things that:

> Safety instruction should be an integral part of the school program and should further develop understandings, attitudes, values, skills, habits and appreciations which will assist the learner in meeting the responsibilities of safe living in today's world.
>
> Safety instruction should seek to develop fully the potentialities of the "whole child" as a happy, well-integrated personality, who can contribute to a better way of life for all. The school should carefully select and plan safety experiences, the method of instruction, and the use of instructional materials to meet the needs of each individual. The learning environment, therefore, should provide experiences that continuously challenge the individual to think clearly and to act wisely in terms of safe living for himself and others.

---

[30]American Association of School Administrators, Safety Education, Eighteenth yearbook (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1940), p. 356.

The school should utilize community resources to implement its program and to further supplement its efforts in safety education.

Safety education should be a vital part of community life. It requires cooperative planning, selecting, utilizing of community resources to the extent that they will contribute to and enrich the quality of safety education. It must be developed with an awareness of the pattern of characteristics of child growth and development. Educating each child for safe living must take into consideration all factors that influence his attitude toward life.

Safety education should develop a continuous awareness of the value of human life and the physical well-being of individuals, and at the same time recognize the achievement of others in meeting these requirements.

Life and human well-being are priceless and can be conserved only to the extent that we are aware of and can appreciate their value.

Safety education should be continuous and contribute to the enrichment of all areas of living.

Education is the ongoing process of life and safety education is the continuous process of conserving it. The Safety experiences in school should be continuous and consistent with those out of school. Safety education should help each individual not only to avoid accidents, but also to free him to live "life more abundantly".[31]

Strasser, Aaron, Bohn, and Eales suggest the responsibility for the total safety program for school youth rests with the school management--the school board and the superintendent.[32] However, it is the responsibility of everyone related to the school to provide instruction in

---

[31]National Safety Council, "Basic Principles for Safety Education," Safety Education, Vol. 35 (December, 1955), pp. 12-13.

[32]Marland K. Strasser, et al., Fundamentals of Safety Education (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1964), p. 117.

safe practices, and to provide a safe environment for school youth.[33] In order to implement and carry out his responsibilities, each superintendent should:

1. Employ teachers with safety training and conduct in-service safety training for all school personnel to meet the needs of their job functions.

2. Provide for cooperative, democratic participation of all school employees and students in the conduct of safety instruction and activities. Define authority and responsibility of each person.

3. Provide a centralized structure for organization and administration of the program.

4. Establish a program of accident records and reports to gather data on safety hazards and unsafe practices within the school's operation.

5. Provide a safe school environment.

6. Conduct a continuous program of evaluating safety instruction and activities within the school district. Revise the school safety program when necessary to meet changing needs as revealed by these data.[34]

Several writers suggested that school districts should seriously consider employing full-time supervisors of safety education to plan, organize, conduct, and coordinate the necessary programs and reports pertinent to a successful total safety program in schools. Gilliland in his 1955 study, recommended that "each school system should assign the administration, supervision, and coordination of

---

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., pp. 121-122.

the school safety program to a qualified member or members of the school personnel.[35]

Aaron underscored this suggestion in 1960, stating that schools should employ full-time supervisors of safety education.[36] He further recommended some personal requirements for this position. These included:

1. Five years of teaching experience in safety education.

2. Great interest and a desire to work in the safety education field.

3. Considerable background, preparation, preferably a major in safety education.[37]

Aaron also listed certain other recommendations concerning the supervisor's interest and activities. These included statements concerning:

1. Attendance at refresher courses, workshops, etc.

2. Attendance at state and national safety conferences each year.

3. Adequacy of designated supervisory time.

4. An individual's professional growth through in-service training.

---

[35]Lonnie Gilliland, Sr., "Practices in Safety Education in the School Systems of Selected Cities in the United States" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1955), p. 189.

[36]James Ethridge Aaron, "A Study of Supervisory Practices in Safety Education in Selected Cities in the United States" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1960), p. 100.

[37]Ibid.

5. Acceptance of responsibility for the development of the instructional service and environmental safety aspects of the school's total program.[38]

Marshall, in 1961, stated that the majority of the systems reporting in his study had assigned the responsibility of safety education programs to qualified professional staff members.[39]

Engelhardt in 1961 stated that:

> One staff person should be designated to guide the safety education program for all schools in the System and a full-time supervisor should be appointed for school systems in communities which can afford them, particularly those with a population of 50,000 or more.[40]

Engelhardt further recommended that supervisors have formal preparation in the field as a prerequisite to appointment.[41] The National Commission on Safety Education stated that a director of safety education at the district level should have:

1. Special preparation and experience in safety education beyond that required for teaching driver and traffic safety education.

---

[38] Ibid., pp. 102-105.

[39] Robert L. Marshall, "An Analysis of Safety Education Programs in Selected Public Schools of the United States with Recommendations for School Systems in Establishing or Evaluating Safety Education Programs" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1961), p. 241.

[40] Melvin E. Engelhardt, "The Administration of Safety Education Programs in Selected School Systems" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1961).

[41] Ibid.

2. An advanced degree in safety education, or in a closely related field with specialization in safety education.

3. Several years of teaching experience including teaching of driver and traffic safety education.

4. Familiarity with details of school organization for safety education programming at all levels.

5. Personal characteristics which are appropriate for effective supervision.[42]

In addition to supervisory staff, every teacher in the schools should have an understanding of and an appreciation for the elements of the school safety education program.[43] This can be accomplished through faculty meetings, in-service workshops, and other means.[44]

As materials from school systems are read and studied, and as other literature is pursued, it was noted that many programs were in general agreement concerning the most basic fundamentals of what constitutes a safety program and the general need for such programs. However, as the specific areas of safety programs were studied, a wide variance of procedures was found. Procedures of operation, instruction, reporting, staffing, and planning varied broadly from one school to another. The Safety Education

---

[42]National Commission on Safety Education, A School Safety Education Program (Washington: National Education Association, 1966), p. 10.

[43]National Commission on Safety Education, School Safety Education Checklist (Washington: National Education Association, 1967), p. 17.

[44]Ibid.

Curriculum Guide from San Diego County Schools suggested that approaches currently in operation through engineering, enforcement, and education can be effective in: "(1) altering human behavior in a manner that will lower the liklihood of injury-producing acts or conditions and (2) reducing the severity of damage when such events take place, or such conditions exist."[45]

Marshall divided the duties of safety education in a school system into three main areas: administration, protection, and instruction.[46]

The National Commission on Safety Education in two publications followed this same division of responsibility as they developed a guide and checklist for a school safety education program.[47,48]

San Diego County schools curriculum guide also stressed these three general areas of concern in safety education.[49]

In defining and developing the specific programs in the schools whose programs were studied for this review, some wide differences of program technique were found.

---

[45]San Diego County Board of Education, A Guide to Safety Education: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (San Diego, California: Department of Education, 1969), p. 1.

[46]Robert L. Marshall, op. cit., p. 16.

[47]A School Safety Education Program, op. cit., p. 5.

[48]School Safety Education Checklist, op. cit., pp. 1-40.

[49]San Diego County Board of Education, loc. cit.

Florio and Stafford suggested that specially designed programs can be accomplished by:

1. Examining the accident records of the school and community.

2. Conducting interviews of distributing questionnaires.

3. Observing the safety practices of all age groups.

4. Studying environmental factors.

5. Utilizing available aids such as research studies, authoritative materials in the safety field, and the opinions of experts.[50]

In addition, content for a safety education program can be geared to:

1. The pupils' interests.

2. Their level of maturity.

3. Their knowledge.

4. Their readiness to learn.

5. Their desire to improve, as indicated by tests and classroom discussion.

6. Legal requirements.[51]

Schmidt noted that safety programs from several school systems offering safety programs on a K-12 basis seemed to be most consistent in the following areas:

1. Safety patrols.

2. School crossing guards.

---

[50]A. E. Florio and G. T. Stafford, Safety Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 54.

[51]Ibid.

3. Fire Safety Programs.
4. Driver Education.
5. Youth traffic safety conferences.
6. School bus driver safety institutes.
7. Emergency evacuation programs.
8. Accident reporting, recording, and analyzation.
9. Indoor safety patrols.
10. Safety patrol leaders' camps.
11. Bicycle safety programs.
12. Publications relating to safety procedures.[52]

Provisions were made in the schools' programs reviewed for training and re-training of school personnel including nurses, secretaries, cafeteria workers, custodians, and general building repairmen.[53]

The majority of the several schools surveyed by Schmidt indicated a program in safety education on several levels throughout the K-12 program, but here too, wide deviations existed. Programs seemed, in some cases, to be sporadic, and displayed no evidence of continuing programs being carried on throughout the school program, especially in the concluding years of the student's education.[54]

---

[52]Duane H. Schmidt, "A Study of Safety Education Curriculums in Selected Public Schools to Determine Consistent Standards in Safety Education Programs" (Unpublished term report, Central Missouri State College, 1970), pp. 31-32.

[53]Ibid., p. 32.

[54]Ibid.

Ashby stated: "Education proceeds on the theory that safety is a quality or characteristic of whatever human beings do, rather than an entity distinct within itself. Safety is involved in any function or activity of life. . . ."[55]

School and state departments of education safety publications were reviewed. Several seemed to stand out as having rather thorough curriculum offerings.

The Kansas City, Missouri, Public schools have developed a number of publications prepared for use by their teachers. Some publications had not been updated for several years; however, the fact that there is information available to teachers is worthy of note. It should further be noted that many of their publications were in the process of being revised at the time this writer reviewed them.

The publication, Safety Responsibilities and Regulations, Manual of Operations, indicated that safety education is regarded as an important matter by all personnel by underscoring such topics as:

I. Introduction

II. Safety Responsibilities
   Superintendent
   Assistant Superintendent
   Supervisor of Safety Education

---

[55]Lyle W. Ashby, "The Educator's Point of View," Report to President's Conference on Occupational Safety (Washington, D.C., 1960), p. 1.

Principal
School Safety Coordinator
Teacher
Nurse
Custodian
School Secretary
Pupil
Cafeteria Worker
Bus Driver
Parents
Workers or repairmen

III. Policies, Rules, and Regulations for Safety
Accident Reporting
Operation of School Safety Patrols
School Safety Committee
Field Trips and Excursions
School Bus Rules
Parking
Hitchhiking
Reporting Home From School

Fire Safety
School Fire Procedures
Fire Prevention
Fire Hazards
Fire Drills

Driver Education

Building Inspection

Civil Defense
Tornado
Enemy Attack

Other Safety Hazards
Dogs on School Grounds
Bombs in School Buildings
Guns, Knives, etc.
Matches, firecrackers, etc.
Snowballing
Molestation
Fighting [56]

---

[56]Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, Safety Responsibilities and Regulations Manual of Operations (Kansas City, Missouri: Department of Safety Education, January 1963), pp. 1-32.

The Resource Guide for Safety Education offered information to Kansas City teachers that can be correlated and implemented in existing programs. The contents included such topics as: need for safety education, objectives for safety education, and the use and organization of the bulletin. Other items included were: opportunities for safety education in traffic, home, schools, playground, school transportation, fire, first aid, civil defense, rural, seasonal and vacation safety; special problems in teaching safety in the high school in areas of driver education, physical education, practical arts and science, units and project development in special areas as: traffic safety in the kindergarten trip to the fire station, problem of the turning car, the seventh grade safety coordinator, school safety committee and social and community life committee. In addition, a thorough listing of audio visual aids and selected references by topic was provided.[57]

A publication dealing specifically with emergency procedures was recently circulated to all Kansas City staff members. Emergency Procedures deals with crises in the school, civil defense, fire, tornado warning, bombs,

---

[57]Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, Resource Guide for Safety Education, Curriculum Bulletin No. 103, Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, June 1958.

epidemics, electric power failure, break in gas line, and break in water main.[58]

In addition to the publications listed, other special curriculum study guides are provided. These include: Handbook and Guide for Driver Education Teachers,[59] Life Savers,[60] and Motorcycle Study Guide.[61] These publications provide material for, and are issued to all teachers in the system.

Lansing Public School System provides many materials for its teachers. The 1964 publication entitled Safety Education, A Suggested Guide for Elementary Teachers, provides information and lesson guides for such topics as: Traffic Safety while walking, in cars or buses, on a bicycle; at school; with the Safety Patrol; at home; in the community; during the seasons, autumn, winter, spring, summer; fire prevention; civil defense. In addition, a

---

[58]Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, Emergency Procedures, Safety Education Department, Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, April 1969, pp. 1-8.

[59]Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, Handbook And Guide for Driver Education Teachers, Safety Education Department, Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, April 1965, mimeographed.

[60]Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, Life Savers, Safety Education Department, Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, mimeographed.

[61]Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, Motorcycle Study Guide, Safety Education Department, Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, September 1968, mimeographed.

bibliography of visual aids and printed materials is provided.[62] Other special publications for Lansing teachers include: Fire Safety,[63] Emergency Procedures and First Aid,[64] Bus Driver Rules and Regulations,[65] and Driver Education.[66] A special program conducted to train school safety patrols in the Greater Lansing area was reviewed. The program is sponsored cooperatively by the Safety Council of Greater Lansing, The Police Departments, and the Boards of Education of Lansing and East Lansing, Michigan, and supported financially by the citizens of that general area.[67] These schools also participate in the Green Pennant Safety Program sponsored in the Greater Lansing Area by Oldsmobile and Fisher Body Divisions of General Motors.[68]

---

[62]Lansing Public Schools, Safety Education: A Suggested Guide for Elementary Teachers. The Board of Education, City of Lansing and The Safety Council of Greater Lansing, 1964.

[63]Lansing School District, Fire Safety, Administrative Bulletin No. 6114.1. Lansing Public Schools, 1968.

[64]Lansing School District, Emergency Procedures and First Aid, Lansing Public Schools, 1965.

[65]Lansing School District, Bus Driver Rules and Regulations, Lansing Public Schools, mimeographed, no date.

[66]Lansing School District, Driver Education, Lansing Public Schools, mimeographed, no date.

[67]Lansing School District, Official Handbook Greater Lansing School Safety Patrols, Greater Lansing School Safety Patrol, Lansing, Michigan, 1967, p. 5.

[68]Lansing School District, The Green Pennant Safety Program, Greater Lansing School Safety Patrol, Lansing, Michigan, brochure.

Los Angeles City Schools offer a safety education program. Curriculum guides for elementary grades were reviewed. These presented ideas and suggestions by grade level to introduce habits, attitudes and skills associated with safe practices as pedestrians, going to and from school, on the playground, in building and classrooms, during emergency drills, and at home.[69]

The Division of Safety Education of the School District of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania offers a twenty-six point safety involvement program for students and staff of that school system. These points are:

1. Responsibility of the Division Staff
2. Safety Coordinators in all Schools
3. Instruction in the Schools
4. Safety Consultant and Information Service
5. Accident Reporting and Analysis
6. Employee Accident Prevention
7. 6,000 Safety Patrol Boys
8. School Crossing Guards
9. Pedestrian Safety Education Project
10. Driver Education Program
11. Driver Improvement (violators) course for adults
12. Fire Safety Education Project

---

[69]Los Angeles City Schools, Safety, Publication No. 375, Los Angeles City Schools Division of Instructional Services, 1957, pp. 1-22.

13. Administrative Bulletin No. I
    - Fire Safety in Schools
      - In case of fire
      - Unidentified smoke
      - Unusual odors or fumes
      - The fire drill
      - Prevention and control

14. Fire Prevention Inspection

15. Fire Drills

16. Safety Flyers

17. Student Safety Organizations
    - Corridor and stairway patrols
    - Safety Councils or commissions
    - Junior fire departments
    - Bicycle clubs

18. Safety Conferences
    - Conferences of School Safety Coordinators
    - Youth Traffic Safety Conference
    - School Bus Matrons and Bus Attendants Safety Conferences
    - Conferences of Cafeteria and other workers
    - Safety Patrol Leaders Camp
    - Philadelphia Safety and Fire Conference and Exhibit

19. Home and School Council

20. Bicycle Safety Programs

21. Emergency and Survey Services
    - Civil Defense
    - Red Cross Activities
    - Surveys of Specific Hazardous Situations and Conditions

22. National School Safety Honor Roll Listing

23. Summer School and Summer Playground Programs

24. School Safety Magazine

25. Community Activities

26. Evaluations[70]

Safety Education is tied quite closely with Health and First Aid measures in the City School System of Rochester, New York. Instruction in the safety field centers on the general topics of (1) In the home: falls, poisons, fire; (2) In the school: a. gymnasium, play areas, pool, home economics room, shops, laboratories, classrooms, and in and around the building; b. fire drills and air raid alerts; (3) In the community: agencies dealing with safety--Chamber of Commerce, Police Bureau, Settlement Houses, Youth Board and Recreation; (4) Year around recreational areas: commercial amusement centers, swimming areas, playgrounds, parks, boating and sailing areas, skiing and water skiing areas, hunting and fishing areas; (5) at work: safety in various types of occupations; (6) on the highway: driver, passenger and pedestrian safety, bicycle and vehicle safety.[71]

---

[70]School District of Philadelphia, Highlights of the Safety Education Program, Division of Safety Education, Philadelphia Public Schools Pennsylvania, September 1968, mimeographed.

[71]City School District, Rochester, New York, Health Education Grades 8-9, Division of Instruction, City School District, Rochester, New York, 1967, O. 53.

A school safety patrols' program operates within the school system.[72] In addition, a school Junior Safety Council functions under the following set of purposes:

1. To promote individual, school, home, and community safety among the pupils.

2. To encourage individual responsibility for personal safety and the safety of others.

3. To cooperate with the City Department of Public Safety and other civic agencies devoted to the promotion of safety education.

4. To assist in developing the overall school safety education programs.

5. To enlist the help of all pupils in the school in carrying out the major objectives of the Junior Safety Council.[73]

A comprehensive curriculum guide for a seven week Safety Education and First Aid program is provided for teachers of Health II in the high school. The safety education section is divided into the units of: General Aspects, Home Safety, School Safety, Recreation Safety, Traffic Safety, and Civil Defense.[74] This curriculum guide is designed to fulfill the following objectives:

---

[72]City School District, Rochester, New York, Manual of Policies, Standards and Procedures For Health, Safety, Physical Education and Recreation, Elementary Schools, Department of Health and Physical Education, City School District, Rochester, New York, July 1962, p. 60.

[73]Ibid., p. 52.

[74]City School District, Rochester, New York, Safety Education, Department of Health and Physical Education, City School District, Rochester, New York, mimeographed, p. 1.

1. To learn to avoid dangers when possible and develop habits of thought and action that will become functional in meeting emergencies.

2. To cooperate with public and other agencies for public safety in the community.

3. To understand the responsibility of the individual in making school safety programs effective.

4. To accept the fundamental concept that accidents are caused; they do not happen.

5. To take an active interest in the protection of life, health and property of the community in which you live.

6. To appreciate the responsibility of the individual for the safety of the troup and the effect of individual conduct on the safety of others.

7. To accept the accident data as a guide to constructive action in accident prevention.

8. To respect and understand safety rules, regulations, laws and practices.

9. To develop cooperation in the solution of such safety problems as traffic hazards and safe driving.

10. To educate pupils to live in harmony with their school environment.[75]

It was noted that each school safety program reviewed included a report of accident statistics and evidence that

---

[75] Ibid.

these accidents had been studied and analyzed.[76,77,78,79,80] Lansing school district published situations and apparent causes and used these as background and study information in safety programs. They also integrated results of analysis into their subsequent safety bulletins.[81]

Many state departments of education have prepared a curriculum guide or syllabus for driver education, but few have a school-wide program or guide in all aspects of safety.

Regulations of the Commissioner of Education of the State of New York states:

---

[76]Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, A Summary of Student Accidents 1967-68 School Term, Safety Education Department, Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, July, 1968, mimeographed.

[77]Lansing School District, Accident Facts, Department of Safety Education, Lansing Public Schools, January, 1969, mimeographed.

[78]Los Angeles City Schools, A Report of Pupil and Employee Accidents, Division of Instructional Planning and Services, Los Angeles City Schools, 1967.

[79]School District of Philadelphia, Student and Employee Accident Facts of the Philadelphia Public Schools, File #550 Division of Safety Education, Philadelphia Public Schools, Pennsylvania, February, 1968, mimeographed.

[80]City School District, Annual Statistical Report: 1968-69, Division of Planning and Research, City School District, Rochester, New York, March, 1969.

[81]Lansing School District, How They Got Hurt, Department of Safety Education, Lansing Public Schools, January, 1969, mimeographed.

> Instruction in safety education, including highway and traffic safety shall be given to all pupils in both elementary and secondary grades; such instruction shall be made a definite part of the school program either as a special subject or in connection with instruction in other subject; comprehensive plans for safety education shall be organized by local school authorities including highway and traffic safety, home safety, recreational safety, industrial and occupational safety, and school safety to insure the development of safety habits in all the varied activities of everyday life; and the instruction in safety education shall be given for not less than 30 periods, or the equivalent thereof, in each year in the junior high school (grades 7 to 9) and for not less than 15 periods or the equivalent thereof in each year of the senior high school (grades 10-12).[82]

Rhode Island State Department of Education publishes Safety Education Bulletins three times per year which keep teachers informed of required fire drills, school bus drills, accident reports, and other information pertinent to the field of general safety education.[83]

Wisconsin suggests that the topics of traffic safety, home safety, school safety, recreational safety and farm safety be taught in primary and intermediate and junior high grades. Occupational safety is added to the list for the senior high school grades.[84] The Wisconsin Guide states:

---

[82]The University of the State of New York, Safety Education, Section 153, Regulations of the Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, mimeographed.

[83]State Department of Education, Safety Education Bulletin, The Department of Education State of Rhode Island, September, 1969, mimeographed.

[84]Department of Public Instruction, Safety Curriculum Guide, Curriculum Bulletin 27, State of Wisconsin, Cooperative Education Planning Program, June, 1961, pp. 3-4.

> Each teacher shall devote not less than thirty minutes each month teaching pupils safety, and another thirty minutes each month teaching fire prevention.[85]

Maine's guide includes some topics that have not been included in others reviewed for this study. These topics included: planning for safety instruction in schools, the place of safety education in kindergarten through grade 12 teaching safety through other curriculum areas, safety education for physically handicapped children, and legal aspects of school safety.[86]

Other materials are available that could be used to help guide teachers, and to make safety programming a definite part of regularly planned lesson content. For example, the American Automobile Association publishes several booklets entitled Ten Traffic Safety Guides. These are divided into age groups such as for teachers of grades K-3, 4-6, and Junior High.[87,88] Helpful hints are provided together with background materials and listings of related materials appropo to the suggested lesson outlines. Birnbach, serving as consultant to the American Automobile

---

[85] Ibid., p. 8.

[86] Department of Education, Safety Education for Maine Schools, State of Maine, Department of Education, 1967, p. 2.

[87] M. Elizabeth Crabtree and Luverne C. Walker, Ten Traffic Safety Guides 1967-1968: Grades K-3, and 4-6, American Automobile Association, Washington, 1967.

[88] Jerrold Glassman, Ten Traffic Safety Guides 1967-1968: Junior High, American Automobile Association, Washington, 1967.

Association developed a booklet for elementary grades in which safety pictures and messages were presented to the student, and the student drew his own picture relating his experience with the presented lesson idea.[89]

The National Commission on Safety Education provided some excellent curriculum helps for teachers in the area of elementary and intermediate grades. Each unit included information as: Why accent safety, what to know and do, and how to develop the Unit.[90,91]

A plan used by some districts in the state of New York to offer specialized programs to students is the Board of Cooperative Educational Services (hereafter referred to as BOCES). Several school districts cooperate to offer special programs, facilities and services not feasible in each individual district.[92] An example of this type structure would be the First Supervisory District of Erie County, New York in which nineteen school districts participate.[93]

---

[89]Sidney B. Birnbach, My Own Safety Story (Washington: American Automobile Association, 1967).

[90]National Commission on Safety Education, Safety Guides for You--in the Primary Grades (Washington: National Education Association, 1961).

[91]National Commission on Safety Education, Safety Guides for You--in the Intermediate Grades (Washington: National Education Association, 1962).

[92]First Supervisory District, The Board of Cooperative Educational Services (Buffalo, New York: First Supervisory District of Erie County, 1968), pp. 1-5.

[93]Ibid., p. 4.

Trade and technical courses are offered on two and three year programs. Programs are multi-occupational in nature and offer opportunities for the gifted and college-bound student, the non-college cound, and the handicapped.[94]

Work-study programs are offered as well as adult programs in such areas as auto mechanics, electronics, computer programming, computer circuitry, refrigeration, and machine shop practice.[95]

In addition, the BOCES structure provides special services to the cooperating districts such as data processing, special education services, curriculum development, film library, learning resource center, materials production service instructional television service, in-service education, consultive services, and special pupil personnel services.[96]

This chapter has reviewed the literature pertaining to the offerings in the nation's schools. It was seen that some schools regard safety as an adjunct to existing courses such as health or physical education. Other schools attempt to integrate safety offerings into all phases of the curriculum offerings. More information concerning driver education was evident than in any other specific area.

---

[94] Ibid., p. 6.

[95] Ibid., p. 9.

[96] Ibid., pp. 10-19.

Curriculum materials and guides are available from a number of sources, including national organizations, insurance companies, state departments of education, and a number of school systems deeply involved in safety education programs.

More and more schools and state departments of education are developing broad based safety education programs from kindergarten through grade 12.

# CHAPTER III

## PROCEDURES USED FOR THE STUDY

The data used in this study was obtained by using a survey type questionnaire. The questionnaires were sent to selected public school systems in New York State to determine the state-of-the-art of safety education. Public school systems were stratified to separate city superintendencies, and centralized districts. From these lists, a 10 percent sampling was randomly selected using a table of random numbers. A total of eighty public school systems were contacted. This made a representative sampling of each group mentioned above.

The questionnaire information served as the main research instrument. Additional information was gained through an extensive review of the literature as described in Chapter II.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire was developed from experience gained from (1) teaching experience in several states, including New York, Michigan and Missouri, (3) several terms of office in the Driver and Safety Educators Association of New York State, (3) discussions with leading safety educators, and

(4) information available in textbooks and available curriculum guides. Questions were designed to determine the state-of-the-art of safety education programs being conducted in the public school systems of New York State. Questions were also designed to obtain pertinent information concerning the type of programs being conducted, methods by which these programs were being conducted, and the backgrounds and qualifications of those persons responsible for these programs. Question format was designed for ease of completion by the respondent. Check marks, and short number answers were asked for in most instances. Additional space was provided for short answers to be written.

A panel of eight nationally recognized educators were asked to evaluate the questionnaire form. Members of the panel agreed to serve in an advisory and evaluative capacity. Copies of the questionnaire were sent to each member of this panel to read, to evaluate, and to make suggestions for clarity, proper wording, and strengthening of the instrument. These panel members were selected because of their long involvement in the field of safety education and to gain the benefit of their experience. The members of the panel were:

Mr. Lewis Clark
Director of Safety Education
Lansing City School District
Lansing, Michigan 48903

Dr. Lonnie Gilliland
Director of Safety Education
3157 Elmwood
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73116

Dr. Dalibor Kralovek
Division of Safety Education
School District of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Dr. Robert L. Marshall
Director, Safety Center
Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri 64093

Mr. Ronald Patterson
Supervisor of Safety Education
Ft. Myers Public Schools
Ft. Myers, Florida

Dr. Thomas A. Seals
Coordinator of Safety Education
San Diego County Schools
San Diego, California

Mr. Nevin Wasson
Supervisor, Department of Safety Education
Board of Education
1211 McGee Street
Kansas City, Missouri

Mr. Cecil Zaun
Director, Safety and Driver Instruction
Los Angeles City School District
Los Angeles, California 90033

Complete evaluations of the questionnaire were received from each member of the panel. Suggestions received from the panel members were included in the questionnaire during revision.

The revised questionnaire was presented to the writer's doctoral advisor for final approval. The advisor's suggestions were incorporated into the final form and the questionnaire was duplicated and mailed to the 80 selected New York State Public Schools. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix A. The listing of selected school systems surveyed is found in Appendix B.

The first mailing of the questionnaires was made on May 10, 1969. The mailing included a letter of explanation from the investigator. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix C. In addition, a letter from Dr. Robert O. Nolan, Director of Driver Education, Michigan State University, Chairman of the investigator's doctoral committee, was included encouraging participation in the study investigation.

On June 10, a second mailing was made to those school systems that had not returned their completed questionnaires. The second mailing included a letter from the investigator requesting them to complete and return the questionnaire. Also, a self-addressed post card requested respondents to check one of two statements and return the card to the investigator. The statements were: (1) that the questionnaire was being completed and would be mailed upon completion, and (2) that an additional questionnaire was needed.

The third and final mailing was made on July 8, 1969 to those school systems who had not submitted completed questionnaires. This mailing included a brief letter of request for completing the questionnaire, and a post card for them to check a response item.

Final results of the three mailings are noted in Appendix B. Fifty of the 80 school systems returned questionnaires, for a percentage of 62.5. Fourteen school systems indicated by post card or letter that they were not

able to participate in the study at this time. Three school systems indicated by card that they planned to participate in the study, but completed questionnaires were not received. There was no response of any kind from thirteen school systems.

In several instances, personal visits and interviews were conducted to check on completeness of questionnaire responses, and to determine validity of responses given.

In several instances, on the second and third mailings, additional questionnaires were requested by school systems. In all but three instances completed questionnaires were returned within several days. Several school systems requested an additional copy of the questionnaire for their personal use.

In almost every instance, those school systems returning completed questionnaires requested an abstract be sent to them following completion of the study.

The 62.5 percent return was considered adequate to produce valid data for interpretation and to develop a rationale for a comprehensive Safety Education Program and a model organizational pattern which would permit inclusion of a Safety Education Program in public school systems in New York State.

## SUMMARY

School systems were stratified to separate city superintendencies, village superintendencies, and

centralized districts. A 10 percent sampling was randomly selected.

A questionnaire was developed. This was reviewed by a panel of eight nationally recognized educators. Following revision, and approval by doctoral advisor, the questionnaire was mailed to eighty randomly selected school systems. Questionnaires were returned by 50 of the eighty school systems contacted, for a percentage of 62.5. Fourteen school systems were not able to participate in the study. Three school systems indicated interest, but did not return questionnaires. No response of any kind was received from thirteen school systems.

Two follow-up letters were sent to urge participation. Personal visits and interviews were made to several school systems to determine validity of responses given, and to obtain clarity and completeness of responses.

# CHAPTER IV

## PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

To determine the state of the art of safety education programs in the public schools of New York State, a questionnaire was used as the main data gathering instrument. Questionnaires were received from fifty of the eighty school systems contacted. Questionnaires were not complete in several instances for a number of reasons, such as: (1) no programs were in existence in the particular school systems, (2) there was not a person designated as either safety supervisor or school coordinator in that system, (3) the person responding to the questionnaire was not knowledgeable about particular segments of the school's program, (4) some questions did not apply to certain school systems--marked N/A on the questionnaire form, and (5) items were simply left blank on the questionnaire form.

With regard to information sought concerning the school, it was noted that the questionnaire was completed in most instances, by either the district principal or the driver education instructor. Others responding to the questionnaire were directors of health, physical education, recreation, and safety, and supervising principals and superintendents. This item was not completed on fourteen questionnaires.

Districts contacted varied in size by population from 1,000 persons to well over 50,000 persons. The majority of the districts reporting size information were between 1,000-5,000 and 5,000-10,000 persons. Nineteen school systems fell within these two size groups. In several instances, no up-to-date figures were available concerning size of school district.

Information concerning size of the school districts by pupil enrollment was reported by 33 of the 50 responding districts. A complete listing of schools reporting enrollment figures divided into grade-level groups is presented in Appendix I. A summary of total enrollment figures from the 33 districts is presented in Table 1.

The smallest number of pupils enrolled reported was 1,000, and the largest reported was 8,800.

Safety Supervisor or Director

Table 2 contains a summary of the responding school systems in New York State concerning system wide safety education supervision. Only 5 schools reported having such a person employed as either a safety supervisor or director. In two instances, this person was the person who completed the questionnaire. Only one school system responding reported having a full-time safety supervisor. Four others stated this was a part-time position. The supervisor's staff size varied. In one instance there was one full-time staff member, and in one instance two part-time staff

Table 1

Distribution of School Size by Pupil Enrollment

| Pupils Enrolled | No. of Schools |
|---|---|
| 1000 - 15000 | 2 |
| 1501 - 2000 | 5 |
| 2000 - 2500 | 4 |
| 2501 - 3000 | 6 |
| 3001 - 4000 | 0 |
| 4000 - 4500 | 1 |
| 4501 - 5000 | 2 |
| 5001 - 5500 | 2 |
| 5501 - 6000 | 3 |
| 6001 - 6500 | 3 |
| 6501 - 7000 | 0 |
| 7001 - 7500 | 2 |
| 7501 - 8000 | 0 |
| 8001 - 8500 | 1 |
| 8500 - up | 2 |

Table 2

Number of Respondents Reporting A School Safety Education Supervisor or Director*

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Full Time | Part Time | Other |
| 1. Schools Having Supervisors | 5 | 45 | 1 | 4 | 0 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Number of Staff** | |
| 1. Number of persons devoting full time | 1 |
| 2. Number of persons devoting part time | 2 |
| 3. Number of persons assigned in addition to teaching duties | 1 (entire elem. staff) |
| 4. Number of full-time secretaries | 1 |
| 5. Number of part-time secretaries | 4 |
| **When Position Established** | |
| 1. Less than two years | 0 |
| 2. Between two and five years | 3 |
| 3. More than five years | 2 |
| **Why Position Established** | |
| 1. To develop a better program | 5 |
| 2. Administrative order | 1 |
| 3. Community influence | 1 |
| 4. Other | |
| a. Need of person to perform duties | 1 |

*Personnel from 50 school systems responding to this item.

members were evidenced. In another instance, one district elementary school charged its entire teaching staff with safety responsibility as an aid to its four nurses and six physical education teachers. In this instance, the physical education teachers had safety responsibility in addition to their regular teaching duties.

It was noted that the one school district having a full-time supervisor, also employed a full-time secretary to supplement the program. Part-time secretaries were noted in the other four instances.

In the five school systems noting supervisory positions, three stated the position had been established and in effect between two and five years, while in two cases the position had been in operation for over five years.

All of the five school districts reporting supervisory positions noted that the reason for having this position was to develop a better program. One school district mentioned that in addition to desiring a better program, the position was established by an administrative order as a result of community influence.

Supervisor qualifications. Information received concerning how supervisors were selected, and recommendations for minimum preparation for a person to qualify for such a position is presented in Table 3. As in Table 2 only five school systems responded to these questions.

Table 3

Safety Supervisor Qualifications and Recommended Preparation for Supervisors

| How Did This Person Become Safety Education Supervisor | No. of Schools | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Hired specifically | 1 | |
| 2. Promoted because | | |
| a. Special training | 3 | |
| b. Education | 2 | |
| c. Experience | 2 | |
| d. Interest | 3 | |
| 3. Volunteered or requested position | 2 | |
| 4. Assigned | 2 | |
| **Recommendations for a Minimum Preparation for a Safety Education Supervisor** | | |
| 1. A course in Safety Education | 2 | |
| 2. A minor in college preparation | 1 | |
| a. Number of hours | | 0 |
| 3. A major in college preparation | 1 | |
| 4. A special degree in this field | 1 | |
| a. B.S. in Safety Education | 0 | |
| b. M.S. in Safety Education | 1 | |
| c. Specialist (6th year) in Safety Education | 0 | |
| d. Doctorate in Safety Education | 0 | |
| 5. Teaching Experience | 0 | |
| a. Number of years | | |
| (1) Less than four years | | 0 |
| (2) Five years | | 1 |
| (3) Eight years or more | | 1 |
| 6. Other | | |
| a. Interest | | 1 |
| b. Health Education Background | | 1 |
| c. Physical Education Background | | 1 |

In only one instance was the person hired specifically for the position. In three instances, the individual was promoted because of special training, education, experience and interest. In two cases, the person was assigned this position after having requested or volunteered for it.

Recommendations for minimum preparation for the job of safety supervisor varied among the five respondents. They ranged from a course in safety education (2), a minor in college preparation (1), a major in college preparation (1), to a special degree in this field on the master's level (1). Teaching experience was recommended as necessary preparation. Five years and eight years were recommended as minimum amounts of teaching experience necessary prior to entering such a position. Other recommendations included interest on the part of the person, and either a health and/or physical education background.

While several recommendations were made concerning preparation for such a position, it was noted that very few schools have officially adopted any definite minimum requirements, as shown in Table 4. One of the five respondents to this section stated a course in safety education and a degree in physical education, one school district required a special degree but did not state at what level, and three stated that no requirements were set by their school district.

Table 4

Minimum Requirements Used by Schools For Employment as Safety Education Supervisor

| Topics | | No. of Schools |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | A course in Safety Education | 1 |
| 2. | A minor in College Preparation | 0 |
| | a. Number of hours | 0 |
| 3. | A major in College Preparation | 0 |
| 4. | A special degree in this field | 1 |
| | a. B.S. in Safety Education | 0 |
| | b. M.S. in Safety Education | 0 |
| | c. Specialist (6th year) in Safety Education | 0 |
| | d. Doctorate in Safety Education | 0 |
| 5. | Teaching Experience | 0 |
| | a. Number of years | 0 |
| 6. | Other | |
| | a. Not Applicable | 2 |
| | b. Degree in Health and Physical Education | 1 |
| | c. No minimum requirements | 1 |

School Safety Coordinators

In only two school districts of the 50 responding was there any evidence of a special safety coordinator in each of the district's school buildings. In one district this was the additional duty of the nine employed nurses in the schools. Each worked about 2 hours per week in the area of safety education. Safety was included as a portion of expected duty, and no special compensation or remuneration was given. In the other school system responding, the safety program was a part of the job of the director of health, physical education, and recreation. His responsibility was the entire district. His time allocation for safety programming was about eight hours per month in each level--elementary, junior high, and senior high.

In two school districts, the supervisor of safety education held regular in-service meetings with the persons having safety responsibilities in the district's schools. In one instance five combined meetings per year were held while in another, ten in-service safety related meetings were held with elementary teachers each year.

Coordinator qualifications. Recommendations for minimum preparation by a person to serve as a school safety coordinator are presented in Table 5. Forty-two school systems responded to this questionnaire item. Leading items concerning preparation were a course in safety education (13) and a college minor in safety education (8). Three

Table 5

Number of Respondents Reporting Recommendations for A Minimum Preparation for Safety Coordinators

| Qualifications | Number of Schools Responding | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. A course in Safety Education | 13 | |
| 2. A minor in College Preparation | 8 | |
| 3. A major in College Preparation | 3 | |
| 4. A special degree in this field | 0 | |
| a. B.S. in Safety Education | | 2 |
| b. M.S. in Safety Education | | 2 |
| c. Specialist (6th Year) in Safety Education | | 1 |
| d. Doctorate in Safety Education | | 0 |
| 5. Other | | |
| a. Experience | | 1 |
| b. Not applicable | | 13 |

*Personnel from 42 School Systems responded to this item.

respondents recommended a college major in safety education. In five instances a special degree in safety was suggested. Two respondents recommended a B.S. in Safety, two recommended a M.S. in Safety, and one recommended a specialist degree. Thirteen respondents marked this item not-applicable.

Only two respondents indicated that any qualifications had been established as minimum requirements for the employment or selection of school safety coordinators. One stated at least a course in safety education, but preferred a major in safety education. The other respondent stated that they looked for (characteristics) such as teaching experience, interest in the field, and success in safety programs as a volunteer, as criterion for selection and employment.

"In-Service" Safety Education Programs

Table 6 summarizes the thirty responses concerning whether the school offers "in-service" education programs for various groups of faculty and staff. The most frequently mentioned group trained by "in-service" programs was school bus drivers. Sixteen school districts indicated they conducted such programs, and held between 1 to 4 meetings per year. Four districts reported yearly in-service safety programs for all teachers in the system. Three held similar programs for driver education teachers, and two conducted yearly programs for administrators. It was

Table 6

Number of Respondents Reporting In-Service Education Programs in Safety Education

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Number Per Year |
| 1. Administrators | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 2. Teachers | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| 3. School bus drivers | 16 | 0 | 1-4 |
| 4. Driver Education Teachers | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 5. Individual school safety coordinator | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Other Employees | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| 7. Others | | | |
| a. When need arises | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| b. Physical Education Personnel | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| c. Coaches | 1 | 0 | 0 |

*Personnel from 30 school systems responded to this item.

interesting to note that schools with supervisory personnel in the area of safety were the ones conducting in-service programs for most of their employees. In several cases school systems indicated "in-service" education programs being conducted for all employees of the district. Most responses indicated from one to four meetings per year, however, one respondent mentioned holding in-service programs "only when the need arises".

Safety Courses For Teachers Required

Data concerning those school systems who require any of their teachers to have safety education courses in their preparation is presented in Table 7. Eleven of the 49 school systems responding to this item stated their school system did require some safety education preparation for some of their teachers. One school system required nine semester hours of safety education related courses in the preparation of all teachers in the system. A number of schools reported some amount of safety education required of teachers in certain subject areas. All eleven responding affirmatively to the requirement item indicated between 2-12 semester hours of education courses for driver education teachers were mandatory. The majority of these (5) required six semester hours, three schools required 3 semester hours, one required 2 semester hours. The highest requirements for driver education teachers came from two school districts.

Table 7

Number of Respondents Reporting School Requirements For Teachers to Have Safety Education Courses in Their Preparation

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding: Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Schools Requiring Courses | 11 | 38 |

| Number of Semester Hours Required By Schools | Number of Schools | Number of Semester Hours |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Elementary | 1 | 9 |
| 2. Junior High | 1 | 9 |
| 3. Senior High | 1 | 9 |
| 4. Teachers of | | |
| a. Health | 8 | 1-9 |
| b. Physical Education | 10 | 2-9 |
| c. Driver Education | 11 | 2-12 |
| d. Industrial Arts | 8 | 2-12 |
| e. Science | 4 | 2-3 |
| f. Others | | |
| (1) Swimming | 1 | 6 |

*Personnel from 49 school systems responded to this item.

One required 9 and one required 12 semester hours of safety courses.

Ten districts required from 2 to 10 semester hours of safety for teachers of physical education, including swimming. The majority of these school systems (6) required six semester hours. A requirement of between 2 and 12 semester hours of safety courses for teachers of Industrial Arts was evidenced by eight school districts, with 3 semester hours indicated in six of the eight school districts. In five of the eight schools reporting a requirement of from 1 to 9 semester hours of safety courses for teachers of health, the requirement was 3 semester hours.

One district required 2 semester hours, and three districts required 3 semester hours of safety courses for science teachers.

An interesting note was that in one school system, 9 semester hours were required by all teachers while in other schools the requirement varied by subject. For example, in one school district the requirements were: Health (6), Physical Education (6), Swimming Lessons (6), Driver Education Teacher (12), Industrial Arts Teacher (12), Science Teachers (3).

It seemed strange that swimming was singled out in addition to physical education in this school system, especially since the semester hour requirement was identical. Generally speaking, where the requirement varied

among courses, the heavier requirements, in the majority of instances, were in the areas of physical education and driver education.

Safety Instruction in Elementary Grades

Safety education was taught in elementary grades in 37 of the 44 schools responding to this item. Table 8 shows that in almost every instance, 34 of the 44, instruction was conducted or planned by the individual classroom teacher. In addition, 14 schools incorporate the use of non-school personnel such as firemen and policemen. Five schools requested use of educational television as a medium or aid, and four indicated use of specialists, such as the safety supervisor, or driver education teacher, do some of the instructing. Also noted were methods including general assemblies, physical education classes, and instruction given by school bus drivers. Methodology of instruction will be more fully described and discussed in the next section, and in Table 9.

Method of instruction. Information concerning techniques used for safety instruction in elementary schools is summarized in Table 9. In only one responding district was it noted that safety education was taught as a separate subject. In this school, this was not the only method used, however. Special safety projects were reported used by 11 school districts. Thirty-two responders indicated their method of instruction was to have safety

Table 8

Number of Respondents Reporting Safety Education Taught in Elementary Schools

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding | |
|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No |
| Safety Education Taught in Elementary School | 37 | 7 |
| How Safety Education Taught | | |
| 1. Individual classroom teacher | 34 | |
| 2. Specialist (Driver Education Teacher, Safety Supervisor, Etc.) | 4 | |
| 3. Educational TV | 5 | |
| 4. Non-school personnel (firemen, policemen, etc.) | 14 | |
| 5. Other | | |
| a. Not applicable | | 1 |
| b. General assemblies | | 1 |
| c. Bus drivers | | 1 |
| d. Physical Education classes | | 1 |

Table 9

Number of Respondents Reporting Methods of Safety Education Instruction Taught in Elementary Schools

| Methods of Instruction | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Separate subject | 1 | |
| 2. Special project | 11 | |
| 3. Integrated with another subject | 32 | |
| a. Health | | 20 |
| b. Social Studies | | 19 |
| c. Science | | 21 |
| d. Physical Education | | 6 |
| e. Shop | | 4 |
| f. Home Economics | | 4 |
| g. Language arts | | 2 |
| h. When it comes up in a subject | | 1 |
| 4. Special unit of another subject | 9 | |
| a. Health | | 6 |
| b. Science | | 8 |
| c. Social Studies | | 8 |
| d. Physical Education | | 2 |
| e. Shop | | 3 |
| f. Home Economics | | 3 |
| 5. Co-curricular activities | 5 | |
| 6. Assembly Program | 24 | |
| a. Number per year | | |
| (1) 1-2 per year | | 16 |
| (2) 3-5 per year | | 5 |
| (3) 6-8 per year | | 3 |
| 7. Other | | |
| a. Safety in Physical Education and Sports | | 1 |
| b. T.V. Tapes | | 1 |
| c. Fire and Civil Defense Drills | | 1 |
| d. Bus Drills | | 1 |

education integrated with another subject or subjects in the regular curriculum. The subjects used for integration of safety programs were: health (20), social studies (19), science (21), physical education (6), shop (4), home economics (4), language arts (2), and whenever it comes up in a subject (1).

Nine schools indicated that safety education was offered as a special unit in another subject. Subjects listed for this technique of instruction included: health (6), science (8), social studies (8), physical education (2), shop (3), and home economics (3).

In 23 cases, assembly programs were used as an additional method of instruction in safety education, and in 5 instances co-curricular activities were add as still another technique. In only one instance were 1 to 2 assembly programs per year listed as the only method of safety instruction in the elementary grades. Sixteen schools mentioned conducting 1 or 2 assembly programs per year, five stated they were holding from 3 to 5 programs per year, and three schools indicated between 6 and 8 safety related programs were held each year. Other techniques mentioned included: safety in physical education and sports (1), television tapes (1), fire and civil defense drills (1), and school bus drills (1). Data also showed that in some schools the only safety instruction received is via state mandated drill procedures.

The amount of time spent specially devoted to safety education varied greatly from school to school. It was extremely difficult for many schools to estimate even a rough approximation. Twenty-nine respondents did attempt some estimate of time spent. Table 10 contains a summary of this information. In five instances between three and nine sessions of 25 to 60 minutes per school year were devoted to safety instruction. Nine schools stated that safety instruction was integrated throughout the school year. Seven reported spending from three to twenty minutes per week with safety instruction. In other schools, very little time if any was spent exclusively devoted to safety instruction. Several schools reporting noted time amounting to that needed for conducting combined state mandated drills.

## Safety Education in Middle and/or Junior High Schools

While only three middle schools are actually in existence in the school districts selected for this investigation, it seemed more practical to include information from this school structure with the junior high schools reporting for they include grades 6, 7, and 8 in most instances.

Summary information concerning the methods of safety instruction used in the thirty-one reporting middle and/or junior high schools is presented in Table 11.

Table 10

Approximated Time Devoted
to Safety Education

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding | |
|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No |
| 1. Schools devoting time | 29 | 13 |
| 2. Average amount of time | | |
| a. Integrated throughout the year | | 9 |
| b. 10-14 minutes per week | | 1 |
| c. 3-20 minutes per week | | 7 |
| d. 1-2 sessions per month | | 1 |
| e. 3-5 hours per month | | 1 |
| f. 1-2 sessions per month | | 1 |
| g. 15-20 minutes per semester | | 3 |
| h. 3-9 sessions, 25-60 minutes per year | | 5 |
| i. 21 or more weeks per year | | 1 |

## Table 11

### Number of Respondents Reporting Safety Education Taught In Middle or Jr. Highs

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding | |
|---|---|---|
| Safety Education Taught In Middle and/or Junior High Schools | Yes | No |
| **Methods of Instruction** | | |
| 1. Separate Subject | | 0 |
| 2. Special Project | | 3 |
| 3. Integrated with another subject | | 26 |
| a. Health | | 18 |
| b. Home Economics | | 5 |
| c. Driver Education | | 1 |
| d. Shop - Industrial Arts | | 5 |
| e. Physical Education | | 6 |
| f. Social Studies | | 7 |
| g. Science | | 12 |
| h. Guidance | | 3 |
| 4. Special Unit of Another Subject | | 9 |
| a. Health | | 9 |
| b. Social Studies | | 1 |
| c. Science | | 6 |
| d. Physical Education | | 1 |
| e. Home Economics | | 1 |
| f. Industrial Arts | | 1 |
| 5. Educational T.V. | | 3 |
| 6. Assembly Programs | | 17 |
| a. Number per year | | |
| (1) 1 per year | | 8 |
| (2) 1-2 per year | | 3 |
| (3) 2 per year | | 5 |
| (4) 3-4 per year | | 1 |
| 7. Other | | |
| a. Fire, Civil Defense, and Bus Drills | | 1 |
| b. Not applicable | | 7 |

As with the elementary schools, the most often used method of presentation of safety material was to integrate it with another subject. This was the method indicated by 26 respondents. Courses used as the parent for integration purposes included: health (18), home economics (5), driver education (1), industrial arts or shop (5), physical education (6), social studies (7), science (12), and guidance (3). Nine school systems indicated safety education as a special unit of another course. Health (9) and science (6) headed the list. The medium of Educational Television was mentioned used by three respondents. Use of assembly programs was mentioned as a technique used by 17 respondents. In 16 of these cases one or two safety related programs were presented per year.

The amount of time devoted was again difficult to ascertain. The most common response was that these programs were integrated through the year, and amounts of time varied so greatly, it was difficult to approximate. Some school systems indicated numbers of sessions held, but did not indicate length. Others estimated time spent per day, week, month, semester or year, but did not indicate any specific number of sessions. A general summary of responses to this item appears in Table 12.

Safety Education in the Senior High Schools

More respondents completed this section than either the elementary or junior high sections. This may be true

## Table 12

### Number of Respondents Indicating Amount of Time in Middle and Junior High Schools Devoted to Safety Instruction

| Approximated Time Devoted To Safety Education | |
|---|---|
| 1. Not applicable | 10 |
| 2. None | 1 |
| 3. Integrated through the year | 7 |
| 4. 3-45 minutes per day | 2 |
| 5. 3-30 minutes per week | 5 |
| 6. 1-2 sessions per month | 2 |
| 7. 1-9 sessions, 40-60 minutes each per semester | 2 |
| 8. 6-9 days per semester | 1 |
| 9. 3-9 hours per year | 3 |
| 10. 1-2 sessions per year | 2 |

in part to the fact that in some schools the only safety education formally presented is in the driver education course. This was true in 19 of the reporting school districts. A total of 38 of the 49 schools responding to this item indicated offering some type of safety education. Summary information concerning this item is included in Table 13.

Safety education was mentioned as being offered as a separate subject in 3 districts, and as a special project in 4 other districts. However, the most common method, again, was integration with another subject. This was the case in 23 situations. The list of courses used as the parent course for safety education inclusion had a strong newcomer in senior high schools--driver education (11). Others included: industrial arts (7), health (21), social studies (3), science (12), physical education (12), and home economics (10).

Eleven school systems offered safety education programs as a special unit within another course. Driver education found its way into this list also. It was mentioned in four instances. Health (8) and industrial arts (6) were the highest on the list of courses featuring special safety units. Physical education (4) and home economics (3) were also mentioned.

Three school systems reported using educational television as an added technique of presenting safety information and programs. Careful note revealed these

Table 13

Number of Respondents Reporting Safety Education Taught in Senior High

| Safety Education Taught In Senior High School | Yes | No | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Schools Having Programs. | 38 | 11 | |
| **Method of Instruction** | | | |
| 1. Separate subject | | 3 | |
| 2. Special project | | 4 | |
| 3. Integrated with another subject | | 23 | |
| a. Industrial Arts | | | 7 |
| b. Driver Education | | | 11 |
| c. Health | | | 21 |
| d. Social Studies | | | 3 |
| e. Science | | | 12 |
| f. Physical Education | | | 12 |
| g. Home Economics | | | 10 |
| 4. Special Unit of Another Subject | | 11 | |
| a. Health | | | 8 |
| b. Physical Education | | | 4 |
| c. Driver Education | | | 4 |
| d. Home Economics | | | 3 |
| e. Industrial Arts | | | 6 |
| 5. Educational T.V. | | 3 | |
| 6. Assembly Programs | | 13 | |
| a. Number per year | | | |
| (1) 1 per year | | | 3 |
| (2) 1-2 per year | | | 4 |
| (3) 2 per year | | | 5 |
| (4) 3-4 per year | | | 1 |
| 7. Driver Education Course Only | | 19 | |
| 8. Other | | | |
| a. Fire, Bus, and Civil Defense Drills | | | 1 |
| b. Not Applicable | | | 3 |

three to be the same ones mentioning this medium used in junior high programs, and also included in the elementary schools reporting using television. It was noted that most schools having this equipment available tended to use it in curricular offerings on all grade levels.

Assembly programs were mentioned by 13 districts for safety programs. In 11 cases these programs expanded or strengthened on-going curricular offerings. In two cases, this was the only method of providing safety instruction for students.

Amounts of time spent in safety education in the senior high schools was as difficult to pin point as it was on the other levels. Table 14 reviews the senior high school responses concerning time at the senior high level devoted to safety education. Eleven respondents marked this item not applicable. Six districts indicated three 44-minute sessions per week were devoted to safety instruction. Four schools indicated that safety programs were integrated throughout the year, but did not indicate a definite amount of time spent in such instructional programs.

Safety Education in Adult Education

Safety education had found its way into the adult education programs of 25 of the 45 schools responding. No adult education programs of any kind were offered in 4 schools, as is shown in Table 15. In most cases it was noted that the safety education program presented were

Table 14

Number of Respondents Indicating Amount of Time In Senior High Schools Devoted to Safety Instruction

| Approximated Time Devoted To Safety Education | |
|---|---|
| 1. Not applicable | 11 |
| 2. Integrated throughout the year | 4 |
| 3. 3-20 minutes per day | 2 |
| 4. 45 minutes per day, ½ semester | 2 |
| 5. 3-44 minutes per week | 6 |
| 6. 1-2 sessions, 40-60 minutes per month | 3 |
| 7. Driver Education class per semester | 2 |
| 8. 6-9 days per semester | 1 |
| 9. 3-5 sessions, 21 or more minutes per semester | 1 |
| 10. 1-2 sessions per year | 2 |
| 11. 6-9 hours per year | 2 |

Table 15

Number of Respondents Reporting Safety Programs in Adult Education and Methods of Instruction Used

| Adult Education | Yes | No | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Schools having programs | 25 | 16 | 4 |
| **Methods of Instruction** | | | |
| 1. Separate subject | | 0 | |
| 2. Incorporated in other subjects | | 1 | |
| a. Shop | | | 1 |
| b. Home Economics | | | 1 |
| c. Physical Education | | | 1 |
| 3. Driver Education | | 25 | |
| 4. Driver Improvement | | 5 | |
| 5. Other | | | |
| a. Qualification course specified by Motor Vehicle Bureau | | | 1 |

directed toward traffic safety. Driver Education programs were offered in all 25 instances. Driver improvement programs and the required Department of Motor Vehicles Pre-Licensing Instruction Course were others mentioned. In one case safety was reported incorporated into adult physical education, home economics and industrial arts courses in addition to driver education.

## Safety Education Information Provided for Teachers

Table 16 shows the kinds of safety education materials supplied by the district for teachers in the system.

Forty-five school systems responded to these items. Seventeen stated that an administrative handbook, developed by local personnel, was available to teachers in the system. In sixteen cases these have been developed on a Kindergarten through grade 12 basis. In one school, Administrative Guides were available for elementary and junior high levels only. Safety curriculum guides were available in only five school systems. Only one of these was done on a K-12 basis. Materials available for teachers had been officially adopted by the responsible school authorities in 13 districts.

## School Plans, Procedures, Policies for Special Events or Emergencies

Several of the items included in the list of plans and policies concerned those required by the state such as fire drills, civil defense drills, and school bus drills.

Table 16

Number of Respondents Reporting Safety Education Information Provided for Teacher

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding | | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | | |
| 1. Administrative Handbook | 17 | | 28 |
| a. Elementary | | 1 | |
| b. Middle or Junior High | | 1 | |
| c. Senior High | | 0 | |
| d. K-12 | | 16 | |
| 2. Safety Curriculum Guide | 5 | | 38 |
| a. Elementary | | 2 | |
| b. Middle or Junior High | | 0 | |
| c. Senior High | | 2 | |
| d. K-12 | | 1 | |
| 3. Materials Developed by Local Personnel | 17 | | 28 |
| 4. Materials officially adopted | 13 | | 32 |

Thiety-seven school districts of the 50 responding answered questions relating to whether or not the school had plans, procedures, and/or policies for special events or emergencies happening in and around the school. Several schools requested extra copies of the questionnaire form for their own use, stating that the list of situations in this item was of special interest to them. Table 17 summarizes the responses to this item.

In 36 of the 37 responses, plans were in evidence concerning fire in school buildings. Other policies reported by a number of school districts were: sending ill pupils home (35), civil defense drills for nuclear attack (33), caring for pupils injured while under school jurisdiction (32), interview by a police officer (31), driver education (33). School bus drills--load and unload (31) and emergency procedures (31) were also reported as areas of policy concern by schools.

Procedures or policies existed in only about one half of the schools reporting items such as safety patrols (18), sending pupils on errands (2), and molestation of children (16).

Only 8 respondents indicated a policy for riot or unruly students. This may be an item of recent concern by school systems since only a small number responded to the question.

Safety patrols were more common in elementary schools than in junior and senior high schools, while driver

Table 17

Number of Respondents Reporting Plans or Policies for Safety in School

| Topics | Yes | No | Number of Schools Responding: Elem. | Jr. High | Sr. High |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Fire in School Buildings | 36 | 0 | 35 | 23 | 35 |
| 2. Second Means of Alarm | 29 | 6 | 29 | 27 | 28 |
| 3. Civil Defense Drills | | | | | |
| a. Natural disaster | 21 | 14 | 21 | 20 | 21 |
| b. Nuclear attack | 33 | 2 | 31 | 29 | 32 |
| 4. School Bus Drills | | | | | |
| a. Load and unload | 31 | 4 | 31 | 29 | 31 |
| b. Emergency procedures | 31 | 4 | 31 | 29 | 31 |
| 5. Bomb threats (by phone) | 24 | 11 | 24 | 21 | 24 |
| 6. Riot or unruly students | 8 | 27 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| 7. Safety Patrol | 18 | 19 | 16 | 8 | 9 |
| 8. Caring for pupil injured while under school jurisdiction | 32 | 3 | 32 | 30 | 32 |
| 9. Sending pupils on errands | 20 | 17 | 20 | 15 | 18 |
| 10. Excursions and field trips | 29 | 6 | 29 | 26 | 29 |
| 11. Christmas Trees | 29 | 6 | 28 | 26 | 28 |
| 12. Sending ill pupils home | 35 | 0 | 35 | 33 | 35 |
| 13. Removal of pupil from school by police officer | 29 | 6 | 29 | 26 | 29 |
| 14. Interview of pupil by a police officer | 31 | 4 | 31 | 27 | 30 |
| 15. Driver Education | 33 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| 16. Molestation of Children | 16 | 19 | 16 | 13 | 15 |
| 17. Pupil bitten by dog | 22 | 13 | 20 | 17 | 19 |
| 18. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

education was mentioned only by Senior high schools. In most cases schools having plans and policies in existence, evidenced these plans at all grade levels.

Complete Accident Reporting System

Table 18 shows that all 36 respondents to the question concerning whether or not the school had a complete accident reporting system indicated they did for student accidents. In all but one instance this included staff accidents as well. In the one case, no answer was given concerning staff accidents rather than an indication that reports were not made, or records not kept.

In 32 schools, reports were analyzed and corrective action was taken in every instance possible.

One school system reported that accident reports were made, records kept, but that data were not analyzed, nor were corrective measures taken. One may question the value of time and effort spent in making and keeping records if they are not used for any purpose other than to have them on file in the event of a court case, or legal question.

Examples of corrective action taken, following accident analysis, were mentioned by 27 respondents. In most cases these included routine correction such as cleaning up debris, checking for similar situations existing elsewhere in the school, or asking for increased care on part of students and staff.

Table 18

Number of Respondents Reporting
An Accident Reporting System

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | No Response |
| 1. Student accidents | 36 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Staff accidents | 35 | 0 | 1 |
| 3. Accident report forms | | | |
| a. Analyzed | 32 | 2 | 2 |
| b. Corrective Action | 33 | 1 | 2 |

In several instances, however, the action taken evidenced a definite change in policy or the addition of a safety measure. These included:

1. Placing abrasive materials on shower room floor
2. Changing design of chalk trays
3. Substituting paper milk cartons for glass bottles
4. Correcting sidewalks--leveling or replacing
5. Lessening physical education requirements for girls in tumbling
6. Modifying playground equipment which caused injuries
7. Adding handrails on bleachers
8. Stripping slippery floors of wax

Special Programs Offered To Students

Table 19 presents a complete summary of responses to the special safety related programs offered to students. Five school systems marked this item not applicable in their system. Responses were received from 45 additional school systems. Programs most commonly offered included pedestrian safety, bicycle safety, driver education, and swimming. It was noted that in schools offering programs in pedestrian safety, bicycle safety and safety patrols, these were predominantly presented in the elementary schools.

Table 19

Number of Respondents Reporting Special Programs Offered To Students in Safety*

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Elem. | Jr. High | Sr. High |
| 1. Pedestrian Safety | 34 | 11 | 22 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. Bicycle Safety | 29 | 16 | 25 | 7 | 6 |
| 3. Safety Patrols | 16 | 29 | 15 | 4 | 4 |
| 4. Recreational Safety | 15 | 30 | 11 | 9 | 13 |
| 5. Hunter Safety | 15 | 30 | 1 | 6 | 13 |
| 6. Motorcycle Safety | 12 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 7. Safety News on Bulletins | 9 | 36 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| 8. Driver Education | 39 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 38 |
| 9. Water Safety | | | | | |
| a. Swimming | 21 | 24 | 11 | 15 | 17 |
| b. Boating | 16 | 29 | 6 | 11 | 13 |
| c. Diving | 15 | 30 | 4 | 9 | 12 |
| 10. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* 5 schools marked this item N/A

Schools which provided recreational safety programs and swimming programs, generally did so for students of all age groups. Programs offered predominantly at the high school level included hunter safety, motorcycle and driver education, boating and diving.

Student Safety Programs, Clubs, or Committees

The technique of student involvement in safety activities in schools and communities was not in evidence in many schools in this survey. Only 7 of the 49 indicated that safety committees or clubs were in existence. In all cases reported, these were in elementary schools. In all but one instance these were conducted as separate clubs or committees within the school. Table 20 reviews activities and club membership. In most cases members were either appointed or volunteered for membership in the school safety club. Activities of these clubs included helping develop school safety regulations, assisting during fire and other emergency drills, conducting school safety survey, planning special safety programs, and publishing school safety paper or newsletter.

Officially Adopted, School Policy Regarding School Safety Education

Three schools of the 50 reporting districts indicated that an officially adopted policy statement concerning safety education was in effect. Even in these three instances this statement was not included because in one

Table 20

Number of Respondents Reporting Student Safety Program, Clubs, or Committees

| Topics | Number of Schools Responding Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Schools with Safety Programs | 7 | 42 |
| **What Level** | | |
| 1. Elementary | | 7 |
| 2. Junior High | | 0 |
| 3. Senior High | | 0 |
| **How Conducted** | | |
| 1. Separate club or committee | | 6 |
| 2. A committee in student council | | 0 |
| 3. Other | | |
| a. Teacher and classroom safety council | | 1 |
| **How Obtain Membership** | | |
| 1. Elected | | 1 |
| 2. Appointed | | 4 |
| 3. Volunteer | | 4 |
| 4. Invited | | 1 |
| **Activities of Club** | | |
| 1. Help develop school safety regulations | | 4 |
| 2. Assist during fire drills | | 3 |
| 3. Assist during other emergency drills | | 4 |
| 4. Conduct school safety survey | | 4 |
| 5. Conduct community safety survey | | 0 |
| 6. Assist safety coordinator for the school | | 1 |
| 7. Plan safety related program for the school | | 3 |
| 8. Publish school safety paper or newsletter | | 4 |
| 9. Other | | |
| a. Assist PTA | | 1 |
| b. Conduct | | 1 |
| c. Control school safety patrol | | 1 |

case it was out of print and was being revised. In another instance the physical education handbook carried the safety procedures, which included nothing more than fire and air raid drill procedures. Finally, the regulation of the State Commissioner of Education was included as the policy adopted by another school. This evidence seems to indicate that a lackadaisical attitude permeates the atmosphere in the schools reporting on their safety education programming.

Concerning stated objectives of the safety program, only two school systems indicated any answer. In one case this was a general statement in keeping with the commissioner's regulations. It was aimed at protecting students from injury, and protecting the school from liability. In the other, the statement reported indicated that their policy was to conform with state regulations, insurance, and liability.

A number of schools included information with their completed questionnaire which evidenced that some statements and policies were in effect in their schools. Many of these were not over-all policies, officially adopted by the school program. Often these regulations were adopted and approved by department chairmen, for use in an individual school building.

Individual statements on recommended policies and procedures most often included the following topics and areas:

1. Procedures of dealing with injuries on school premises or under school supervision

2. Student insurance

3. School liability

4. School bus rules, drills, etc.

5. Physical education--including swimming pool and playground

6. Fire and civil defense drills

7. Laboratory courses including

    a. Industrial Arts

    b. Home Economics

    c. Science--especially chemistry and physics

    d. Driver Education

Evidence presented throughout this chapter indicates that there are policies and programs in effect in a good number of schools, but that these are, in most cases, not officially adopted, underwritten, or demanded by the chief administrative body of the school system. In a number of cases, corrective action was taken only after an accident had taken place. On-going safety programs, engaging the help of safety clubs, school coordinator and supervisory personnel, together with safety inspections and constant vigilance to serve as preventive measures for accidents and injuries were not evidenced by respondees.

# CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to review present programs of safety education in selected New York Public Schools to provide data to develop a rationale for a comprehensive Safety Education Program and recommend a model organizational pattern to permit the inclusion of a Safety Education Program in any New York Public School System.

### SUMMARY

Since the inclusion of safety programs in a curriculum seemed inherent to the general educational philosophy of a school system, philosophies of education and of safety education were reviewed.

An extensive review of literature related to this study was made. Information was gathered concerning the importance of safety education to the lives of citizens. Of particular note was the fact that recommendations for safety education programs have been discussed for many years by a number of leading educators.

Curriculum guides from school systems known to have safety programs in operation were reviewed to gain insight into the types of programs being conducted, and what types of programs seemed successful.

Data concerning the state-of-the-art of safety education in the public schools of New York State was gathered by means of a questionnaire. Public school systems were stratified into city superintendencies, village superintendencies, and centralized districts. From these groups, a 10 percent sampling was randomly selected. A total of eighty schools were contacted.

The questionnaire was designed to gather pertinent safety program information from the schools. A panel of eight nationally recognized educators evaluated the questionnaire. Following revision and approval by the study advisor, the questionnaires were mailed to the selected school systems.

A total of 50 of the 80 school systems returned questionnaires for a percentage of 62.5.

Personal visits were made to several schools to determine completeness of questionnaire responses and to check on validity of responses given.

Questionnaire responses were tabulated and analyzed. From this data, several conclusions and recommendations have emerged.

As data collected concerning the safety programs existant in the public schools of New York was studied and analyzed, it became evident that not much was being done currently in the schools in the area of safety education. In some instances, responses indicated that administrative personnel had not given thought to developing policies

concerning special situations such as: 1) molestation of children, 2) pupil bitten by a dog, 3) Christmas trees, 4) riot or unruly students, or 5) removal from school or interview of a student by a police officer, to suggest a few. These items were considered important by those programs considered to be successful, and by the panel of eight experts who reviewed the questionnaire as a part of a safety program. It would seem necessary then, that serious consideration be given to the list of concerns outlined in the questionnaire as recommended parts of a comprehensive safety program.

A comprehensive safety program must be concerned with a "total program," in which all areas of safety are considered for all age groups throughout the school and community. As accident rates continue to climb, it is imperative that accident records be studied, that corrective programs be initiated, and that corrective measures be taken to eliminate hazards and problem areas. A comprehensive, total safety education should provide educational and informational programs for: 1) kindergarten through twelfth grade, 2) Adult Education, 3) business persons, 4) community organizations, 5) service groups, and 6) citizen groups in the community.

A comprehensive safety program should include such concerns as:

I. Administration and Supervision

A. A full-time safety supervision in the district who is specifically trained for this position

B. A safety coordinator assigned in each school building in the district

C. Secretarial support staff for these staff positions

II. Staff Education

A. A general safety course required in the preparation program of all teachers in the system

B. In-service educational programs on a regular basis for all staff including:

1. Administrators
2. All teachers
3. School bus drivers
4. School safety coordinators
5. Custodial, cafeteria, clerical and support staff

III. Safety Education Programs for Students

A. Integrated into the curriculum

B. Meet fully the Commissioner's Regulations for safety education

C. Special programs for

1. pedestrian safety
2. bicycle safety
3. safety patrols
4. recreational safety

5. hunter safety
6. motorcycle safety
7. water safety
   a) swimming
   b) boating
   c) diving
8. driver education

D. Student safety club on all levels (K-12)

IV. Special Safety Education Programs for:

A. Adults

B. Senior Citizens

C. Driver Improvement Groups

V. Educational Support for Teachers

A. Administrative handbooks

1. Written on a K-12 basis
2. Developed for individual school district
3. Adopted officially by the school board

B. Curriculum guides

1. Written on a K-12 basis
2. Developed by local persons and tailored to school and subject areas

VI. Special Policies Developed for Emergency Situations

A. Published for all staff personnel

B. See Appendix A, Study Questionnaire, question #9.

VII. A Complete System for Accident Records

A. Regularly reported

B. Studied fully to determine cause

C. Corrective action taken to eliminate danger, hazard, or lack of education

VIII. Program Evaluation

A. Continuing evaluation

B. Insure up-to-date programs

C. Programs re-designed to meet the school and community need

## CONCLUSIONS

1. It was noted that when and where a community wants or is sold on safety education, such programs will be in evidence in the curriculum.

2. In most instances, there was little evidence of continuing safety programs being offered in schools surveyed.

3. Safety programs, when offered, were usually sporadic in nature.

4. There are very few Safety Supervisors in the public schools of New York State.

5. Safety programs are in evidence in schools having safety supervisory personnel.

6. There is ample work for the safety supervisor. In the schools when there was a part-time supervisor, part-time secretarial help was also employed. A full-time supervisor used a full-time secretary.

7. In each school, there is a definite need for Safety curriculum guides in schools for teachers. Very few

schools responding to this study have such information available.

8. There is a need for more schools to develop Administrative Safety materials for teachers.

9. Of those few schools developing an Administrative Handbook, most are preparing such material on a K-12 basis.

10. In-service safety education programs were found to be held only by those school systems with safety supervisory personnel.

11. Schools hiring supervisory safety personnel did so to develop stronger programs.

12. Some schools conduct in-service safety education programs "after-the-fact" conducting such programs only when the need arises.

13. Most all schools had driver education programs. Often schools told a lot about safety education programs, but upon close examination, the offerings available were in driver education only.

14. In some school systems, the only safety education provided was via state mandated drill procedures.

15. Safety education programs were most often offered as a special unit of another subject, or integrated within other subjects.

16. Safety education was most often offered as a part of science, health, and physical education classes.

17. Recommendations suggested for minimum preparation for safety supervisors and directors were not adhered to in all instances by those same schools when they hired such personnel.

18. School bus drivers tended to receive the most in-service education programs of any staff group.

19. Only a small number of schools require safety education courses in the preparation programs of the teachers they hire.

20. When safety courses are required in preparation programs of teachers for employment, it was usually required for teachers of health, physical education, driver education, industrial arts, and science.

21. Safety education was most often taught by the individual classroom teacher at the elementary level.

22. Assembly programs were often used for special safety programs in the elementary schools. Schools conducting assembly programs most often held one or two such programs per year.

23. In middle and junior high schools, safety education was most often integrated with another subject. Highest on the list of subjects used as the parent course for safety education programs were health and science.

24. Safety related assembly programs were used in some middle and junior high schools.

25. The most commonly used method for safety instruction in the senior high schools was via integration

with other subjects. Highest on the list of subjects used was health, followed by science, physical education, driver education, and home economics.

26. Safety education instruction was most prevalent in adult education in the area of driver education.

27. When special safety policies were in effect in schools, they were found to be quite consistent across all grade levels.

28. In schools that incorporated an accident reporting system, these were usually analyzed and corrective action taken following the accident.

29. Special safety programs were most often geared to the age level wherein the most benefit or need was evident.

30. Very few schools conduct student safety clubs or committees. Those in existence were found mainly at the elementary school level.

31. There were found to be wide gaps in safety education programs in the schools participating in this study.

32. More thorough programs seemed to be offered where supervisory and trained personnel were in evidence.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. All teachers should have a basic safety education course in their preparation.

2. All schools, regardless of size, should have a person responsible for coordinating safety education programs.

3. In multi-school districts, a safety supervisor should be employed or designated to coordinate and direct the safety programs and activities conducted by the safety coordinator in each school building.

4. School safety supervisors should arrange for special in-service training programs in various areas of safety.

5. Safety programs should be designed on a Kindergarten through grade 12 basis.

6. More safety programs need to be designed and conducted to involve more students in safety related activities.

7. Curriculum materials must be developed to include safety topics for use in all subjects on all age and grade levels.

8. School safety policies must be developed, approved, and provided for all teachers. Too often teachers never see or know the school policy.

9. Serious consideration should be given to cooperative methods and approaches to provide needed programs for schools of all sizes. The Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) program in New York State is this type of facility and technique.

For example, it would not be economically sound to expect every school to provide a multiple-car off-street driving range and/or simulation equipment for a driver education program if there is only a small number of students eligible for the course.

However, by adopting the BOCES approach, several schools could cooperatively provide additional outstanding services and programs for their students. This cooperative program would allow schools to participate in such endeavors on a prorated cost based on the number of students involved.

Cooperative Safety Center facilities could be used as the foundation for many types of safety related programs within the several school or town area. An economically sound use of facilities, personnel and equipment would thus be possible. In addition, broader curricular offerings could be provided and developed.

Through the BOCES framework, school systems could cooperate and share staff, facilities, and program offerings to bring meaningful information and programs to the students in the cooperating schools. In addition, this cooperative BOCES "center" would be a source not only of education programs, but also a source of information for teachers, a resource for material, help, and direction for integrating special safety programs into their curriculum. Further, the staff of such a cooperative "center" would be available to serve as consultant and advisory personnel to

aid administrators and teachers in developing and executing their programs. This program structure would allow a home base for special programs to be offered such as hunter safety, recreational safety, water safety, as well as a location for activities such as safety conferences and other special activities and programs for both students and other citizens.

It has been this writer's experience to direct and conduct a cooperative driver and safety education program through the Safety Center at Central Missouri State College. Seven area schools cooperatively use the most up-to-date and complete set of facilities and equipment possible for a program. Equipment includes a multiple-car off-street driving range, a driving simulator, multi-media programmed learning equipment, educational television, dial-access information storage and retrieval equipment, and video-tape equipment.

Not one of the seven cooperating schools have either the number of students necessary or the funds available to provide this equipment for their students. Cooperatively, however, they are able to offer a most thorough, interesting and exciting course of study to their students.

It would seem that the BOCES framework would be a sound, justifiable, and flexible model to be used to build and expand safety education programs for the New York State Public Schools.

## DISCUSSION

During this study, and while tabulating and analyzing data, several underlying ideas or thoughts have come to mind. While these cannot be factually reported from the data presented, they seem, in fact, to be inherent as either problems or feelings concerning the study results.

1. It was felt that safety education was given only lip service by some school administrators.

2. In some instances the only reason any safety programs were conducted was to satisfy the most minimum requirements.

3. Safety programming has not been sold properly to educators, to students, or to citizens.

4. There is a lack of safety related material included into curriculum materials in the public schools.

5. There is a lack of public relations, and community involvement in safety curricular offerings.

6. Driver education is often construed to be the only program that is needed in order to have safety included in the school curriculum.

7. Often administrators have policies written to cover special situations and/or events, but these are not available to the teachers in the system.

8. It seemed that some administrators had not taken time to consider safety policies and practices needed for safe and efficient operation of the school program.

On a more positive vein, as school systems were visited, and questions were asked, it was felt that more safety education was being conducted than the questionnaire revealed. Teachers, especially in the elementary grades, did include safety practices, safety recommendations and policies in their classrooms. These were not considered or realized as special safety programs. However, it would seem that this type of programming would fit that most highly recommended technique, in that it was fully immersed with their regular classroom activities.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. Further research is needed to develop the kinds of programs that could be incorporated into a BOCES Program format.

2. There is a need to study and determine the kinds of specific safety programs that are most genuinely needed in the schools in New York State.

3. Studies are needed to determine the type of BOCES Network needed to provide safety education programs for all schools in New York State.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BOOKS


Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: MacMillan Co., 1916.

Florio, A. E. and G. T. Stafford. Safety Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1969.

Henderson, Stella Van Petten. Introduction to Philosophy of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Lane, Howard and Mary Beauchamp. Human Relations in Teaching. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Peters, R. S. Ethics and Education. New Jersey: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1966.

Seaton, Don Cash, Jerbert J. Stack, and Bernard I. Loft. Administration and Supervision of Safety Education. New York: MacMillan Co., 1969.

Stack, Herbert J. and J. Duke Elkow. Education For Safe Living. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Strasser, Marland K. and others. Fundamentals of Safety Education. New York: MacMillan Co., 1964.

Whitehead, A. N. The Arms of Education and Other Essays. London: Williams and Norgate Ltd., 1932.


## BULLETINS


Birnbach, Sidney B. My Own Safety Story. Washington: American Automobile Association, 1967.

Crabtree, M. Elizabeth and Luverne C. Walker. Ten Traffic Safety Guides 1967-1968: Grades K-3. Washington: American Automobile Association, 1967.

Crabtree, M. Elizabeth and Luverne C. Walker. Ten Traffic Safety Guides 1967-1968: Grades 4-6. Washington: American Automobile Association, 1967.

City School District, Rochester, New York. Annual Statistical Report: 1968-69. Rochester: Division of Planning and Research, March, 1969.

_____. Health Education Grades 8-9. Rochester: Division of Instruction, 1967.

_____. Manual of Policies, Standards and Procedures for Health, Safety, Physical Education and Recreation. Rochester: Elementary Schools, Department of Health and Physical Education, July, 1962.

_____. Safety Education. Rochester: Department of Health and Physical Education, no date. (Mimeographed.)

Department of Education. Safety Education for Maine Schools. State of Maine: Department of Education, 1967.

Department of Public Instruction. Safety Curriculum Guide. Curriculum Bulletin No. 27. State of Wisconsin: Cooperative Education Planning Program, June, 1961.

First Supervisory District. The Board of Cooperative Educational Services. Buffalo: First Supervisory District of Erie County, 1968.

Glassman, Jerrold. Ten Traffic Safety Guides 1967-1968: Junior High. Washington: American Automobile Association, 1967.

Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools. A Summary of Student Accidents 1967-68 School Term. Kansas City: Department of Safety Education, July, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

_____. Emergency Procedures. Kansas City: Department of Safety Education, April, 1969.

_____. Handbook and Guide For Driver Education Teachers. Kansas City: Department of Safety Education, April, 1965.

_____. Life Savers. Kansas City: Department of Safety Education, no date. (Mimeographed.)

_____. Motorcycle Study Guide. Kansas City: Department of Safety Education, September, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools. Resource Guide for Safety Education. Curriculum Bulletin No. 103. Kansas City: Department of Safety Education, June, 1958.

_____. Safety Responsibilities and Regulations Manual Of Operations. Kansas City: Department of Safety Education, January, 1963.

Lansing Public Schools. Safety Education: A Suggested Guide for Elementary Teachers. Michigan: Board of Education, City of Lansing and The Safety Council of Greater Lansing, 1964.

Lansing School District. Accident Facts. Lansing: Department of Safety Education, January, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

_____. Bus Driver Rules and Regulations. Lansing: Department of Safety Education, no date. (Mimeographed.)

_____. Driver Education. Lansing: Department of Safety Education, no date. (Mimeographed.)

_____. Emergency Procedures and First Aid. Lansing: Department of Safety Education, 1965.

_____. Fire Safety. Administrative Bulletin Number 6114.1. Lansing: Board of Education, 1968.

_____. How They Got Hurt. Lansing: Department of Safety Education, January, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

_____. Official Handbook Greater Lansing School Safety Patrols. Lansing: Greater Lansing School Safety Patrol, 1967.

_____. The Green Pennant Safety Program. Lansing: Greater Lansing School Safety Patrol, no date. (Brochure.)

Los Angeles, California, City Schools. A Report of Pupil and Employee Accidents. Los Angeles: Division of Instructional Planning and Service, 1967.

_____. Safety. Publication No. 375. Los Angeles: Division of Instructional Services, 1957.

National Commission on Safety Education. A School Safety Education Program. Washington: National Education Association, 1966.

National Commission on Safety Education. Safety Guides for You--In the Intermediate Grades. Washington: National Education Association, 1962.

_____. Safety Guides for You--In the Primary Grades. Washington: National Education Association, 1961.

_____. School Safety Education Checklist. Washington: National Education Association, 1967.

National Safety Council. Accident Facts. Chicago: National Safety Council, 1966.

_____. Accident Facts. Chicago: National Safety Council, 1968.

_____. Accident Facts. Chicago: National Safety Council, 1969.

New York State Department of Motor Vehicles. Accident Facts. Albany: The Department of Motor Vehicles, 1968.

San Diego County Board of Education. A Guide to Safety Education Kindergarten through Grade Twelve. San Diego: Department of Education, December, 1969.

School District of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Highlights of the Safety Education Program. Philadelphia: Division of Safety Education, September, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

_____. Student and Employee Accident Facts of the Philadelphia Public Schools. File No. 550. Philadelphia: Division of Safety Education, February, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

State Department of Education. Safety Education Bulletin. State of Rhode Island: Department of Education, September, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

## DOCUMENTS

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Education for a Changing World of Work. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963. (Mimeographed.)

University of the State of New York. Regulations of the Commissioner of Education of the State of New York: Safety Education. Section 153. Albany: The State Education Department, no date. (Mimeographed.)

## MULTI VOLUME WORKS AND SERIES

American Association of School Administrators. Safety Education. Eighteenth Yearbook. Washington: National Education Association, 1940.

## PERIODICALS

National Safety Council. "Basic Principles for Safety Education," Safety Education, Vol. 35, 1955.

Sternberg, Robert. "Traffic Safety Education in Michigan," Michigan Challenge, November, 1963.

Tenenbaum, Samuel. "Selected for Review," Educational Leadership, October, 1969.

## UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Aaron, James Ethridge. "A Study of Supervisory Practices in Safety Education in Selected Cities in the United States." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, New York University, 1960.

Ashby, Lyle W. "The Educator's Point of View." Report to President's Conference on Occupational Safety. Washington, D. C., 1960.

Engelhardt, Melvin E. "The Administration of Safety Education Programs in Selected School Systems." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, 1961.

Gilliland, Lonnie, Sr. "Practices in Safety Education in the School Systems of Selected Cities in the United States." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1955.

Marshall, Robert L. "An Analysis of Safety Education Programs in Selected Public Schools of the United States With Recommendation for School Systems in Establishing or Evaluating Safety Education Programs." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Kansas, 1961.

Schmidt, Duane H. "A Study of Safety Education Curriculums in Selected Public Schools to Determine Consistent Standards in Safety Education Programs." Unpublished term report, Central Missouri State College, 1970.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

## Questionnaire Used for the Study

SPECIAL INQUIRY REGARDING SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

IN SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN NEW YORK STATE

Explanation and Instructions:

The items in this questionnaire are designed to gather information concerning the "State of the Art" of Safety Education in selected school systems in New York State.

Items 1-6 deal with safety personnel and their training.

Items 7-14 request information concerning instructional programs in Safety Education.

Wherever squares ☐ are provided, please (✓) the appropriate square(s).

Blanks are provided in some items for specific "number" answers.

Space is provided in some items for brief details, descriptions, or lists to be entered.

The items were designed to take a minimum of time to complete. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated! THANK YOU!.

**Definition of Terms:**

1. Safety Supervisor of Director: A person responsible for the development and determination of administrative policy and procedures regarding the over-all safety education program for the entire school system. Directs the activities for the safety coordinators in each school building and receives reports from them.

2. Safety Coordinator: A person in a particular school building responsible for carrying out the policies and procedures of the supervisor or director. He works with the principal and teacher in his building to encourage, develop, improve, and analyze safety instruction at all grade levels. He organizes "in-service" safety programs and activities for faculty and students, is responsible for uniform accident reporting and study, and serves as a contact person for the supervisor or director.

3. Safety Education: The process of using administrative practices, instructional techniques and protective features in a comprehensive program designed to reduce accidents, conserve human and material resources, and to make it possible for students to participate in additional activities. This covers all phases of Safety Education including traffic safety.

4. School Accident: A recordable accident is one which results in pupil injury severe enough to cause the loss of one-half day or more of school time, or requires medical attention.

5. In-service Education: Educational programs conducted at the local school district level to provide instruction and information vital to the local staff and administrative personnel, for the purpose of upgrading knowledge and background in any subject area, activity or program.

6. Safety Education Program: Those activities and practices that tend to be presented and entered into by the staff and students to prepare them to do safely those things that they will be doing anyway. Driver Education is included in this type of program, but is only a part of the total Safety Education Program of the School.

7. Full Time: A person hired by the Board of Education who devotes 100% of his time to supervising, directing, and administering the total school safety education program.

8. Part Time: A person hired by the Board of Education who devotes any set portion of his time to supervision, directing, and administering the total school safety education program.

About your schools:

School _____

Address _____
(Street)

_____
(City) (State) (Zip)

Person completing this questionnaire:

_____

Title: _____

Population (total residents), of the school district or system _____

Number of professional staff members . . . . . _____

Number of other staff members . . . . . _____

Number of schools in your district or system:

Number____ Elementary schools (Grades___thru___) Pupil Enrollment _____

Number____ Middle Schools (Grades___thru___) Pupil Enrollment _____

Number____ Junior High Schools (Grades___thru___) Pupil Enrollment _____

Number____ Senior High Schools (Grades___thru___) Pupil Enrollment _____

Number____ Junior Colleges (Grades 13 and 14) Pupil Enrollment _____

1. **Does your school system have a Safety Education Supervisor or Director?**
   ☐yes ☐no If no, proceed to item #2 (See Definition #1, p. ii)

**If yes,**

a. His/Her Name (if different from person on page 1)_____

b. Is this position ☐Full-time ☐Part-time ☐Other_____ (See definitions #7 & 8, p. ii)

c. How large is his staff?

_____ Number of persons devoting full time to supervision, direction, or coordination of school safety education

_____ Number of persons devoting part-time to this activity

_____ Number of persons for whom this is assigned as duty in addition to regular teaching assignment

_____ Number of full-time secretarial personnel

_____ Number of part-time secretarial personnel

d. When was the position of safety education supervisor or director established?
   ☐Less than two years ago
   ☐Between two and five years ago
   ☐More than five years ago

e. Why was the position established?
   ☐To develop a better program
   ☐Administrative order
   ☐Community influence
   ☐Other. Please explain _____

f. How did this person become Safety Education Supervisor or Director?
   ☐Hired specifically for this position
   ☐Promoted because of:
      ☐Special training
      ☐Education
      ☐Experience
      ☐Interest
   ☐Volunteered for or requested this position
   ☐Assigned this duty

g. What would you recommend as a minimum preparation for a Safety Education Supervisor or Director?
   ☐A course in Safety Education
   ☐A minor in college preparation (_____hours)
   ☐A major in college preparation
   ☐A special degree in this field
      ☐B.S. in Safety Education
      ☐M.S. in Safety Education
      ☐Specialist (6th year) in Safety Education
      ☐Doctorate in Safety Education
   ☐Teaching experience. Number of years _____
   ☐Other _____

1 Cont'd

h. Which of the following have been established as minimum requirements for persons to be employed in your school system in the position as safety education supervisor or director?

- ☐ A course in safety education
- ☐ A minor in college preparation (____hours)
- ☐ A major in college preparation
- ☐ A special degree in this field
  - ☐ B.S. in Safety Education
  - ☐ M.S. in Safety Education
  - ☐ Specialist (6th year) in Safety Education
  - ☐ Doctorate in Safety Education
- ☐ Teaching experience. Number of years _____
- ☐ Other _____

2. Does each individual school in your school system have a Safety Coordinator assigned who works with the supervisor or director of safety education? (See Definition #2, p. ii) ☐ yes ☐ no

a. How many persons does this include? _____

b. Circle the grade level from which the coordinator is assigned in the individual schools:

Elementary schools K - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6

Junior High Schools 7 - 8 - 9

Senior High Schools 10 - 11 - 12

c. Is some form of compensation given for this assignment?

☐ yes ☐ no

If yes, is this in the form of:

- ☐ This is the teacher's only assigned duty
- ☐ Released time is given
- ☐ Extra pay
- ☐ Other _____

d. What formula, criterion, or basis is used to determine the type and amount of compensation given for duties as school safety coordinator?

Elementary _____

Middle or Jr. High _____

Senior High _____

e. How many hours does this person spend in his duties as school safety coordinator?

Elementary ..... _____ (number) of hours per _____ (day, week, month)

Middle or Jr. High _____ (number) of hours per _____ (day, week, month)

Senior High ..... _____ (number) of hours per _____ (day, week, month)

2 Cont'd

f. Does the supervisor of safety education have regular in-service meetings with the safety coordinators? (See definition #5, p.ii)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| With combined group? | ☐yes | ☐no | If yes, Number per year _____ |
| Elementary | ☐yes | ☐no | If yes, Number per year _____ |
| Middle or Jr. High | ☐yes | ☐no | If yes, Number per year _____ |
| Senior High | ☐yes | ☐no | If yes, Number per year _____ |

3. What would you recommend as minimum preparation for an individual school safety coordinator?

☐A course in safety education
☐A minor in college preparation
☐A major in college preparation
☐A special degree in this field
- ☐B.S. in Safety Education
- ☐M.S. in Safety Education
- ☐Specialist (6th year) in safety education
- ☐Doctorate in safety education

☐Other _____

4. Which of these qualifications have been established as minimum requirements for employment or selection of school coordinators for your school system?

☐A course in safety education
☐A minor in college preparation
☐A major in college preparation
☐A special degree in this field
- ☐B.S. in Safety Education
- ☐M.S. in Safety Education
- ☐Specialist (6th year) in safety education
- ☐Doctorate in safety education

☐Other _____
☐None of the above

5. Does your school offer "in-service" education programs in safety education for: (See Definition #5, p.ii)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Administrators | ☐yes | ☐no | number per year _____ |
| b. Teachers | ☐yes | ☐no | number per year _____ |
| c. School bus drivers | ☐yes | ☐no | number per year _____ |
| d. Driver education teachers | ☐yes | ☐no | number per year _____ |
| e. Individual school safety coordinator | ☐yes | ☐no | number per year _____ |
| f. Other employees | ☐yes | ☐no | number per year _____ |
| g. Others - please list | ☐yes | ☐no | number per year _____ |
| _____ | | | number per year _____ |
| _____ | | | number per year _____ |

6. Does your school system require any of its teachers to have safety education courses in their preparation? ☐yes ☐no

If yes, which ones:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Elementary | ☐yes | If yes, number of semester hours | _____ |
| b. Junior High | ☐yes | If yes, number of semester hours | _____ |
| c. Senior High | ☐yes | If yes, number of semester hours | _____ |
| d. Teachers of: | | | |
| Health ..... | ☐yes | If yes, number of semester hours | _____ |
| Physical Educ.... | ☐yes | If yes, number of semester hours | _____ |
| Driver Educ..... | ☐yes | If yes, number of semester hours | _____ |
| Industrial Arts.. | ☐yes | If yes, number of semester hours | _____ |
| Science..... | ☐yes | If yes, number of semester hours | _____ |
| Others_____ | | | _____ |

7. In your school system, is safety education taught in:
(See definition #3, p. ii)

a. Elementary Grades? ☐yes ☐no

(1) How? ☐Individual classroom teacher
☐Specialist (Driver Education Teacher, Safety Supervisor, Etc.)
☐Educational TV
☐Non-school personnel - (firemen, policemen, etc.)
☐Other, please explain _____

(2) Methods of instruction

☐Separate subject
☐Special Project
☐Integrated with another subject such as, Health, Social Studies (list subject(s) _____)
☐Special unit of another subject such as: Health, Social Studies (list subject(s) _____)
☐Co-curricular Activity
☐Assembly programs (number per year _____)
☐Other, please explain _____
_____

(3) Approximately how much time is devoted to safety education?

| NUMBER (of sessions) | | OF (length of sessions) | | PER | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ☐1-2 | | ☐Minutes | | ☐Day |
| | ☐3-5 | | ☐Hours | | ☐Week |
| | ☐6-9 | | ☐Days | | ☐Month |
| | ☐10-14 | | ☐Weeks | | ☐Semester |
| | ☐15-20 | | | | ☐School year |
| | ☐21+ | | | | |

If other, explain _____
_____

b. Middle schools and/or Junior High? ☐yes ☐no

(1) How? ☐Separate subject
☐Special project
☐Integrated with another subject such as: Social Studies, Health (list subject _____)
☐Special unit of another subject such as: Health, Physical Education, etc. (list subject(s) _____)
☐Educational TV
☐Assembly programs (number per year _____)
☐Other, please explain_____
_____

7 Cont'd

(2) Approximately how much time is devoted to safety education?

NUMBER (of sessions) ☐1-2 ☐3-5 ☐6-9 ☐10-14 ☐15-20 ☐21+ OF (length of sessions) ☐Minutes ☐Hours ☐Days ☐Weeks PER ☐Day ☐Week ☐Month ☐Semester ☐School Year

If other, explain _____

c. Senior High Schools? ☐yes ☐no How?

☐Separate subject
☐Special project
☐Integrated with another subject such as: Health, Home Economics, etc. (list subject(s) _____)
☐Special unit of another subject such as: Health, Physical Education, Home Economics (list subject(s) _____)
☐Educational TV
☐Assembly programs (number per year _____)
☐Driver Education Course only
☐Other, please explain _____

(1) Approximately how much time is devoted to safety education?

NUMBER (of sessions) ☐1-2 ☐3-5 ☐6-9 ☐10-14 ☐15-20 ☐21+ OF (length of sessions) ☐Minutes ☐Hours ☐Days ☐Weeks PER ☐Day ☐Week ☐Month ☐Semester ☐School Year

If other, please explain _____

d. Adult Education? ☐yes ☐no

(1) How? ☐Separate Subject
☐Incorporated in other subjects (list subjects _____)
☐Driver Education
☐Driver Improvement
☐Senior Citizen Programs
☐Other, please explain _____

8. Is safety education information provided for teachers in your system in the form of:

a. Administrative Handbook (directives and policies)? ☐yes ☐no

If yes, at what level? ☐Elementary ☐Middle or Junior High ☐Senior High ☐K-12

b. Safety Curriculum Guide? ☐yes ☐no

If yes, at what level? ☐Elementary ☐Middle or Junior High ☐Senior High ☐K-12

8 Cont'd

c. Were these materials developed by local personnel? ☐yes ☐no

d. Have these materials been officially adopted by the responsible school authorities? ☐yes ☐no

If available and if possible, please enclose a copy or advise where they may be obtained.

9. Does your school system have plans and/or procedures and policies with regard to:

| | Topic | Yes | No | Elem. | Jr. Hi. | Sr. Hi. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | Fire in school building.... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. | Second means of alarm..... (in case of electrical failure or black out) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. | Civil Defense Drill | | | | | |
| | (1) Natural disaster..... (blizzard, wind) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | (2) Nuclear Attack..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. | School Bus Drill | | | | | |
| | (1) Load and unload..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | (2) Emergency procedures.. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. | Bomb threats (by phone)..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. | Riot or unruly students.... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| g. | Safety Patrol..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| h. | Caring for pupils injured while under school jurisdiction..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| i. | Sending pupils on errands.. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| j. | Excursions and/or field trips..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| k. | Christmas trees..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| l. | Sending ill pupils home.... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| m. | Removal of pupil from school by police officer... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| n. | Interview of pupil by a police officer..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| o. | Driver Education..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| p. | Molestation of children.... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| q. | Pupil bitten by dog..... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| r. | Other - please list: | | | | | |
| | _____ | | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | _____ | | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | _____ | | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

10. Does your school system have a complete accident reporting system for:

a. Student accidents: ☐yes ☐no
(See definition #4, p. ii)

b. Staff accidents ☐yes ☐no

10 Cont'd

If yes, are accident report forms:

a. Analyzed? ☐ yes ☐ no

b. Is corrective action taken? ☐ yes ☐ no

c. Briefly give one example of how corrective action was taken. ___

_____

If yes, and if possible, please enclose a copy of the yearly accident report summary, or advise where they may be obtained.

11. Does your school system offer special programs to its students such as:

| Topic | Yes | No | Elem. | Jr. Hi. | Sr. Hi. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Pedestrian safety | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Bicycle safety program | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Safety Patrols | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Recreational safety | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. Hunter safety programs | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. Motorcycle safety | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| g. Safety news or bulletin | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| h. Driver Education | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| i. Water Safety | | | | | |
| (1) swimming | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| (2) boating | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| (3) diving | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| j. Other _____ | | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _____ | | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

12. Do you have a student safety program, club or committee in your school?
☐ Yes ☐ No

a. If yes, at what level?
☐ Elementary
☐ Junior High
☐ Senior High

b. How is it conducted?
☐ Separate club or committee
☐ A committee in Student Council
☐ Other, please explain _____
_____

c. Its members are
☐ Elected
☐ Appointed
☐ Volunteer
☐ Invited

12 Cont'd

d. What does the club do?

- ☐ Help develop school safety regulations
- ☐ Assist during fire drills
- ☐ Assist during other emergency drills (air-raid)
- ☐ Conduct school safety survey
- ☐ Conduct community safety survey
- ☐ Assist safety coordinator for the school
- ☐ Plan safety related programs for the school
- ☐ Publish school safety paper or newsletter
- ☐ Other, please list: _____

_____

_____

13. Does your school have in effect an officially adopted policy statement with regard to school safety education? ☐ yes ☐ no

If yes, please enter it here, or attach a copy, or advise where it may be obtained: _____

_____

_____

_____

14. What are the stated objectives of this safety education program?

Please list them here, or attach a copy, or advise where they may be obtained: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

If you wish an abstract of this study, please indicate. ☐ Yes ☐ No

If you have any materials relating specifically to safety education not asked for elsewhere in this questionnaire, the investigator would appreciate a copy of each available item.

When completed, please mail in the stamped envelope to:

Robert A. Ulrich
Assistant Professor
Safety Education Center
Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri 64093

YOUR ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION IS DEEPLY APPRECIATED!

# APPENDIX B

## List of Selected School Systems Surveyed

## APPENDIX B

### City Superintendencies

1. Albany City Schools, Albany, New York
2. Buffalo City Schools, Buffalo
* 3. Long Beach City Schools, Long Beach
* 4. Rochester City Schools, Rochester
5. Rome City Schools, Rome
* 6. Watertown City Schools, Watertown

### Village Superintendencies

7. Bay Shore Public Schools, Bay Shore
* 8. Bethpage Public School, Bethpage
* 9. Central Square Public Schools, Central Square
10. East Rockaway Public School, East Rockaway
* 11. Fredonia Public Schools, Fredonia
* 12. Hamburg Public Schools, Hamburg
* 13. Hempstead Public Schools, Hempstead
* 14. Horseheads Public Schools, Horseheads
15. Ilion Public Schools, Ilion
16. Kenmore Public Schools, Kenmore
* 17. Malone Public Schools, Malone
* 18. Malverne Public Schools, Malverne
* 19. Massena Public Schools, Massena
* 20. Orchard Park Public Schools, Orchard Park
21. Potsdam Public Schools, Potsdam
* 22. Vestal Public Schools, Vestal
23. Wellsville Public Schools, Wellsville
24. Westbury Public Schools, Westbury

### Central School Districts

* 25. Alice Freeman Palmer Central School, Windsor
26. Amherst Central School, Amherst
* 27. Batavia Central School, Batavia
* 28. Canajoharie Central School, Canajoharie
29. Canisteo Central School, Canisteo
* 30. Canton Central School, Canton
* 31. Cassadaga Valley Central School, Cassadaga Valley
* 32. Center Moriches Central School, Center Moriches
33. Horace Greeley Central School, Chappaquee
* 34. Clayton A. Bouton Central School, Voorhersville
* 35. Cleveland Hill Central School, Cheektowaga

* 36. Colonie Central School, Albany
* 37. Canestota Central School, Canestota
* 38. Dansville Central School, Dansville
39. Dundee Central School, Dundee
* 40. Eden Central School, Eden
41. Ellicottville Central Schools, Ellicottville
42. Floral Park Central School, Floral Park
* 43. Forestville Central School, Forestville
* 44. Friendship Central School, Friendship
* 45. Frontier Central School, Hamburg
46. Glens Falls Central School, Glens Falls
47. Greece Olympia Central School, Rochester
* 48. Griffith Institute and Central School, Springville
* 49. Guilderland Central School, Guilderland
50. Hammondsport Central School, Hammondsport
51. Hauppauge Central School, Hauppauge
* 52. Holland Central School, Holland
53. Honeoye Central School, Honeoye
54. Kenmore East Central School, Tonawanda
* 55. Lake Shore Central School, Angola
* 56. Lewiston-Porter Central School, Youngstown
57. Liberty Central School, Liberty
* 58. Maryvale Central School, Cheektowaga
59. Medina Central School, Medina
* 60. New Hartford Central School, New Hartford
61. New Paltz Central School, New Paltz
* 62. Newfane Central School, Newfane
* 63. North Collins Central School, North Collins
64. Onondaga Central School, Nedrow
* 65. Ossining Central School, Ossining
* 66. Oswego Central School, Oswego
67. Penfield Central School, Penfield
* 68. Pulaski Academy and Central School, Pulaski
* 69. Randolph Central School, Randolph
* 70. Royalton-Hartland Central School, Middleport
* 71. Rye Central School, Rye
* 72. Sandy Creek Central School, Sandy Creek
* 73. Saranac Central School, Saranac
* 74. Silver Creek Central School, Silver Creek
* 75. Tonawanda Central School, Tonawanda
76. Valley Stream Central School, Valley Stream
77. Warrensburg Central School, Warrensburg
78. Wellsville Central School, Wellsville
* 79. White Plains Central School, White Plains
* 80. Williamson Central School, Williamson

* Survey Respondents

# APPENDIX C

## Initial Letter of Explanation To School Superintendents

*Education for Service*
CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE COLLEGE
WARRENSBURG, MISSOURI 64093

May 10, 1969

Dear

The purpose of this letter is to request that your school assist in a study designed to determine the "State of the Art" of Safety Education Programs in the public schools in New York State

I am interested in New York State for several reasons. It is my home state, I taught in Hamburg, New York for twelve years, I have been active in the DASEANYS, and served as President of this Association during 1968. I am also very much interested in improving the safety education offerings in the schools in New York State.

The NEA National Commission on Safety Education in its publication, A School Safety Education Program, states, "Safety authorities . . . now consider education as a foundation for conserving human and material resources." The American Association of School Administrators, in their 1940 Yearbook, states, "It is to the school particularly that we must look for the development of the knowledge, the attitudes, the habits, and the skills that are necessary if we are to live with reasonable safety in the modern world."

This study is a part of my doctoral research at Michigan State University. It is my hope to develop a "Rationale for the Inclusion of a Comprehensive Safety Education Program in the Public Schools of New York State." Your school has been selected as a part of this study.

Would you please complete the enclosed questionnaire, or have the person with responsibility for Safety Education Programs in your school system do so. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope by June 15, 1969, if at all possible.

It was hoped that the conclusions and recommendations from this investigation will be helpful to educators and support groups concerned about the total Safety Education Programs in the schools of New York State. If you would like an abstract of this study, please indicate this on the questionnaire.

Thank you for your time and support on this study. Your cooperation will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Ulrich
Assistant Professor
Safety Education Center

RAU/

# APPENDIX D

## Grade Levels and Numbers of Pupils Enrolled By School Level in 33 School Districts Reporting

## APPENDIX D

### GRADES AND NUMBERS OF PUPILS ENROLLED BY SCHOOL LEVEL IN 33 SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPORTING

| | Elementary | | Middle | | Junior High | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School | Grades | Pupils | Grades | Pupils | Grades | Pupils | Senior High | | Total |
| 1 | (K-6) | 1525 | | NA | | NA | (7-12) | 1033 | 2558 |
| 2 | (K-6) | 1500 | | NA | (7-8) | 400 | (9-12) | 900 | 2800 |
| 3 | (K-6) | 4700 | | NA | (7-9) | 1900 | (10-12) | 2200 | 8800 |
| 4 | (K-6) | 3170 | | NA | (7-8) | 991 | (9-12) | 1958 | 5619 |
| 5 | (1-6) | 4000 | | NA | (7-9) | 1300 | (10-12) | 1150 | 6450 |
| 6 | (1-6) | 580 | | NA | | | (7-12) | 420 | 1000 |
| 7 | (K-6) | 586 | | NA | | | (7-12) | 580 | 1166 |
| 8 | (K-4) | 950 | (5-8) | 614 | | NA | (9-12) | 550 | 2114 |
| 9 | (K-3) | | | | | | | | |
| | (3-6) | 950 | | NA | (7-8) | 250 | (9-12) | 450 | 1650 |
| 10 | (K-8) | 4035 | | NA | | NA | (9-12) | 1462 | 5497 |
| 11 | (1-6) | 1624 | | NA | | NA | (7-12) | 1348 | 2972 |
| 12 | (K-6) | 2260 | | NA | (7-8) | 680 | (9-12) | 1200 | 4140 |
| 13 | (K-6) | 900 | | NA | | NA | (7-12) | 700 | 1600 |
| 14 | (1-6) | 2500 | | NA | (7-9) | 1100 | (10-12) | 970 | 4570 |

| | Elementary | | Middle | | Junior High | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School | Grades | Pupils | Grades | Pupils | Grades | Pupils | Senior High | | Total |
| 15 | (K-6) | 950 | NA | | NA | | (7-12) | 650 | 1600 |
| 16 | (K-6) | 3240 | NA | | (7-9) | 1458 | (10-12) | 1426 | 6124 |
| 17 | (K-6) | 1800 | NA | | (7-8) | 425 | (9-12) | 710 | 2935 |
| 18 | (K-6) | 1000 | NA | | NA | | (7-12) | 760 | 1760 |
| 19 | (K-2)<br>(3-6) | 900 | NA | | NA | | (7-12) | 765 | 1665 |
| 20 | (K-6) | 3030 | NA | | (7-9) | 1350 | (10-12) | 1170 | 5550 |
| 21 | (1-8) | 3900 | NA | | NA | | (9-12) | 1500 | 5400 |
| 22 | (K-6) | 1713 | NA | | (7-9) | 637 | (10-12) | 558 | 2908 |
| 23 | (K-6) | 3955 | NA | | (7-9) | 1647 | (10-12) | 1417 | 7019 |
| 24 | (K-6) | 2545 | NA | | (7-8) | 728 | (9-12) | 1402 | 4675 |
| 25 | (K-4) | 900 | (5-8) | 700 | NA | | (9-12) | 650 | 2250 |
| 26 | (K-6) | 3500 | NA | | (7-9) | 1250 | (10-12) | 1150 | 5900 |
| 27 | (K-6) | 750 | NA | | (7-9) | 325 | (7-12) | 600 | 1675 |
| 28 | (K-6) | 1500 | NA | | NA | | (9-12) | 700 | 2200 |
| 29 | (K-6) | 4804 | NA | | (7-8) | 1316 | (9-12) | 2230 | 8350 |
| 30 | (K-6) | 4300 | NA | | (7-9) | 1053 | (10-12) | 2000 | 7353 |
| 31 | (K-2)<br>(3-6) | 1275 | NA | | (7-9) | 560 | (10-12) | 550 | 2385 |
| 32 | (K-6) | 1800 | NA | | (7-8) | 400 | (9-12) | 800 | 3000 |
| 33 | (K-6) | 3200 | NA | | (7-9) | 1550 | (10-12) | 1300 | 6050 |