

RESEARCH PROPOSAL TO STUDY THE ARAPAHOE HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING
University of Colorado-Boulder's Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence
(Sarah Goodrum and Bill Woodward)
July 30, 2014

BACKGROUND

On December 13, 2013, 18 year old senior Karl Pierson shot and killed classmate Claire Davis and then himself at Arapahoe High School. Preliminary reports suggest that Pierson entered the school armed with a shotgun, machete, three Molotov cocktails, and more than 125 rounds of ammunition and that sometime in the months prior to the attack he had been disciplined for threatening the debate coach.¹ Little else is known about the reasons for the shooting or others' awareness of the potential threat that he posed. To better understand Pierson's motivations and how similar school shootings might be prevented, the Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office approached the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV) to conduct an in-depth life history of Karl Pierson. The purpose of the proposed study is to understand Pierson's background and behavior, the school's threat/risk assessment procedures and responses, and the lessons that may be learned from this incident that could improve youth violence prevention in school settings.

CSPV has extensive experience in studying the causes of youth violence, preventing violence among youth, and promoting safe schools and safe communities in Colorado and in the U.S. We aim to bridge the gap between research and practice to improve the quality of life for children and families, and we view the promotion of safe school environments as key to achieving this goal. Thus, we feel passionate about the need to conduct this study, and we believe we are ideally suited to execute it. Based on the findings from the proposed study and the lessons learned from those findings, will develop specific recommendations for legislation, policy, and procedure to prevent school violence. This research project will provide confidentiality under the state's open records act concerning research projects of state agencies. This will primarily protect participants who may not be willing to talk to us without such protection. Only the final report of general findings will be available to the public.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Current Research

A recent FBI report indicates that mass shootings have increased over the last 13 years in the U.S., from 5 per year from 2000 to 2008 to 16 per year from 2009 and 2013 (Blair, Martaindale, and Nichols 2014). The 2013 Student Safety Survey Report found that 37% of students knew someone that presented a risk to their school (Awareity 2013). The fact that high school and college-age students continue to perpetrate acts of mass violence in schools and elsewhere in the U.S. suggests that we could be doing more to identify risk behaviors, assess threats, and prevent violence in schools settings.

Three areas of research will inform and guide the proposed study: (1) the research and reports on school and mass shootings, (2) the research on public health and delinquency (e.g., risk factors, threat assessment, protective factors, and life course development), and (3) the research on case management in bureaucratic settings (e.g., organizational errors).

¹ Meyer, Jeremy P. 2014. "Motive Behind Arapahoe High School Attack Remains Murky." *The Denver Post*.
Arapahoe Research Proposal, Page 1

Exhibit No.:	64
Deponent:	S. Murphy
Date/RPR:	11/11/15
Hunter + Geist, Inc. AM	

First, for almost fifteen years, researchers, policy makers, and politicians have been working to prevent school shootings like the 1999 attack at Columbine High School that left 12 students and one teacher dead (Elliott 2009; Erickson 2001; Vossekuil, et al. 2002). The 2001 Columbine Commission Report suggested that Colorado schools work to prevent violence by creating a safe school climate for students (i.e., bullying prevention, Safe2Tell), encouraging students to anonymously report concerns (e.g., leakages, threats), sharing information about problem behavior across school and law enforcement agencies, and using threat/risk assessment tools to evaluate a student's potential risk for violence (Erickson 2001). A comparison of the Commission's recommendations and current practices reveal that *law enforcement responses* to school shooting events have improved significantly (see also, Blair, Martaindale, and Nichols 2014), but *school responses* to climate and safety issues have improved only slightly in some areas (e.g., Safe2Tell, information sharing) and very little in others (e.g., use of threat assessment tools and evidence-based programming) (Elliott 2009). For example, Colorado implemented Safe2Tell, a state-wide anonymous telephone reporting system, in 2004, and the system received more than 5000 calls from 2004 to 2009 in Colorado. The program provided information that helped prevent 28 school attacks over five years, but not all Colorado middle and high schools train their students in Safe2Tell. Challenges have emerged in the effort to implement the Commission's other recommendations, including the need to improve information-sharing agreements across organization boundaries (e.g., law enforcement, school, mental health) and the effort to use threat/risk assessment tools and measured responses (not clinical judgments) to evaluate students' potential risk for violence (Elliott 2009).

In their review of the research on school shootings, Bondu and Scheithauer (2011) identified seven warning signs and risk factors for school shooting offenders, including planning the attack, leaking the plan, enjoying violent fantasies (or violent media), displaying narcissistic personality traits (but not psychotic symptoms), experiencing peer rejection (e.g., bullying), experiencing a significant loss (e.g., heartbreak, college non-admittance), and having a negative school climate (e.g., highly competitive) (see also, Meloy, Hempel, Gray, Mohandie, Shiva, and Richards 2004; Meloy, Hoffman, Guldemann, and James 2012; Rappaport and Thomas 2004). Bondu and Scheithauer's (2011) model delineates three stages in the path toward a school shooting (e.g., biopsychological risk factors, social risk factors, and structural risk factors); these stages may prove helpful in understanding what aspects of Pierson's background and behavior contributed to his murder-suicide. Relying on strain theory, social control theory, and routine activities theory, Levin and Madfis (2009) argue that cumulative frustrations experienced over the course of childhood or adolescence contributes to feelings of isolation among school shooters. They suggest that this social isolation limits the individual's opportunity for supportive attachments with peers and family members, making it more difficult to recover from a small loss and leading to the planning of a violent attack as a solution.

Second, the public health literature encourages the consideration of universal needs (i.e., general population or subpopulation's risk for disorders or conditions), selective needs (i.e., subpopulation's higher risk for developing disorders or conditions), and indicated needs (i.e., individual's small but identifiable symptoms of a disorder, condition, or problem behavior) in addressing problem behavior. The life course paradigm, on the other hand, encourages researchers to examine the individual's behavior within their family, peer, school and societal contexts. These key developmental stages include: (1) preschool to kindergarten, (2) childhood to adolescence, and (3) adolescence to adulthood. Specific attention is given to the individual's progress (or perceptions of progress) in transitioning through the three key stages of development (e.g., from stage 2 to 3). This study will examine Pierson's various needs, as well as his experiences in the first two stages of development and the perceptions about his progress toward the third stage of development.

Finally, the social scientific research on bureaucratic organizations will inform the analysis of school policies and procedures for threat/risk assessment and management. Doyle (2010) has recently argued that the criminal justice system should develop regular routines for reflecting on major errors, near misses, and other mistakes in the management of individual cases (e.g., wrongful conviction, eyewitness misidentification). Evidence from medicine and aviation indicates that errors in case management do not arise from one person's bad judgment or one procedural misstep. Instead, errors in case management arise from a series of smaller level errors combined with a system's reluctance for self-examination, and these smaller errors along with a reluctance for self-examination can lead to major problems or events (Chassin and Becher 2002). Doyle (2010) highlights the dramatic changes in the ways that aviation and medicine now conduct "error reviews" of airplane disasters and surgical mistakes (respectively). These industries have sought to move away from *adversarial models* of error review to implement *continuous improvement models* of error review. This change requires the promotion of a "culture of safety" and a willingness to evaluate procedures and practices in a critical manner. These cultural shifts in organizational practice do not come easily, but they can prove critical to the improvement of safety and service. We believe a similar approach to "error review" should be taken to study school shooting events and to improve school safety. In the proposed study, we will consider the possibility that a series of missed opportunities to identify and manage Pierson as a threat may have contributed to his murder-suicide.

Research Plan

The proposed 8-month project has four objectives:

- (1) To conduct an in-depth multi-faceted case study (or sociobiography) of Arapahoe High School shooter Karl Pierson,
- (2) To conduct a detailed review of the current research and reports on school shooting events, school shooters, threat/risk assessments, and school safety,
- (3) To conduct a detailed policy analysis of the Arapahoe shooting incident in comparison to other similar shootings in Colorado and the U.S. in recent years, and
- (4) To conduct a review of the threat/risk assessment and response procedures in place at Arapahoe High School at the time of Karl Pierson's shooting event.

Recognizing the complexity of these situations, we will take a holistic approach to the collection and analysis of data, by examining the stages of development (e.g., prenatal, childhood, adolescence) and multiple social contexts (e.g., individual, family, peer groups, student-teacher relationships, and student disciplinary actions) influencing actors and behavior (see Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg 1991). The researchers will use the public health literature on risk factors (i.e., early and consistent problem behavior and deviant peer friendships) and protective factors (i.e., parental warmth and supervision) to interpret and analyze project data.

We seek to answer the following research questions:

- Study Task #1 (Pierson's Background): Were there any red flags in Karl Pierson's background and behavior? Was Pierson viewed as a problem, risk, or threat? What procedures, if any, were used to assess and respond to him?
- Study Task #2 (School Safety Programs and Procedures): What programs were in place to address school safety? What procedures were in place to identify and manage students exhibiting problem behaviors? We will ask, when students are at-risk or exhibiting problem behaviors, are there effective assessments and interventions? How do those procedures

compare to recommendations offered in published research and reports? Are there any gaps in policy and practice or in needs and services? If so, where and why? How might we address the gaps?

- Study Task #3 (Policy Analysis and Error Review): How were those procedures used and policies followed in Pierson's case? What can this case study tell us about school shootings that provide lessons learned for other schools?

Our approach aims to identify the gaps in the prevention of mass shootings at the school level (e.g., school climate, school safety, student-teacher interaction) and at the individual level (e.g., student-family interaction, mental health resources, threat/risk assessment tools, threat/risk assessment treatment).

Data Collection

The data for this project will come from three sources: (1) one-on-one in-depth interviews with up to 30 people who have knowledge of Karl Pierson or Arapahoe High School's climate and responses, (2) documents related to Pierson's background (pending availability), including school report cards, school disciplinary measures, medical records, mental health records, and law enforcement reports, and (3) documents related to research, reports, policies and procedures on school climate, school discipline, threat/risk assessment, and violence prevention.

In-depth Interviews. The study leads, Sarah Goodrum and Bill Woodward, will conduct one-on-one in-depth confidential interviews with up to 30 people who knew Karl Pierson or have knowledge of Arapahoe High School, including school administrators, school counselors, school resource officers, teachers, friends/peers/classmates, law enforcement officers, and pastors. The purpose of the interviews will be to explore the life history of Karl Pierson and the manner in which people responded to him. While the primary interest is in understanding the experiences and events that contributed to Pierson's murder-suicide, we also seek to place his actions in context of the school climate, school policies, and school procedures. Thus, the interviews will include questions about these contexts. Participants will be recruited using purposive (or judgment) and snowball sampling. For purposive sampling, we will rely on the sheriff's office's knowledge and our knowledge of the school and the situation to recruit participants. With snowball sampling, we will rely on those initial participants to recruit subsequent participants. The interviews will provide participants with an opportunity to talk about Pierson, the shooting event, and the school setting, in their own words. It is important to recognize that asking participants to relive these stories may cause psychological distress. To encourage participation, each participant will be guaranteed confidentiality and will be paid a \$40 stipend.

All interviews will be tape-recorded and transcribed (see Budget for Equipment and Transcription Costs). Research participants will be guaranteed confidentiality, which means that each participant will be given a case number and a pseudonym to shield their identity. Only the study leads will have knowledge of participants' identities, and this identity information will not be shared in any of the research reports to come from the project. In addition, to further preserve confidentiality, we will use pseudonyms to replace the county name, participants' job titles, and any other identifying information. The event date will also be altered to ensure confidentiality.

Each interview transcript will be read several times and coded into thematic categories drawn from the literature, document analysis, and interview data. Coded interview data will be copied into a Word file organized by codes. The recurring themes will be described and reported in the findings section of the

report. In addition, these themes will be compared to and analyzed with other project data, specifically the documents on Pierson's life history and the documents on school safety policies and procedures.

Pierson's Background Documents. To develop a detailed understanding of Pierson's life history, we will seek to obtain copies of the following documents: the Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office's report on the shooting event and any other Pierson-encounters, Pierson's Arapahoe High School academic record, Pierson's Arapahoe High School disciplinary record, Pierson's firearms and weapons purchases, and Pierson's personal communication (e.g., emails, texts, webposts, facebook accounts). We anticipate encountering some obstacles to the acquisition of these documents due to agencies' concerns about students' right to privacy (FERPA), the protection of medical records (HIPAA), and the school's potential liability for the event. We will work within the proper channels to obtain these materials, relying on professional contacts in the field and the universities' commitment to the fair and respectful treatment of human subjects.

Policy Documents and Analysis. To provide context for Pierson's murder-suicide, we will seek to obtain copies of the following school policies and procedures: the school's approach to threat assessment, risk assessment, and threat response; the school's approach to problem behavior and discipline; the school's approach to and programming for climate and safety issues; the school's bullying prevention plan; the school district's and high school's agreement on information-sharing. In addition, we will review the research and reports on other mass shooting events (e.g., Aurora Theater, Sandy Hook, Paducah, Virginia Tech, and Columbine). We will compare AHS's written policies and procedures to: (1) the policies and procedures used in practice (as revealed through the interviews), (2) the recommendations made by the Columbine Commission, and (3) the findings from other research and reports on school shooting events. We anticipate encountering very few obstacles to obtaining information on the school policies and procedures, as it should be online. However, we may face challenges in getting school administrators and teachers to talk about these policies and procedures in the interviews, due to participants' concerns about student privacy and school liability.

Project Team Members

Goodrum and Woodward will be the lead investigators on the study, conducting most of the interviews, data analysis, and policy analysis. They will be the lead authors on the report. Goodrum has extensive experience in conducting interviews with crime victims, perpetrators, and criminal justice professionals (Goodrum 2007, 2013; Goodrum and Keys 2007). As a retired police officer, former Colorado Division of Criminal Justice Director, and violence prevention expert, Woodward has extensive experience working with crime victims, perpetrators, and criminal justice professionals. During interview meetings, Goodrum and Woodward will build rapport with participants and monitor the psychological well-being of participants.

Elliott and Kingston will provide in-kind assistance on the project, acting in an advisory capacity, as needed. Elliott is an internationally renowned violence researcher, the founder of CSPV; he participated in the Columbine Commission and started the Safe Communities-Safe Schools initiative. In the year after Columbine, he visited every middle and high school in Colorado to ask students about their concerns and their school's climate. Kingston is the current director of CSPV and has extensive experience working with school districts, law enforcement and other community partners to prevent youth violence. Transcriptions services will be provided by a professional transcriber, and an undergraduate research assistant will help with the coding and analysis interview data, review of the research literature and governmental reports, and organization of the final report.

Project Timeline

This is an 8-month project that will begin in August 2014 and end in March 2015. We anticipate that data collection will be conducted from August to November 2014; the analyses of the interview data and school safety policy will be conducted from August to December 2014. A draft report is anticipated to be produced by January of 2015 with a draft report getting submitted to the client in January of 2015 and finalized by March 2015. This timeline and target dates are ideal, but they may be modified if obstacles arise in participant recruitment and data collection.

TIMELINE FOR PROJECT TASKS								
	2014					2015		
	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Obtain CU Institutional Review Board Approval	X							
Gather Pierson Docs	X	X						
Gather School Docs	X	X						
Conduct Interviews	X	X	X	X				
Transcribe Interviews		X	X	X				
Conduct Policy Analysis			X	X				
Code Interview Data			X	X	X			
Draft Recommendations					X	X		
Draft Report					X	X		
Present Draft to Client						X		
Submit Final Report							X	X

Study Limitations

It is important to note that the current project will not examine law enforcement's response to the shooting event, emergency medical responses to the shooting event, or communication in critical emergencies (see Erikson 2001), as this is not within the scope of the project or our area of expertise. Our expertise allows us to conduct an in-depth sociological analysis of Karl Pierson's life history, school processes and procedures related to climate and safety, and threat/risk assessment guidelines for the identification and management of potential violence.

DELIVERABLES

The project will produce a single report submitted to the Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office in January of 2015. The report will summarize the results of Study Tasks 1-3, as well as offer recommendations for policy and procedure.² We anticipate that the recommendations – but maybe not the full report due to

² More specifically, we plan to address the following issues in the final report: (1) the programs and services currently being offered at AHS to address violence prevention, school climate, school safety and bullying, (2) the plans and procedures currently in place at AHS to identify and manage students posing a threat (e.g., counseling, suspension, mental health care, arrest), (3) the gaps in health promotion, violence prevention, and threat reduction, and (4) the policy recommendations for educators, counselors, SROs, and police for preventing school shootings (e.g., threat assessment tool, educator training, and student coping skills).

concerns about maintaining the confidentiality of participants – will be shared with the Colorado Department of Education, Colorado Association of School Resource Officers, Arapahoe High School Administrators, and the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice. All dates mentioned in proposal are ideal and may not reflect challenges we may encounter during this project. The timing of the release of the final report and the recommendations will be negotiated with the Sheriff's Office, in consideration for Claire Davis' family and AHS staff and students.

BUDGET

The budget for the project totals \$49,340 (see Project Budget attached). The University of Colorado-Boulder will provide \$7,321 in matching funds to support the study, and the Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office will provide \$42,019 to support the study.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

The project budget includes support for research staff salary and wages (including fringe benefits), travel costs, supply costs, study participant stipends, and indirect costs. The salary and wages for UCB staff total \$16,546, and the fringe benefits for UCB staff total \$1,837. The UCB staff include Dr. Sarah Goodrum (PI), Bill Woodward (Co-PI), and Beth Whalley (interviewer). The UCB staff will be responsible for all aspects of the study, including participant interviews, data analysis, and reporting findings. In August 2014, Dr. Goodrum will leave the faculty at UCB to join the faculty at the University of Northern Colorado (UNC), but will still maintain an affiliation with CSPV as a Research Associate. Thus, a subcontract with UNC is necessary, in order for Goodrum to continue work on the proposed study. This subcontract includes funds for Goodrum's course buyout (or salary) for two courses, an undergraduate research assistant, and fringe benefits (Total: \$20,483). The undergraduate research assistant will help with the coding and reporting of project data.

The travel costs will cover mileage and gas expenses incurred during trips to and from interview meetings in Arapahoe County (Total: \$2,400). The supply costs will cover the expenses for a digital audio recorder, flash drive, microphone, and telephone recording adapter (for those participants unable to meet in-person). The supply costs also include \$120/interview for the professional transcription (word-for-word) of the 30 audio-taped interviews.

Given the importance of this research and the two universities' recognition of county government agreement, UCB and UNC have agreed to the 5% indirect rate mandated by ACSO. It is important to note that the Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office's normal indirect rate is 0%, but they have generously agreed to the indirect rate of 5% in this case (see the below Project Budget; Indirect Costs Total: \$4,128).

REFERENCES

- Blair, J. Pete, M. Hunter Martindale, and Terry Nichols. 2014. "Active Shooter Events from 2000 to 2012." *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, January.
- Bondu, Rebecca and Herbert Scheithauer. 2011. "Explaining and Preventing School Shootings: Chances and Difficulties of Control" in W. Heitmeyer et al.'s (eds.) *Control of Violence*.
- Chassin, Mark R. and Elise C. Bevher. 2002. "The Wrong Patient." *Annals of Internal Medicine* 136: 826-833.
- Doyle, James M. 2010. "Learning from Error in American Criminal Justice." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 100: 109-147.
- Erickson, William. 2001. *The Report of Governor Bill Owens' Columbine Review Commission*. Denver: The State of Colorado.
- Feagin, Joe R. Anthony M. Orum, and Gideon Sjoberg. 1991. *A Case for the Case Study*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Goodrum, Sarah. 2013. "Bridging the Gap between Prosecutors' Cases and Victims' Biographies in the Criminal Justice System through Shared Emotions." *Law and Social Inquiry* 38(2): 257-287.
- Goodrum, Sarah. 2007. "Victims' Rights, Victims' Expectations, and Law Enforcement Workers' Constraints in Cases of Murder." *Law and Social Inquiry* 32(2): 725-768.
- Goodrum, Sarah and Jennifer L. Keys. 2007. "Reflections on Two Studies of Emotionally Sensitive Topics: Bereavement from Murder and Abortion." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory & Practice* 10(4):249-258.
- Levin, Jack and Eric Madfis. 2009. "Mass Murder at School and Cumulative Strain: A Sequential Model." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52: 1227-144.
- Meloy, J. Reid, Anthony G. Hempel, B. Thomas Gray, Kris Mohandie, Andrew Shiva, and Thomas Richards. 2004. "A Comparative Analysis of North American Adolescent and Adult Mass Murders." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 22:291-309.
- Meloy, J. Reid, Jens Hoffmann, Angela Guldemann, and David James. 2012. "The Role of Warning Behaviors in Threat Assessment: An Exploration and Suggested Typology." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 30: 256-279.
- Rappaport, Nancy and Christopher Thomas. 2004. "Recent Research Findings on Aggressive and Violent Behavior in Youth: Implications for Clinical Assessment and Intervention." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 35:260-277.
- Vossekuil, Bryan, Robert A. Fein, Marisa Reddy, Randy Borum, and William Modzeleski. 2002. *The Final Report and Findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the Prevention of School Attacks in the U.S.* Washington, DC: U.S. Secret Service and Department of Education.

PROJECT BUDGET

Principal Investigator: Sarah Goodrum; Co-PI: William Woodward		Duration: 08/1/2014-03/31/2015		
A. Salaries and Wages	ACSO	CUB	Total	
Principal Investigator: Sarah Goodrum				
34% time, 2 weeks, Summer 2014	1,227			
Co-Principal Investigator: William Woodward				
12.5% time, 8 mos (5 hours/week)	13,537			
Graduate Research Assistant: Beth Whalley				
4 mos (5 hours/week)	1,782			
Total Salaries and Wages			16,546	
B. Fringe Benefits				
PI: Goodrum: 12.3%	151			
Co-PI Woodward: 12.3%	1,665			
GRA: Whalley: 32.2%	21			
Total Fringe Benefits			1,837	
C. Travel				
<i>Domestic (Mileage = r/t miles x \$0.50)</i>				
Mileage (15 r/t Greeley - Centennial; 30 r/t Boulder - Centennial)		2,400		
Total Travel			2,400	
D. Other Direct Costs				
SUBCONTRACT - University of Northern Colorado				
Faculty Salary - Two Course Buyout for Sarah Goodrum	13,000			
Fringe - 32.2%	4,186			
Undergraduate Research Assistant - 193.5 hours @ \$12/hr	2,322			
Fringe	0			
Indirect Costs - 5% State agency	975			
TOTAL SUBCONTRACT			20,483	
Transcription costs -- 30 interviews @ \$120 each		3,600		
Digital Recorder		50		
Carrying Case for Recorder		10		
Flash drive (8GB)		16		
Telephone Recording Adaptor		22		
Olympus ME-15 Microphone		23		
Study Participant Incentives -- 30 participants @ \$40 each		1,200		
Total Other Direct Costs			25,404	
E. Total Direct Costs			46,187	
F. Indirect Costs				
5% TDC, State agency	3,153		3,153	
G. Total Costs	42,019	7,321	49,340	
Total Amount Requested for Project	\$42,019	\$7,321	\$49,340	

APPENDIX G: INTERVIEW GUIDE, VERSION 3 (July 11, 2014)

Interview No. _____
Interview Date _____
Interview Location _____

INTERVIEW GUIDE

STUDY OF THE ARAPAHOE HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING

(Project Directors: Sarah Goodrum and Bill Woodward)

Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence
Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado-Boulder
Boulder, CO 80302

We are conducting an in-depth case study of the Arapahoe High School shooting, which happened on December 13, 2013.

The university will take all necessary steps to ensure that the information you provide during this interview will remain confidential. Because there is the potential that the information collected may be subject to subpoena or an open records request, your name and other identifying information (e.g., job title) will not be associated with the digital recording, interview guide, or interview transcript.

With your permission I would like to audio tape the entire interview, except the end part where I will ask you for background information (e.g., age, gender, race). If I ask you any question you do not want to answer, please tell me and we'll go on to the next question. Please also feel free to ask for clarification or to stop the interview at any time. This interview could take anywhere from 45 minutes to 90 minutes, depending on how much you have to say.

Before we start, I'd like you to read over this consent form. If you consent to participate, please sign both copies – one for you and one for me.

The questions will cover four main topics, including: (1) the background on the shooting event and the shooter Karl Pierson, (2) the policies and procedures on school safety, school climate, and youth violence prevention at AHS, (3) your background on age, race/ethnicity, and level of education, and (4) your recommendations or advice for other students, schools, and states seeking to prevent these kinds of violent events. With your permission, I would like to tape record parts 1, 2, and 4 of the interview.

PART 1: BACKGROUND ON SHOOTING EVENT AND SHOOTER

Most of the questions you can answer in your own words. I would like to start the tape recorder now if that is okay with you.

SHOOTING EVENT AND SHOOTER		
1.	We have heard various accounts of the shooting event – in the news and from different people. We would like to hear about what you saw and heard that day. So, to start, I would like to take 4 or 5 minutes for you to tell me about what you remember from that day. Anything else?	
2.	When you think back on that day, what do you wish had been handled differently? Can you elaborate?	
3.	<p>Now, I'd like to move on to questions about Karl Pierson, the shooter in this case. We want to better understand him and his behavior – with the idea that this information may allow us to help others and prevent violence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you know Karl? <u>YES or NO</u> • If no, skip to #6. • If yes, for how long did you know him? _____ • How well did you know him? Would you say that you knew him: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. not at all we well b. somewhat well, or c. very well 	
4.	Can you estimate how often each week (or month or year) you had contact with Karl? _____ In what contexts or places? What was the nature of those contacts or interactions (e.g., friendship, school, family, therapy)?	
5.	Can you tell me about any experiences or encounters you may have had with Karl? Can you elaborate? (Follow-up: Do you recall any times when Karl seemed particularly happy or upset?)	
6.	Often times in these cases, there are things that other people wish they had noticed about the person – <i>prior</i> to the shooting. In looking back, they realize – that indeed, it was an important issue. Are there things that you wish that you (or others) had noticed about him?	
7.	<p>What was Karl like as a kid? Can you give any examples? Were there any events in his life that you think had a particularly strong effect on him? How so?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the interest of trying to prevent future shooting events, what do you think led him to commit this shooting? Can you explain? 	

8.	To your knowledge, did Karl ever make any threats to anyone? <u>YES or NO</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, can you tell me more about that? 	
9.	At any time, did you ever think of Karl as a threat to himself or others? <u>YES or NO</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why or why not? Can you say more about that? 	
10.	Do you think other people ever thought of Karl as a threat to others? Why or why not? Can you say more about that?	
11.	Was Karl ever identified by school staff as posing a threat to anyone? <u>YES or NO</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you tell me about that? 	
12.	Do you know whether Karl was ever referred for mental health counseling or therapy? <u>YES or NO</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, did he ever receive any counseling or therapy for mental health issues? Can you elaborate on that? If not, why do you think he was never referred? 	
13.	Some people believe that offenders in these types of school shooting cases give hints about the plan for trouble to come. Do you think Karl gave any hints about his plan? Can you elaborate?	
MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS		
The next series of questions ask you to rate your experiences and thoughts on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being I never had this thought to 10 being I regularly had this thought. (USE CARD #1)		
14.	On a scale of 1 to 10, at any time before the shooting occurred, I thought of Karl as a threat. ONE is "I never had this thought" and TEN is "I frequently had this thought."	
15.	On a scale of 1 to 10, at any time before the shooting occurred, I thought I should express my concerns about Karl to another person.	
OR		
The next series of questions ask you to rate your experiences and thoughts on a three point scale – including 1-never, 2-sometimes, and 3-often. Please choose one.		

16.	At any time before the shooting occurred, did you think of Karl as a threat? 1. never 2. sometimes 3. often	
17.	At any time before the shooting occurred, did you ever contact anyone with concerns about Karl? 1. never 2. sometimes 3. often	
18.	If yes, who was that? _____ How did you feel about the way that was handled?	

PART 2: THREAT ASSESSMENT AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

This next section includes questions about your experiences with and perceptions of AHS and school safety issues.

THREAT AND RISK ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES		
19.	Some research suggests that schools, universities, and other institutions are not well equipped to assess and handle students that pose a risk for potential violence. Do you think schools today know how to assess and manage students at risk for violence? Why or why not? Can you give any examples?	
20.	What about AHS? Do you think AHS was well equipped to assess and handle a student that posed a risk for potential for violence at the time of this event? Can you elaborate on that? What kinds of things do staff and teachers do when a student seems to be displaying problem behaviors or a risk for violence? What are the steps? Can you give any examples – in the hypothetical?	
21.	If we were to make improvements in schools to prevent these kinds of events, even small improvements, where do you think schools could be improved in this regard? Where do you think schools need the most help? Can you give any examples?	
22.	Do you have some knowledge of the Threat Assessment or Risk Assessment Tools used in Colorado Schools? <u>YES or NO</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If no, skip to NEXT QUESTION. • If yes, can you tell me about the Threat Assessment or Risk Assessment Tools or procedures that were in place at AHS prior to this event? • Can you offer any examples? • Were they used with Karl? <u>YES or NO</u> 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, what was the outcome of the Assessment of Karl? 	
23.	<p>Some of the research on Threat Assessment indicates that SIX FACTORS should be considered when evaluating an individual as posing a possible threat (USE CARD #2). Can you tell me – YES or NO – if any of these factors were ever discussed as a concern in Karl’s case?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> questioned or discussed if Karl had engaged in thinking about or planning a violent act. <u>YES or NO</u> tried to evaluate the seriousness of Karl’s threat through interactions with others, the situation, and setting. <u>YES or NO</u> tried to use a skeptical, investigative, and inquisitive mindset to conduct the threat assessment of Karl. <u>YES or NO</u> engaged with multiple professionals from education, counseling, law enforcement to discuss Karl. <u>YES or NO</u> evaluated the case based on facts (student spent time by himself), not on traits (student is a loner). <u>YES or NO</u> evaluated the case based on the individual posing a threat, not because he actually made a threat. <u>YES or NO</u> 	
24.	If you could change anything about the way the high school staff and teachers worked with Karl, what would you change?	
25.	If you could change anything about the way the SRO worked with Karl, what would you change?	
26.	If you could change anything about the way fellow students interacted with Karl, what would you change?	
27.	If you could change anything about the way mental health professionals worked with Karl, what would you change?	
28.	Is there anyone else that you think could have done more to work with or help Karl? How so? Can you give any examples?	
SCHOOL CLIMATE AND REPORTING PROCEDURES		
29.	<p>When was the last school climate survey, if any? _____</p> <p>What was the name of the survey?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did you learn the results? YES or NO If yes, what did they say? If no, why not? 	
30.	Do you know whether there was an anonymous phone number available at	

	school to call in concerning problematic school behavior? If so, what was it called?	
31.	Following an event like this one, many people talk about school climate as it affects school safety. How would you describe the atmosphere (or climate) of AHS, prior to the shooting? What about bullying? Can you think of any examples?	
32.	Many people say that hind-sight is 20-20, meaning that in looking back, they noticed things they wish they had. Are there any things about AHS that you wish you had noticed before the shooting incident?	
33.	<p>Some people say that some schools unknowingly foster a kind of "code of silence" which discourages people from snitching or reporting information that may reflect negatively on another student or a teacher. Do you think students and staff feel comfortable reporting negative information about other students or staff? Can you give any examples?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does information about an individual's potential risk or threat for violence get shared with the administration? Can you give any examples? 	
34.	<p>The next listing asks you to provide a response rated from 1 to 5 (with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree) on EIGHT FACTORS. (USE CARD #3)</p> <p>Please indicate your rating from 1 to 5 for the following eight statements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AHS has High Academic Standards 2. AHS has Clear Rules and Policies, Fairly Enforced 3. AHS has High Levels of Parent Involvement 4. AHS has Effective Community-School Partnerships 5. AHS has Extended Day/After School Programs 6. AHS Promotes Good Citizenship & Character 7. AHS Encourages Positive Relationships Among Students 8. AHS Encourages Positive Relationships Among Staff 9. AHS Promotes School Safety Awareness & Reporting 	
35.	Some people feel uncertain about participating in a study of this nature or they may warn others not to participate in a study of this nature. Has anyone cautioned you about participating in this study? Can you tell me more about that?	

PART 3: BACKGROUND

STOP THE TAPE!!

In this fourth section, I'd like to ask you a little bit about your background. These questions are multiple choice.

36.	What was your age on your last birthday?														
37.	Gender														
38.	What is your current marital or partnership status? a. Married/Civil Union b. Divorced c. Separated d. Widowed e. Never Married														
39.	Which one or more best describes you? a. White b. Black c. American Indian d. Asian e. Spanish or Hispanic f. Other														
40.	How much education have you completed? 00-11 (Code Year) 12 High School Graduate 13-15 Some College 16 Graduate School 17 Master's Degree 18 Doctorate or Professional Degree 20 GED 21 Vocational, technical school, training														
41.	Do you have any children? <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 40%;">Name</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Age</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Living w/You?</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Name	Age	Living w/You?	a.			b.			c.		
Name	Age	Living w/You?													
a.															
b.															
c.															
42.	What is your occupation?														
43.	For adult respondents (18 years and older), if we include your income from all sources and all of your and your spouse or partner's earnings and other sources of income (such as veterans benefits, unemployment, social security, disability, food stamps and trust funds), what would your total income before taxes for the last 12 months add up to? a. Not Applicable/High School Student b. Less than \$5,000														

	c. \$5,000-9,999 d. \$10,000-14,999 e. \$15,000-19,999 f. \$20,000-24,999 g. \$25,000-29,999 h. \$30,000-39,999 i. \$40,000-59,999 j. \$60,000-79,999 k. \$80,000+	
--	--	--

PART 4: ADVICE, RESULTS, ETC.

START TAPE BACK UP!! To finish, I have a few more questions. I'd like to ask you about advice you would give others. I'm going to start the tape back up.

44.	What would you want other _____ to know about these kinds of cases? a. High school administrators b. High school teachers c. SROs d. School district administrators e. Parents f. High school students
45.	To help improve school safety policy and procedures, what recommendations would you have for _____? a. High school administrators b. High school teachers c. SROs d. School district administrators e. Parents f. High school students
46.	Is there anything else you'd like to tell me that I haven't asked about?
47.	Can you think of anyone else that we should talk to about this case or this situation – with the idea that we hope to develop information that will prevent youth violence in schools?

INTERVIEWER POST-INTERVIEW COMMENTS

[Address Issues of Setting, Respondent, Emotional Tone, Difficulties, and Interviewer Insights/Reflections]