

Testimony on Senate Bill 317
Government Oversight and Reform Committee

Submitted by:
Ann Morahan

Chair Coley, Vice Chair Huffman, Ranking Member Craig, and members of the committee, thank you for allowing me to present this testimony in opposition to SB 317. I am a retired teacher of 37 years and I strongly oppose this bill.

The Columbus Dispatch reported in an article in Sunday's Dispatch that keeping public schools safe from the coronavirus could require more teachers, substitutes, nurses, and custodians, in other words: more money. So why are we worried about allowing teachers to be armed with significantly less training? Is there an ulterior motive for Buckeye Firearms to promote teachers and administrators carrying guns? Will school systems have the money to buy guns and training from Buckeye Firearms? In his testimony Rob Sexton never mentioned the Buckeye Firearms Foundation's Faculty /Administrator Safety Training & Emergency Response (FASTER) training.

Senator Peggy Lehner, your colleague from Kettering, stepped out in favor of gun control laws after the 2019 shooting in Dayton's Oregon district. As chair of the Senate Education Committee, Lehner said she sees no use in legislating more guns in schools. She hit the nail on the head when she stated that if anyone is armed in schools, it should be a school resource officer, trained as a police officer is. She went on, "I think it would be far more beneficial to be spending money on counselors and school psychiatrists," Lehner told the Capital Journal. "The needs of kids are such that they need a strong adult that they can lean of for help."

As a teacher for 37 years, I can attest to that. I have taught all ages of children from 3 years old to 19 years of age. To get a child tested, a teacher had to fill out a mountain of paperwork and it could take weeks and more likely months. More Psychologists and psychiatrists as well as councilors are greatly needed.

In a study of 41 nationwide "incidents of targeted school violence" from 2008 to 2017, the United States Secret Service's National Threat Assessment Center found that of the schools targeted, only seven had "any type of system in place to notify school staff or administrators of threatening or concerning student behaviors before the attack." Only nine had a program to "assess unwanted or potentially harmful student behavior."

A study of "school-associated violent deaths" by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that nearly half of the perpetrators or youth homicide "gave some type of warning signal such as making a threat or leaving a note, before the event."

Other important considerations: 1) You decrease violence by decreasing the inventory of weapons. The Second Amendment does not mean that everyone has a right to own

an automatic weapon. 2) Classis research has shown that people with guns in their homes are three times more likely to result in serious injury or death. 3) Promoting or encouraging weapons in school by legislation is a distraction, an attempt at changing the subject. The issue is meaningful gun control (ban on semiautomatic weapons, registration for every weapon, licensing, and training before any license is issued,)

Allowing teachers to carry weapons with less training only increases the legal liability for school districts and their employees. And who will pay the teacher's personal liability insurance?

Please vote no on this dangerous legislation.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Morahan