

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

School Safety Site Assessment Report

Aligned with CPTED and CISA K-12 School Security Guide Best Practices

CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE (RCW 42.56.420)

School / Site Name:	
District:	
Site Address:	
Student Count:	
Staff Count:	
Assessment Date(s):	
Time:	
Report Date:	
Assessed By — Name / Title / Organization:	
Assessed By — Name / Title / Organization:	
Assessment Participants (optional):	

Executive Summary

[2-3 sentence overview of the site, its population, and the purpose of this assessment]

Key Strengths

- *[Add a positive finding]*
- *[Add a positive finding]*
- *[Add a positive finding]*

Key Findings and Areas for Improvement

Natural Surveillance: *[summarize the top finding(s) for this principle]*

Access Control and Wayfinding: *[summarize the top finding(s) for this principle]*

Territorial Reinforcement: *[summarize the top finding(s) for this principle]*

Maintenance and Management: *[summarize the top finding(s) for this principle]*

Safety, Security, and Emergency Operations Integration: *[summarize the top finding(s) for this principle]*

Priority Recommendations

- *[Immediate, no-cost operational improvements — summarize]*
- *[Short-term, low-cost enhancements — summarize]*
- *[Long-term capital planning needs — summarize]*

Emergency Operations Plan Alignment and Support

This assessment considers whether the school's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) reflects current site conditions, staffing structures, and operational practices. Where gaps are identified—such as emergency communication procedures, staff roles, documentation organization, access and functional needs considerations, or post-incident support—NWESD is well-positioned to support plan updates, provide templates and technical assistance, and collaborate with school leadership to ensure the EOP is practical, inclusive, and regularly reviewed and exercised.

REMS Site Assessment and Emergency Operations Planning Alignment

In addition to CPTED and CISA physical security principles, this assessment considers the value of incorporating REMS (Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools) site assessment practices to strengthen emergency preparedness and planning. While CPTED and CISA focus on how the physical environment supports prevention, detection, delay, and response, REMS site assessments connect environmental conditions directly to Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) development, accessibility, and functional response planning across all hazards.

Conclusion

[Summarize overall condition of the site, key opportunities, and the value of a phased, collaborative approach to improvement]

Section 1: Purpose, Scope, and Methodology

Purpose of the Assessment

This CPTED assessment is designed to support the school's ongoing efforts to strengthen campus safety, supervision, and environmental design in alignment with nationally recognized Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles, the CISA K-12 School Security Guide, and Washington State school safety expectations.

This document is intended to serve as a planning and improvement tool. Recommendations are not prescriptive or exhaustive and should be reviewed in conjunction with district policy, building codes, fire codes, and applicable state and local regulations.

CPTED and CISA Framework

This assessment is grounded in CPTED principles as outlined by the National Institute of Crime Prevention (NCIP), focusing on how physical environments influence behavior, perception of safety, and opportunities for positive supervision. It is also informed by the CISA K-12 School Security Guide, which organizes physical security into four layers—School Perimeter, School Grounds, Building Perimeter, and Building Interior—evaluated through the strategies of detection, delay, and response.

The primary CPTED principles addressed include:

- Natural Surveillance
- Access Control and Wayfinding
- Territorial Reinforcement
- Maintenance and Management
- Safety, Security, and Emergency Operations Integration (Integration)

Scope of Assessment (check all that apply)

- ☐ Exterior grounds
- ☐ Interior spaces
- ☐ During school hours
- ☐ Outside school hours
- ☐ Shared-use facility
- ☐ Parking and arrival/departure areas

Methodology

The assessment consisted of a guided walkthrough, environmental observations, informal discussion with staff, and review of existing safety features and documentation. Where used, the companion NWESD 189 Scored Checklist (CPTED + CISA) provides the item-level ratings that inform the observations and recommendations below.

Section 2: General Site Description

School Type: *[e.g., elementary, middle, secondary, alternative learning site]*

Instructional Model (if applicable): *[describe]*

Building Description: *[describe number of buildings, floors, shared spaces, and primary functions]*

Facility Ownership and Use

[Describe ownership, leasing arrangements, and general facility use]

Outdoor Areas and Grounds

[Describe outdoor spaces, fields, playgrounds, and shared-use areas]

Parking, Traffic Flow, and Access

[Describe parking layout, traffic patterns, and access routes]

Site Context

[Describe surrounding land uses (north/south/east/west) and community context]

Shared Use Considerations

[Describe any additional programs, tenants, or community partners operating out of the facility]

Section 3: CPTED Analysis and Findings

CPTED Principle 1: Natural Surveillance

Principle Overview

Natural surveillance addresses both the physical and psychological need for people to see and be seen within a space. When individuals can easily observe their surroundings—and feel that their actions may be observed by others—spaces are perceived as safer and more predictable. Visibility supports positive behavior, discourages misconduct, and reduces anxiety that can cause people to avoid certain areas. Effective natural surveillance is achieved through clear sightlines, unobstructed windows, appropriate lighting, and strategic landscaping. In school environments, visibility into and around buildings, classrooms, entrances, parking areas, and common spaces supports supervision, strengthens informal oversight, and reinforces a culture of accountability and care.

Within the CISA K-12 School Security Guide framework, this principle applies primarily to the School Grounds and Building Interior layers, and supports the detection strategy of CISA's detection-delay-response model—the ability to notice a concern before it escalates.

Observations

Windows and Visibility

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Landscaping

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Building Layout and Campus Design

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Lighting, Monitoring, and Technology

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Identified Risks or Concerns

[Describe how current conditions may impact supervision, visibility, access control, or perceptions of safety related to this principle]

Recommendations

Immediate / No-Cost Actions

- *[Add immediate, no-cost or low-effort operational recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Short-Term / Low-Cost Actions

- *[Add short-term, low-cost recommendation]*

- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Long-Term / Capital Improvements

- *[Add long-term or capital-improvement recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Related Policy / RCW References (if applicable)

- RCW 28A.320.125 – Safe School Plans and school safety planning requirements
- RCW 28A.210.310 – Required posting of health and safety signage
- District facilities and maintenance policies related to landscaping, lighting, and building upkeep
- National Institute of Crime Prevention (NCIP) CPTED guidelines
- *[Add site-specific policy or RCW reference]*

CPTED Principle 2: Access Control and Wayfinding

Principle Overview

Access control and wayfinding work together to guide how pedestrians and vehicles enter, exit, and move through a campus. The goal is not to restrict appropriate access, but to clearly communicate which spaces are public, semi-public, or private, and to establish predictable, supervised routes of travel. Effective access control may be natural (landscaping, pathways, building orientation), mechanical (doors, locks, fencing), or organizational (visitor procedures, schedules, supervision). Wayfinding elements such as signage, visual cues, and focal points reduce confusion, discourage inappropriate movement, and help staff quickly identify behavior that does not align with expected use of the space.

This principle spans CISA's School Perimeter and Building Perimeter layers and is central to the delay strategy—the physical and procedural barriers that slow unauthorized access and give staff and first responders time to react.

Observations

Site Location and Traffic Context

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Parking and Vehicle Flow

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Entry Control and Screening

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Campus Layout and Building Use

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Identified Risks or Concerns

[Describe how current conditions may impact supervision, visibility, access control, or perceptions of safety related to this principle]

Recommendations

Immediate / No-Cost Actions

- *[Add immediate, no-cost or low-effort operational recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Short-Term / Low-Cost Actions

- *[Add short-term, low-cost recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Long-Term / Capital Improvements

- *[Add long-term or capital-improvement recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Related Policy / RCW References (if applicable)

- RCW 28A.320.125 – Safe School Plans and school safety planning requirements
- *[Add site-specific policy or RCW reference]*

CPTED Principle 3: Territorial Reinforcement

Principle Overview

Territorial reinforcement focuses on how a site communicates ownership, purpose, and care. Clear territorial cues help users understand what a space is used for, who belongs there, and what behaviors are expected. When a space appears cared for and actively used, it signals that inappropriate behavior is more likely to be noticed and addressed. In school settings, territorial reinforcement may include signage, artwork, staff presence, consistent identification practices, and clear boundaries between shared or restricted areas. These elements foster a sense of belonging among students and staff while discouraging misuse by individuals who do not have a legitimate purpose on campus.

This principle reinforces CISA's School Grounds and Building Interior layers by signaling clear ownership and expected use of space, supporting both the detection and delay strategies.

Observations

Boundary Delineation and Signage

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

School Identity and Shared Spaces

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Vandalism and Upkeep of Territorial Cues

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Identified Risks or Concerns

[Describe how current conditions may impact supervision, visibility, access control, or perceptions of safety related to this principle]

Recommendations

Immediate / No-Cost Actions

- *[Add immediate, no-cost or low-effort operational recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Short-Term / Low-Cost Actions

- *[Add short-term, low-cost recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Long-Term / Capital Improvements

- *[Add long-term or capital-improvement recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Related Policy / RCW References (if applicable)

- District facilities and signage policies

- National Institute of Crime Prevention (NCIP) CPTED guidelines
- *[Add site-specific policy or RCW reference]*

CPTED Principle 4: Maintenance and Management

Principle Overview

Maintenance and management address the ongoing condition and upkeep of the physical environment. Well-maintained spaces communicate pride, oversight, and accountability, reinforcing expectations for respectful behavior. Conversely, visible disrepair, clutter, or neglect can signal a lack of supervision and increase the likelihood of misuse or disorder. In schools, maintenance considerations extend beyond aesthetics to include functionality, safety, and compliance. Regular attention to lighting, doors, windows, landscaping, storage areas, and shared spaces supports both CPTED principles and broader safety and operational goals.

Maintenance and management cut across all four CISA physical security layers—School Perimeter, School Grounds, Building Perimeter, and Building Interior—since consistent upkeep is what keeps detection and delay measures functional over time.

Observations

Grounds and Exterior Condition

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Life-Safety and Building Systems

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Repair Tracking and Timeliness

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Identified Risks or Concerns

[Describe how current conditions may impact supervision, visibility, access control, or perceptions of safety related to this principle]

Recommendations

Immediate / No-Cost Actions

- *[Add immediate, no-cost or low-effort operational recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Short-Term / Low-Cost Actions

- *[Add short-term, low-cost recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Long-Term / Capital Improvements

- *[Add long-term or capital-improvement recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Related Policy / RCW References (if applicable)

- District facilities and maintenance policies
- Applicable fire and building code requirements
- *[Add site-specific policy or RCW reference]*

CPTED Principle 5: Safety, Security, and Emergency Operations Integration

Principle Overview

Integration ensures that CPTED strategies support and reinforce the school's broader safety, security, and emergency preparedness efforts. Environmental design alone cannot address risk without alignment to clear procedures, communication systems, training, and coordination with district plans and external partners. Effective integration connects physical design features—such as controlled access points, visibility, signage, and wayfinding—to Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs), Standard Response Protocols, communication systems, and staff roles. This alignment strengthens prevention and protection while also supporting effective response and recovery during incidents.

This principle connects directly to CISA's response strategy, ensuring that physical design and access-control measures are backed by clear communication systems, staff roles, and coordination with district Emergency Operations Plans and first responders.

Observations

Emergency Operations Plan Alignment

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Communication Systems and Staff Training

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Behavioral Threat Assessment and First Responder Coordination

- *[Describe observed condition]*
- *[Describe additional observed condition]*

Identified Risks or Concerns

[Describe how current conditions may impact supervision, visibility, access control, or perceptions of safety related to this principle]

Recommendations

Immediate / No-Cost Actions

- *[Add immediate, no-cost or low-effort operational recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Short-Term / Low-Cost Actions

- *[Add short-term, low-cost recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Long-Term / Capital Improvements

- *[Add long-term or capital-improvement recommendation]*
- *[Add additional recommendation]*

Related Policy / RCW References (if applicable)

- RCW 28A.320.125 – Safe School Plans and school safety planning requirements
- RCW 28A.300.136 – Model policies and procedures for threat assessment
- WAC 392-411 – Safe school plans
- *[Add site-specific policy or RCW reference]*

Appendix: Supporting Documentation

Planning Documents: *[link to shared planning sheets, photo log, or site diagrams]*

Photo Log

[Insert or reference site photographs supporting observations above (cross-reference Photo Ref. column on the companion Scored Checklist)]