



Alert
Lockdown
Inform
Counter
Evacuate

THE ORIGIN OF LOCKDOWN

A photograph showing a group of young people sitting on the floor in a hallway. They appear to be in a state of distress or concern. One young man in the foreground has his hand covering his face, while others look on with serious expressions. The background shows a plain wall and a door.

Enduring Questions and One Man's Journey to Discover
Where Lockdown Came From

ALICE Training Institute

3613 Reserve Commons Drive
Medina, Ohio 44256

Phone 330.661.0106

Fax 330.661.0111

AliceTraining.com



About the Author



Author: Lieutenant Joseph A. Hendry Jr. , CLEE

Purpose: Joe Hendry's journey to find the origins of lockdown and why it became widely adopted for response Active Shooter events.

Lt. Hendry is an expert consultant to the Ohio Department of Homeland Security for civilian response to Active Shooter Incidents. He has been named a subject matter expert in Active Threat Response by the Ohio Attorney General's Office. Lt. Hendry assisted in the development of the Ohio Peace Officers Training Academy course, "Single Officer Response to Active Threats" and is a master law enforcement instructor for the State of Ohio.

Lt. Hendry, who received a B.A. in Telecommunications, is a 25 year veteran of the Kent State University Police Department. He is also a graduate of the Ohio Police Chiefs Association's "Executive Leadership College" and the "Ohio Certified Law Enforcement Executive" Program. Lt. Hendry is a six year veteran of the United States Marine Corps.

Lt. Hendry is a certified instructor for law enforcement in Solo-Engagement Tactics, Active Shooter Response, Preventing and Responding to Suicide Bombing Incidents, and Tactical Chemical Weapons. He is a past member of a multi-agency SWAT team, and is currently a Terrorism Liaison Officer with the Ohio Department of Homeland Security. He is a trained Crisis Intervention Team Officer in dealing with mental health issues.

Lt. Hendry is a much-traveled and much-in-demand national instructor for the "ALICE Training Institute" in teaching ALICE (Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter, and Evacuate). He is a past presenter at the International Conference of Crisis Intervention Teams in 2011 and was a guest presenter for three consecutive years for the Ohio Homeland Security Law Enforcement Planning Retreats.

He has trained staff and students and consulted on security plans for Pre-Schools, K-12, Universities, Hospitals, Libraries, MRDD Facilities, Business and Industry.

He also developed, for Rhodes State College, an eight hour training course for unarmed security response to crisis events. The course development was financed by the U.S. Department of Justice. He instructed the National Pilot course in July of 2013. In December of 2014, Campus Safety Magazine selected his article "Physical Security: Are We Protecting People or Trapping Them?" as the top Security/Technology article for the year.

In September of 2013, he was selected by the Ohio Department of Homeland Security to deliver the State Law Enforcement Unclassified Briefing on "Active Shooter: The Evolution of Law Enforcement and Civilian Response". In October of 2014, he was selected as an expert security panelist at the Ohio Homeland Security State Mall Briefing to answer questions about physical security and training for personnel to protect retail establishments from terrorism and active shooter.

He has been interviewed as an Active Shooter Response Expert by Campus Safety magazine, Emergency Management magazine and several news media outlets in television, radio and print.

Lt. Hendry is married and has three children.

The Origin of Lockdown



FIRE SAFETY TRAINING: BASIC, EFFECTIVE, AND UNIVERSAL

Since the late 1950's, fire safety training has been part of our lives from when we attend pre-school or kindergarten. Firemen and fire trucks are introduced almost immediately to four year old children. They learn about fire safety and not one survival option is withheld from them. Perhaps one of the most interesting considerations about this training is that children are even trained on what to do if their teacher is not with them, if he or she perished. They learn how to evacuate burning buildings, what to do if they or one of their friends are on fire and what to do when they are trapped in a fire! They are sent home with crayons, coloring books, and bookmarks reinforcing survival techniques. These four year old children are instructed to work with their parents to develop fire evacuation plans for their homes, to remind parents to check smoke detectors, fire extinguishers and to decide on meeting places if they could not evacuate as a family. By law, we practice our fire response every month. We build buildings to meet fire code and install alarms, special signs, maps, fire extinguishers, and doors to assist the public in survival.

But what if we decided that all of that wasn't necessary? What if we thought that all we had to do was close the door, pull the drapes, turn out the lights, and put everyone in the corner on the floor, with instructions to stay quiet and still? What if our strategy was to see who gets to the children first, the fire or the firemen, and gave the children no other options or instructions? That would be considered insane. Yet, that is exactly what we have trained an entire generation of Americans to do for active shooter and acts of terrorism.

ENDURING QUESTIONS: SHORTCOMINGS OF A LOCKDOWN ONLY POLICY

For the last six years I have searched for the origins of lockdown. Where did it come from and who developed it? Why were specific procedures being followed when they seemed to be counterproductive to survival in Active Shooter events? Why was hiding considered the best tactical decision in a building where every room is occupied by 20 or so people? Why did we continue to use the same response over and over again, even after repeated concept failure occurred, expecting a different result? Blind optimism? Denial? Naivety? Unwillingness to believe that this tragedy can happen anywhere?

My journey in search of answers to these questions did not lead me to where I thought I would eventually end up. The result was much worse. There was a reason that the tactics in traditional lockdown had failed. **Traditional lockdown was never intended for Active Shooter events.**

In 2009, I was asked to research plans for civilian training to an Active Shooter. This request was in response to the massacre at Virginia Tech. What I discovered were dozens of lockdown policies that had a series of procedural steps. Knowing that lockdown and lockdown tactics had failed at Columbine, Red Lake, and Virginia Tech, I began to dig deeper, identifying trends, such as events where individuals were being killed in locations other than classrooms. I read "school security experts'" books that offered many "suggestions," but had no basis in the reality of the situation. I found vague references to reverse evacuations. I discovered



that plans for Active Shooter were relying on coded announcements, with no plans for cafeterias, hallways, gyms, outside buildings, or buses. I found no training facility, no certification, no plan for contact with the shooter, no plan for evacuation, no survivability studies, and no drills ever run using a gunman.

When I asked Law Enforcement Officers and School Officials how the plan worked, I was stunned by their responses. **Law Enforcement Officers thought the plan was unworkable, and made it a point to say that they told their own children not to follow the school plan, but to evacuate from the building.** School Officials seemed unaware of the gaping holes in their plans. When I asked how they trained students, I was told they did not train the students. Several told me that they ran drills for Active Shooter, but didn't let students know why they were running the drill. When asked why over 90% of their occupants were not being trained in anything other than high-risk, passive response for someone attempting to kill them, the answers left me dumbfounded. Worries about liability, accountability, scaring children, and the proverbial "it's not going to happen here" or "it's unlikely" were all bandied about. There was no real understanding that the tactics were likely going to lead to the murder of dozens by a single gunman, or the possible loss of an entire facility if a terrorist attack were to occur.

Through my research, digging, and questioning the pieces started falling into place and I realized how these killers were so successful in mass shooting events. I recognized how Virginia Tech became a massacre. Adults in those classrooms had been trained and conditioned since childhood to respond by being quiet, laying on the ground, and not moving

when someone was attempting to kill them. Even more disheartening was the rumor that the Virginia Tech gunman had trained to shoot into the ground. It became fairly obvious that he knew where his targets were going to be when he started pulling the trigger. In reading the "**Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech**" Governor's Report, I discovered most of the students who reacted outside of traditional lockdown tactics survived at a much greater rate than students who did not.

Analyzing Virginia Tech and other mass shootings illustrated many flaws in the lockdown-only plan. How do you lockdown in a facility in which every room is occupied and then tell people that they are hiding? The killers usually come from the facility, have scouted it out, and know occupants will respond by hiding passively. Additionally, multiple media sources have reported on locations where victims have hidden in previous events. Now future killers know to check areas where those people hid.

Throughout my search, I have spoken to hundreds of Senior Law Enforcement Officials and School Administrators, The Department of Homeland Security, The Department of Education and have been granted access to the FEMA Lessons Learned Documents. I have been given a complimentary three year membership by A.M. Best (The largest holder of insurance records in the world) to search its record's database for lockdown mentions in insurance documents, survivability studies or references to it worldwide (A.M. Best's database goes back to 1899). I have had insurance companies query their underwriters for information on lockdown, survivability studies concerning it, or its history.



The answer was always the same. There are no official documents recommending the tactics, no survivability studies, no records concerning its history, and are no records of development by any government agency or private entity.

All I knew was that somehow, lockdown, a term invented in the California Prison system in 1973, was reminiscent of the old nuclear bomb drills several school administrators referenced when speaking with me. I knew it had come into use while Law Enforcement was still using SWAT as a primary response to active shooter. I also was acutely aware that Law Enforcement had evolved it's Active Shooter response twice since 1999 when SWAT proved too slow a response at Columbine; first to small unit tactics and then to Single Officer Engagement. SWAT and small unit tactics were deemed too slow for the survival of victims at the scene, and while not discarded as response, were supplanted by reality, in much the same way traditional lockdown was replaced by the federal recommendations in June of 2013.

ORIGIN OF LOCKDOWN: WHERE IT CAME FROM AND WHY IT WAS WIDELY ADOPTED

In November of 2013, an employee at the Department of Education suggested that I contact William Modzeleski, who retired after a long distinguished career in the Department of Education.

Following up with Mr. Modzeleski was an eye opening leg of this journey. He was very engaging and enlightening in explaining his comprehensive response to overall school safety and said that training for active shooters is part of a comprehensive EOP. He said that Active Shooter incidents

made "it difficult to advocate for any single approach to an active school shooter [that is, every incident is different so we can't say in every incident run out the back door, or stay in your classroom]."

Mr. Modzeleski said that "lockdown" tactics were developed in the late 1970's in Southern California (possibly in the Los Angeles Unified School District). He said that a more accurate description of the tactic would be "secure in place." **Lockdown was developed in response to drive-by shootings and street level crime occurring outside of school buildings.** The district had perimeter fencing, the building would be "locked down" and Law Enforcement Officers employed by the school district, who were already within the perimeter, would deal with the incident along with other arriving outside agency officers. Mr. Modzeleski stated that these drills were referred to as "drive by drills" when he was exposed to the concept.

Suddenly, the tactics of traditional lockdown made sense. Curtains pulled helped prevent outside threats from seeing into the classroom and also prevented glass from flying around the room if shattered by gun fire. Lights off prevented shadows from being cast on the curtains, preventing target acquisition by outside threats. Getting down on the floor away from the windows and door allowed the students and staff to be below the level of rounds coming in a window and used the wall below the windows to provide some cover from incoming bullets. Evacuation was not an option because the threat was already outside.



People in the rooms were told to be quiet so the threat outside could not pinpoint their position in the room. It was true- they were hiding- because the threat was outside. It also explained why several school administrators referred to this as a “reverse fire drill” and never considered evacuation (now the primary recommended response). It explained the concept behind the office making an announcement. The Office was inside a secured fenced perimeter and Law Enforcement was already on scene. Mr. Modzeleski referred to this as “concentric levels of security.”

This revelation also explained some of the most perplexing parts of traditional lockdown. This is why the training only applied to classrooms and no other locations. The pre-occupation of active shooter plans evacuating students back into the building, regardless of the Active Shooter location, made sense. The emphasis on getting students out of all other parts of the building into classrooms, instead of evacuating, became clear.

I asked Mr. Modzeleski if there were any drills or survival studies conducted in the use of lockdown as a stand-alone response for Active Shooter. He was not aware of any studies conducted for any of the responses. I then became curious about how lockdown became so widely used. He said that during conferences put on by the Department of Education, several big city Police Chiefs referred to the drills during their presentations. Schools started to use them in response to the threats they were experiencing. He said the response “morphed over time” and began to be used for Active Shooter.

I asked if there were ever any official recommendations to use lockdown for active shooter. Mr. Modzeleski said the tactics were “suggestions” and were never “recommendations.”

THE FIRST TRACES OF LOCKDOWN: HOW BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE CHANGES THE DYNAMIC

After speaking with Mr. Modzeleski, I contacted Dr. Jill Barnes, the Coordinator in the Office of Emergency Services and School Operations for the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Dr. Barnes was unable to verify for certain whether or not LAUSD was the originator of the lockdown concept for use in schools for Active Shooter. However, through several of her contacts she was able to trace its first use to possibly occurring in the 1960’s when LAUSD was confronted with riots occurring in the city which threatened the perimeter of their schools.

Dr. Barnes said they treat lockdowns “as protective actions, where the building itself is used to shield students from exposure to bullets and other hazards.” She also shared some of the unique characteristics of her school buildings that are not similar to many parts of the United States. She described many of her buildings as being “motel-style.” There are no interior hallways, the classrooms open to the outside and their cafeterias and lockers are often all outdoors. Additionally, she confirmed that “These schools have an increased risk from off-campus threats, such as police activity in the area near a school. Our schools are also completely fenced in on the perimeter.”

These revelations confirmed several components of Mr. Modzeleski’s statements about lockdown possibly coming out of LAUSD and Southern California. They also



explained why several school administrators referred to this as a “reverse fire drill”. Students who were outside of the classrooms, but inside the fencing, would obviously have little option but to re-enter back into the classrooms with gunfire and street level crime outside of that fencing.

LAUSD has its own School Resource Officers that would be inside the fenced in area and generally outside of the “motel-style” classrooms. This would possibly lead to interdiction of threats between the perimeter and classrooms. It also would make an Active Shooter easier to locate because movement between rooms would lead to the individual exposing themselves, unlike a school with interior hallways. Because of fewer ingress and egress points in the fencing, evacuation at LAUSD (“rapid relocation” in LAUSD) has only been adopted since the Federal recommendations were released in 2013.

Dr. Barnes shared that she is constantly asked for copies of LAUSD policies. This may have led to several of the “cut and paste” policies I have read that speak about evacuating students back into a building for Active Shooter or having them lay on the ground and not move, even if the threat was inside the building and they could evacuate the area.

This would also explain why lockdown training has almost always only been conducted in classrooms. With lockers, cafeterias, etc. being located in open air, in motel-style schools, there is no other place to even practice or think about its use. Because the tactic was developed for threats outside of a fenced perimeter, there was never any plan for contact with an individual who was shooting people from a few feet away in a classroom, hallway, cafeteria, library, etc. It is also important to note that a “drive-by” usually lasts for a

matter of seconds. The tactics were not meant to stand up to an Active Shooter incident that can last for 10-15 minutes.

CONCLUSION: PATH TO CHANGE

Now, in the years after these tragic events, we discover George Santayana’s famous quote **“Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it”** is unfortunately ringing true. The continued failure of buzzer systems, locked doors, lockdown response and lack of training based in reality has led us to huge changes in what is considered “best practices.” In June 2013, the Federal Government issued **“The Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans.”** It was signed off on by the Department of Education and five other Federal agencies, including the FBI, FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security.

This document moves lockdown to a secondary response, after evacuation of the school; making it clear that not every room is suitable for lockdown. This is in direct opposition to what was once considered a “best practice” - locking down every room. Furthermore, it recommends barricading and adds more proactive options by advocating that students and staff should “hide along the wall closest to the exit but out of the view from the hallway (allowing for an ambush of the shooter and for possible escape if the shooter enters the room).” The document directly states that students and staff may have to use more than one option during an incident. This is a dramatic shift from the past practice of only allowing students a single option.



These federal recommendations are a paradigm shift from the single response, lockdown-only policies of the past.

A week before this federal document was released, my own state of Ohio, issued recommendations through a School Safety Task Force put together by the Attorney General's Office that encouraged a proactive, rather than passive response to active shooter. This report also moved lockdown to a secondary response after evacuation. Additionally, it provided recommendations for individuals, including students, who come in contact with the gunman.

In conclusion, we need to change our thought process about this crime. Not training everyone to respond as if their life depended on it is shortsighted, high-risk and does not align with the realities of an active shooter event. Increased emphasis on "Run, Hide, Fight" recommendations and multi-optioned training like "ALICE" enables the public to respond based on their circumstance and allows for the mitigation of casualties. Plans in which 100% of a structure's occupants are only trained in a passive response, over reliance on building infrastructure to protect occupants, and lack of any plan when in contact with the threat are vestiges of a plan that was never meant for someone trying to kill people from a few feet away.

We must borrow a page from the fire safety training book. We need to be training the public in proactive response options to the threat of active shooters, because time and time again, lockdown-only policies have failed us. Fire safety training evolved to help prevent fire deaths in schools; it is now time for proactive responses to physical threats, such as Active Shooter events and acts of terrorism, to be universally incorporated into training.

GET ALICE CERTIFIED TODAY

Contact the ALICE Training Institute to learn more about proactive response options to active shooter events.



CERTIFIED

ALICE Training Institute

3613 Reserve Commons Drive
Medina, Ohio 44256

Phone 330.661.0106

Fax 330.661.0111

AliceTraining.com