Nastava i vaspitanje

Obaveštenje za čitaoce časopisa
Nastava i vaspitanje

Obaveštavamo uvažene čitaoce časopisa Nastava i vaspitanje, da će broj 3 časopisa za 2024. godinu biti objavljen dvojezično, na srpskom i na engleskom jeziku. Na ovakvo izdanje smo se odlučili u želji da obezbedimo što veću vidljivost radova u časopisu zainteresovanima kako u našoj sredini, tako i van Srbije, a da istovremeno čuvamo i razvijamo naučnu terminologiju na srpskom jeziku.

Uredništvo časopisa

Information for readers of the journal
Studies in Teaching and Education

We would like to inform all valued readers of Studies in Teaching and Education that the third and final issue for the year 2024 will be published bilingually, in Serbian and English. This decision is based on our desire to ensure the greatest possible visibility of the articles in the journal for interested parties both in our environment and outside Serbia, while maintaining and further developing scientific terminology in Serbian.

The Editorial board of the journal

Školski prostor kao „siguran prostor" i „bezbedan prostor": obrazovni i arhitektonski izazovi[1]

Nena Vasojević[2] ⓘ

Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd, Srbija

Ivana Vučetić ⓘ

Inovacioni centar Mašinskog fakulteta, Beograd, Srbija

Suzana Ignjatović ⓘ

Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd, Srbija

Željka Buturović ⓘ

Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd, Srbija

�æ⟩⟨⟨∘⟩⟨⟨⟩⟩⟨∘⟩⟨⟨⟨

Apstrakt   *U radu se uporedno razmatraju dva koncepta školskog prostora – „siguran prostor" i „bezbedan prostor", koristeći obrazovni i arhitektonski pristup. Ukazuje se na razlike ali i preklapanja ova dva pojma. U radu se takođe analiziraju međunarodna iskustva u projektovanju bezbednih školskih prostora i postojeća zakonodavna rešenja za bezbednost u školskim zgradama u Srbiji. Ostvarivanje uslova sigurnog i bezbednog školskog prostora je razmatrano na nivou propisa, preporuka i postojećih mera. Pokazalo se da zakonodavna rešenja mera bezbednosti u školskim zgradama ne uključuju konkretne preventivne mere koje se odnose na bezbednost i sigurnost u pomenutom kontekstu. Konstatovano je da razvijanje koncepta „sigurnog" i „bezbednog" prostora u srpskim školama zahteva reviziju postojećih propisa. Da bi se omogućilo efikasno upravljanje bezbednošću uopšte, kao i upravljanje u vanrednim situacijama, prilikom projektovanja školskih zgrada treba voditi računa o arhitektonskoj logici prostora i ljudskom faktoru. Takođe, svaka aktivnost usmerena na donošenje prostorne regulative i organizovanje sistema reagovanja unutar školske zgrade na bezbednosne rizike treba da uzme u obzir specifičnosti pojedinačnih školskih zgrada. Novim propisima treba osigurati*

---

2   nvasojevic@idn.org.rs

bezbednost za sve subjekte koji su uključeni u vaspitno-obrazovni proces, pri čemu školsko okruženje treba da odgovara potrebama učenika i nastavnika, uz mogućnost menjanja i prilagođavanja obrazovno-kulturnoj zajednici.

Ključne reči: *siguran prostor, škola, bezbedan prostor, arhitektura školskih zgrada.*

Uvod

Bezbednost je veoma široka tema koju možemo da razmatramo kao fizičku bezbednost i kao kvalitet okruženja u kojem se osoba oseća slobodnom da izražava svoje mišljenje i bude ono što jeste. Usled tragičnog događaja pucnjave u jednoj školi u Beogradu, u domaćoj javnosti je postala dominantna tema bezbednosti u školama, tj. bezbednosti u školskom prostoru. Ni naučna istraživanja na ovom polju nisu izrodila jedinstven teorijski pristup izučavanju bezbednosnih rizika u školama, što predstavlja prepreku za stvaranje naučno zasnovanog i praktično upotrebljivog hipotetičkog okvira za procenu i odgovor na heterogene rizike s kojima se suočava školska omladina (Keković i sar., 2012).

U obrazovanju sve više dolazi do preklapanja pojmova bezbednosti (eng. *security)* i sigurnosti (eng. *safety*), odnosno oni se često povezuju kroz sintagmu „bezbednost i sigurnost u školama“ (Vallinkoski & Koirikivi, 2020: 103). Koncept sigurnosti ima razne dimenzije, od fizičke sigurnosti od zemljotresa, do socijalne sigurnosti od siromaštva i isključenosti. S druge strane, koncept bezbednosti se odnosi pre svega na bezbednost od fizičkih napada na telesni integritet, sa različitim stepenom životnog ugrožavanja. U skladu s preovlađujućim pristupom da se bezbednost/sigurnost posmatra kao jedinstven koncept, predlažu se modeli za rešavanje glavnih problema u školama u vezi s ovim aspektom. U strateškim dokumentima se govori o „sveobuhvatnoj sigurnosti“ (eng. *comprehensive safety*), koja obuhvata veoma širok spektar pitanja sigurnosti/bezbednosti: od psihosocijalne sigurnosti i vršnjačkog nasilja i sadržaja kurikuluma, do kontrole rizika od katastrofa, nasilja i klimatskih promena (GADRRRES, 2022).

U radu ćemo razlikovati dva koncepta koji se odnose na bezbednost, tj. sigurnost. Koncept „sigurnog prostora“ ima pre svega socijalnu i psihološku osnovu, ali takođe i fizičku prostornu komponentu. Drugi koncept koji je tesno vezan za dimenziju fizičkog prostora u obrazovanju odnosi se na bezbednost u užem smislu reči u okviru školske zgrade i prostora izvan zgrade koji joj pripada. Ovde mislimo na zaštitu fizičkog integriteta, kako od opasnosti spolja („amok situacije“) (Vulević, 2019) tako i od opasnosti unutar škole (vršnjačko nasilje).

Prostor škole je prvenstveno društveni prostor koji označava društveno uokviravanje fizičkog, geografskog ili materijalnog supstrata (Reed–Danahay, 2015). On je definisan sociokulturnim obrascima shvatanja škole kao obrazovne institucije i osnovnog instrumenta javnog obrazovanja. Škola kao „društveni prostor“ podrazumeva spoljašnje prostorne granice (koje određuju fizički okvir školskog prostora), i unutrašnje prostorne granice (koje određuju različite funkcije škole, tj. kompartmentalizaciju

prostora unutar datih granica škole). U tako širokom okviru, postavlja se pitanje kako u praksi artikulisati kontrole rizika koji se odnose na fizičku bezbednost, uz poštovanje principa sigurnog prostora kao socijalne i psihološke kategorije. Na koji način se određuju granice „sigurnog prostora" unutar škole, a na koji način „bezbednog prostora"? Da li postoje određeni delovi škole koji su posebno namenjeni sigurnom prostoru (na primer, kabinet psihološke i pedagoške službe) a neki fizičkoj bezbednosti u slučaju rizika? Da li se norme ponašanja prostorno ograničavaju u realizaciji principa sigurnog i principa bezbednog prostora?

Prostor škole postaje predmet intervencija u skladu sa zahtevima „sveobuhvatne sigurnosti" i bezbednosti, dakle sigurnost i bezbednost se tretiraju kao celina, a ne pojedinačno. U radu se bavimo fizičkim i prostornim dimenzijama regulisanja dva glavna zahteva koja smo prepoznali kao jezgro savremenih paradigmi: zahtev za „sigurnim prostorom" (eng. *safe space*) i zahtev za fizičkom bezbednošću. U kombinaciji, ova dva pojma imaju podjednako simboličko i praktično značenje, a u ovom radu nas posebno zanima prostorni i fizički aspekt sigurnosti, odnosno bezbednosti. Kako se ona operativno sprovodi (sistemi bezbednosti unutar prostora škole)? Kako se prostor segmentira prema bezbednosnim rizicima (zgrada, dvorište)? Kako se definišu uloge aktera u školi u kontroli prostorne bezbednosti (roditelji, nastavnici, učenici, uprava) – ko ima nadležnost da proverava prostorije, ko ima pristup kom delu prostora? Kako se prostor bezbednosno kontroliše, koja su arhitektonska rešenja, raspored kontrolnih punktova, evakuacioni izlazi itd. Osim toga, važno pitanje je da li dolazi do kolizije dva koncepta u realnosti školskog okruženja – sigurnog prostora kao društveno tolerantne sredine, s jedne strane, i bezbednosti kao zaštite od rizika fizičkog ugrožavanja, s druge strane, posebno iz perspektive prostorne regulacije i arhitektonskih rešenja. U domaćoj literaturi nema mnogo radova o ovom pitanju (Hebib i Žunić Pavlović, 2018; Tadić, 2022).

„Siguran prostor" kao školski prostor

Značenje sigurnosti u ovom kontekstu odnosi se na kombinaciju fizičke bezbednosti i slobode da se otvoreno iznose stavovi i govori o sebi. Poslednjih godina ovaj termin je sve više zastupljen u obrazovnim dokumentima, kada se govori o dimenziji „sigurnog prostora" koji se vezuje za slobodu i prava učenika.[3] Važnost ove teme prepoznata je i u zvaničnim dokumentima i preporukama Saveta Evrope, pa se tako u dokumentu Putokazi „siguran prostor" definiše kao mesto gde su „učenici u mogućnosti da izraze svoje stavove i otvoreno govore, čak i ako se razlikuju od pozicija nastavnika ili vršnjaka" (Jackson, 2014: 48). Fizička bezbednost tu pada u drugi plan.

---

3   U relevantnoj literaturi mogu se naći različite definicije koje opisuju koncept „sigurnog prostora" (eng. „safe space"). Važno je napomenuti da je koncept „bezbednog prostora" potekao od feminističkog i LGBT pokreta 1970-ih godina prošlog veka, i da je prvobitno korišćen za imenovanje „fizičkih mesta za sastanke gde su istomišljenici mogli da se sretnu i podele svoja iskustva u bezbednom okruženju" (Flensner & Von der Lippe, 2019: 276).

S druge strane, pojedini autori, kao što su Domalevska i saradnici (Domalewska et al., 2021), ukazuju da „siguran prostor bez rizika predstavlja 'hrabri prostor', naime okruženje slobodno od zlostavljanja i podsmeha" (Domalewska et al., 2021: 36). Siguran prostor je društveni prostor u metaforičkom značenju i podrazumeva okruženje ili sredinu. Takav „prostor" u školama vezuje se za fizički prostor u kojem učenici borave tokom obrazovno-vaspitnog procesa, a to su učionice, školske prostorije (kancelarije, sale za sport i rekreaciju, trpezarija, školsko dvorište, nastavničke kancelarije i sl.). Taj prostor označava okruženje koje podržava učenje, gde je zastupljeno prosocijalno načelo kojim se obezbeđuje da se pojedinci, tj. učenici poštuju uprkos razlikama. Međutim, u SAD u praksi se pokazalo da koncept „sigurnog prostora" (safe space) često može izazvati negativan efekat, gde preventivna upozorenja o merama sigurnosti i bezbednosti mogu sama po sebi delovati uznemirujuće na učenika, a predavači i literatura sa potencijalom da izazovu neprijatna osećanja mogu biti odstranjeni iz kurikuluma (Byron, 2017).

Autori Domalevska i sar. (2021) navode da se „učionice bezbednog prostora u obrazovnim ustanovama razlikuju od politike bezbednog prostora u visokoškolskim ustanovama ili radnim mestima jer se pravila i ciljevi kohabitacije razlikuju" (Flensner et al., 2019, prema: Domalewska et al., 2021: 36). Siguran prostor je prvenstveno prostor za učenje koji treba da obezbedi pozitivnu atmosferu koja podstiče učenike da razbiju svoju izolovanost, i doprinosi formiranju saradnje unutar zajednice tj. učionice (Biegel, 2010; Gawlik-Kobylinska, 2021; Kislyakov et al., 2014, prema: Domalewska et al., 2021: 36). Takav prostor podrazumeva „klimu u učionici u kojoj se svi učesnici u vaspitno-obrazovnom procesu osećaju bezbedno, gde pritom svi mogu da iskažu svoje mišljenje i osećanja bez straha da će biti meta nasilja, uznemiravanja ili govora mržnje" (Domalewska et al., 2021: 36). Takav pristup je podsticajan za interakciju unutar prostora bez straha i podsmevanja, jer se u takvom prostoru „podržava njihovo blagostanje, otpornost i moralni identitet" (Domalewska et al., 2021: 36; Kislyakov, 2014).

Karakteristikama obrazovnog okruženja mogu se smatrati faktori sredine koji definišu psihosocijalno blagostanje svih subjekata vaspitno-obrazovnog procesa (Kislyakov et al., 2014), i podjednako je važno za učenike i nastavnike. Samo u sigurnom prostoru nastavnik može da primeni individualni pristup svakom učeniku i „stvori prostor za interakciju subjekat–subjekat" (Antonova, 2013: 286, prema: Kislyakov et al., 2014). Veština nastavnika da formira „tolerantni prostor" uključuje sinergiju mnogih elemenata kao što su prihvatanje subjekata bez obzira na različitost (starost, rasa, etnička grupa, jezik, materijalni položaj itd.) i administraciju (Pogodina, 2006, prema: Kislyakov et al., 2014).

S druge strane, treba imati u vidu da je kod klime bezbednog prostora kao socijalnog okruženja glavni preduslov međukulturni dijalog, s jedne strane, i istraživanja različitosti mišljenja, vrednosti i stavova, s druge strane (Domalewska et al., 2021; Jackson, 2014). Ovakav ambijent podstiče samootkrivanje kod učenika praćeno različitim izazovima, ali jedino na ovaj način dolazi do kognitivnog, emocionalnog i društvenog razvoja (Vygotsky, 1978) pojedinca, tj. učenika. Međutim, klima bezbednog prostora ne podrazumeva „udobnost" (Domalewska et al., 2021), pa možemo govoriti o socijalno-psihološkoj sigurnosti u različitim situacijama. Vaspitno-obrazovne institucije moraju da rade

na stvaranju pozitivnog okruženja za učenje koje obuhvata komponente fizičkih resursa (učionice, materijali, tehnologije, i sl.) (Velissaratou & Blyth, 2017).

Treba imati u vidu da intersekcionalni pristup podrazumeva da je bezbedan prostor nemoguć za pripadnike marginalizovanih grupa u kontekstu dominantnih institucija. Iz tog razloga, okvir bezbednog prostora je u nekim kontekstima, suprotno ideji otvorene multikulturalne komunikacije, rezultirao isključivanjem neprijatnih tema i davanjem primata udobnosti učenika i nastavnika. Ovako shvaćen, pojam bezbednog prostora je često kritikovan (Haidt & Lukianoff, 2019).

Sve više se ističe i važnost inkluzivnosti školskog okruženja, koja doprinosi da se učenici osećaju bezbedno i prijatno (Joseph et al., 2023). Tako je jedan od ključnih elemenata međunarodnih obrazovnih smernica i školskih politika širom sveta upravo izgradnja inkluzivnijih škola, za koje se smatra da podstiču pozitivne odnose između učenika i smanjuju vršnjačko nasilje te unapređuju opštu dobrobit učenika (Margas, 2023). Neka istraživanja (Baeva, 2023; Flynn, 2018) su pokazala da je u cilju prevencije potencijalno ugrožavajućih situacija u školskom okruženju neophodno posvetiti pažnju socijalno-emocionalnom učenju i angažovati se na formiranju pozitivnih vrednosti kod učenika, kao i obučiti nastavnike da prepoznaju i rešavaju probleme koji nisu lako uočljivi (nasilništvo i sl.). Praksa je pokazala da školska zgrada može da ima veliki uticaj na proces učenja, nastavu i odnose učenika i nastavnika (Harber, 2021). Zbog toga bi školske zgrade trebalo projektovati tako da podstiču učenje, u skladu s teorijom i praksom u oblasti obrazovanja i psihologije životne sredine (Dyck & Lippman, 2023).

Ipak, koncept „sigurnog prostora" kao socijalno bezbednog okruženja u školi sve više pada u drugi plan sa novim rizicima u školskom prostoru. Učestale pojave pucnjava u školama (eng. *school shootings*) stavile su fizičku bezbednost učenika u fokus i otvorile polemiku o načinu projektovanja školskih zgrada kako bi se minimizovale žrtve do kojih dolazi prilikom ovih napada. Preporuke o poželjnim prostornim rešenjima koja treba da podstaknu toleranciju i komunikaciju unutar škole mogu da budu u koliziji sa prioritetom fizičke bezbednosti. Stoga ćemo se u nastavku rada pozabaviti ovim drugim konceptom bezbednosti iz perspektive arhitektonskih rešenja za bezbednosne rizike u školskim zgradama.

Školska zgrada kao bezbedan prostor

Posle Drugog svetskog rata, porast broja dece školskog uzrasta i reforma u pravcu demokratizacije obrazovanja doveli su do promene propisa u projektovanju školskih zgrada i uspostavljanja dinamičnije prostorne veze s okruženjem (Tiškevič, 2023). Ovakva otvorena koncepcija školskih zgrada učinila ih je dostupnijim lokalnoj zajednici. Međutim, otvorenost škole za komunikaciju s okruženjem ujedno je čini podložnom bezbednosnim rizicima. Usled učestalosti ovakvih događaja poslednjih decenija, postalo je neophodno raditi na unapređivanju bezbednosti školskih zgrada. Tako je prilikom projektovanja školskih zgrada pored praktičnih, estetskih i ekonomskih zahteva, potrebno uzeti u obzir i bezbednosne zahteve (Tiškevič, 2023).

Savremena škola treba da kombinuje efektivni dizajn s fizičkim, socijalnim i psihološkim potrebama korisnika (Blue, 1998). To usložnjava proces projektovanja pošto arhitekte moraju da izbegnu štetne efekte preventivnih mera bezbednosti koje mogu izazvati strah i nelagodu kod učenika. Potrebno je pronaći inovativna prostorna rešenja koja mogu da spreče i ograniče nasilje, ali koja ne narušavaju karakter podsticajnog okruženja za učenje. Na ovaj način stvorile bi se povezane, otvorene školske zajednice u skladu s društvenim, psihološkim, ekonomskim faktorima i faktorima životne sredine (AIA, n.d.). Prostorni elementi koji doprinose bezbednosti mogu uključivati različite barijere u kretanju, ograničavanje pristupa ili sigurnosne sisteme. Oni treba da budu što manje primetni i projektovani kao sastavni deo prostornog rešenja. U suprotnom, obrazovni proces, emocionalni razvoj učenika i njihovo društveno ponašanje mogu biti ugroženi (Schneidawind, 2018).

Međutim, jedan od glavnih problema koji se nameće je nedostatak smernica i pristupa adekvatnim informacijama za projektovanje školskih zgrada. Pri tome, ne postoji jedinstveno projektno rešenje koje može biti primenjeno u svakoj školi, već ono mora biti prilagođeno konkretnoj populaciji učenika, zahtevima lokacije, i potrebama lokalne zajednice (Schneidawind, 2018). Kada se govori o unapređivanju bezbednosti školskog okruženja, moraju se uzeti u obzir ne samo vanredne okolnosti, već i uobičajeni problemi koji ugrožavaju bezbednost, s kojima se učenici i nastavnici mogu susreti svakodnevno, kao što je vršnjačko nasilje. Zbog toga je, pored strategija za unapređivanje bezbednosti, neophodno voditi računa i o aspektima koji doprinose „sigurnom prostoru" u psihosocijalnom smislu. Dobins ističe da treba učiniti pristupačnim prostorije za savetovanje i psihološku podršku tako što će biti locirane u blizini biblioteke ili neke zajedničke prostorije (Dobbins, 2018).

Rasprava o bezbednosti u školskom prostoru mora uzeti u obzir individualni doživljaj javnog prostora različitih aktera u školi – učenika, nastavnika, roditelja. Školski prostor je ujedno i javni prostor. A percepcija bezbednosti u javnom prostoru kod dece školskog uzrasta razlikuje se od razumevanja rizika kod odraslih. Jedno istraživanje o percepciji rizika za decu u javnom prostoru u Srbiji pokazalo je manje oštru podelu javno–privatno nego na Zapadu, kao i veću autonomiju mobilnosti dece u prostoru u odnosu na druge zemlje (Tomanović & Petrović, 2006). Isto istraživanje je pokazalo da je anksioznost u vezi s rizikom u Srbiji relativno niža od očekivane, a roditelji više pribegavaju instruktivnim nego restriktivnim merama u kontroli rizika u prostoru (Tomanović & Petrović, 2006). Naravno, iskustvo takođe utiče na promenu percepcije. Prvo masovno ubistvo u školi u Srbiji možda će promeniti dominantni kulturni skript u reagovanju na opasnosti u javnom prostoru, uključujući i školski prostor.

Ekstremne situacije bezbednosnog rizika i školski prostor

Sjedinjene Američke Države beleže najviše slučajeva ekstremnih situacija sa mogućim teškim posledicama, pre svega onih u vezi s oružanim napadima u školi. Zbog toga su razvijeni posebni protokoli bezbednosti koji se od 2013. godine moraju uvažiti prilikom projektovanja školskih zgrada ili rekonstrukcija većih obima postojećih objekata

(OSPI, 2013; Vulević, 2019). Kada su u pitanju ekstremne situacije gde se predviđa da opasnost dolazi iz spoljašnjeg okruženja, bezbednosne strategije zasnivaju se na otežavanju pristupa unutrašnjem prostoru školske zgrade fizičkim preprekama, posebno projektovanim prostornim elementima i sistemima kontrole ulaska u školski prostor. Istovremeno, radi se na omogućavanju brze evakuacije iz unutrašnjeg prostora školske zgrade u slučaju nužde, planiranjem putanja za bekstvo. Važno je i da se u okviru školske zgrade obezbede sigurna mesta za skrivanje u slučaju nemogućnosti evakuacije. Navedene preventivne mere mogu uključivati različite elemente arhitektonskog i pejzažnog dizajna, kao i upotrebu savremene tehnologije i posebnu prostorno-funkcionalnu organizaciju školske zgrade.

Prostorno-funkcionalna organizacija školske zgrade je polazna osnova za stvaranje sigurnog i bezbednog okruženja. Neki autori ističu da zona glavnog prostora škole sa učionicama i prostorijama sa pratećim sadržajima u kojima borave učenici treba da bude odvojena od ulaznog hola, uz koji treba da budu grupisane prostorije javne namene (uslužni toaleti, sale za sastanke/prijem roditelja i kancelarije za rad sa strankama) kojima nije ograničen pristup (Cassidy, 2014). Takođe, ulazni hol sa prijemnim delom treba da bude i fizički odvojen od glavnog dela škole, i često se preporučuje zastakljivanje staklom otpornim na metke. Međutim, ova preporuka ne važi za sve prostorije, tj. zastakljivanje oko ulaza u učionice treba izbegavati jer se na taj način mogu stvoriti tzv. bezbednosne niše u slepim tačkama koje se ne mogu sagledati iz hodnika (Flynn, 2018). Ulaz treba da bude pozicioniran tako da se kretanje posetilaca može pratiti kako iz glavnog prostora školske zgrade i prijemnog dela, tako i sa partera i javnih površina. Preporučuje se ograničen broj ulaza, sa tehnologijom nadzora i provere, kao što su kamere i detektori metala koji mogu biti locirani unutar prvih dvostrukih vrata. U slučaju da detektori nešto otkriju, druga vrata se ne otvaraju dok ih ne otvori obezbeđenje (Schneider, 1998; 2007). Takođe, poželjno je omogućiti više alternativnih izlaza u slučaju hitne evakuacije (Kirk, 2018). Postojanje jednog ulaza i izlaza može stvoriti efekat uskog grla, čineći učenike posebno ranjivim metama tokom gužve koja se stvara u vreme dolaska i odlaska iz škole. Najzad, preporuka je i da osoblje u prijemnom delu prođe obuku kako bi tačno znalo šta da radi ili koga da pozove ako se otkrije pretnja (Flynn, 2018). Poželjno bi bilo i da postoje sigurne sobe na strateški odabranim lokacijama u celoj zgradi, sa sigurnosnim bravama i metalnim vratima (Kirk, 2018).

Takođe se preporučuju i planska rešenja za školsko dvorište i prilaz školi. Staza kojom se pristupa školskoj zgradi treba da bude projektovana tako da usporava kretanje, upotrebom različitih prostornih prepreka koje su deo parternog rešenja[4] (Flynn, 2018). Stručnjaci za bezbednost smatraju da dobro razrađena parterna rešenja šalju poruku da je ljudima stalo do škole, i da mogu odvratiti od loših namera. Međutim, zelenilo u parteru treba da bude pažljivo uređeno da ne bi zaklanjalo pogled i da se ne bi moglo iskoristiti kao mesto za skrivanje (Cassidy, 2014). Pristupna staza i pripadajuće površine partera treba da budu lako sagledive iz unutrašnjeg prostora školske zgrade (Flynn, 2018).

---

4   Parterno rešenje ili pejzažno arhitektonsko rešenje obuhvata popločane površine za okupljanje ili komunikaciju (staze), parking i zelenilo neposredno u zoni školske zgrade, kao pripadajući spoljašnji prostor između školske zgrade i površina javne namene.

„Siguran prostor" kao koncept nije moguće ostvariti ako fizička organizacija prostora ne podstiče komunikaciju, otvorenost i povezanost u nastavnim i socijalnim aktivnostima u školi. Arhitekta Brotman koji se zalaže za „otvoreni prostor" u rešavanju bezbednosti školske zgrade, navodi primer „kišne bašte" oko škole (kao „šanac") čija je dobra strana to da nije toliko primetna kao deo projektnog rešenja, a ima bezbednosnu funkciju (Schneidawind, 2018). To je primer prostorne organizacije u kojoj su povezani koncepti „sigurnog prostora", kao pozitivnog socijalnog okruženja, i fizičke bezbednosti.

Pored ovih, primenjuju se i strategije unapređivanja bezbednosti školskih zgrada zasnovane na performansama evakuacije (eng. *performance-oriented*). Pokazalo se da svaki pojedinac sledi tri principa prilikom donošenja odluka u procesu hitne evakuacije: praćenje instinkta, praćenje iskustva i ograničene racionalnosti (Pan et al., 2005, prema: Lian et al., 2023). U kriznoj situaciji, većina ljudi ima tendenciju da napusti zgradu putem koji im je najpoznatiji (Lian et al., 2023). Pored toga, za predviđanje ponašanja prilikom evakuacije u školskim zgradama treba posmatrati i interakcije između evakuisanih i okoline, dakle, uzeti u obzir druge pojedince i prostorne prepreke. Rezultati simulacije evakuacije uz pomoć programskog paketa za modeliranje *AnyLogic platform* u jednoj osnovnoj školi u Hangdžou u Kini pokazali su da način na koji su projektovane komunikacije u školskoj zgradi, dimenzije i pozicije hodnika i stepeništa mogu da utiču na ishod evakuacije (Lian et al., 2023). Simulacija evakuacije u školi „Svetozar Marković" u Nišu uz pomoć specijalnog softvera *Pathfinder,* pokazala je da je za efikasnost evakuacije važna brzina kretanja, i da ona treba da bude u određenim granicama, kako ne bi došlo do stvaranja čepova na prolazima i izlazima iz školske zgrade, koji bi uzrokovali zastoje (Jevtić, 2023). U SAD, kada je reč o napadima tipa „aktivnog strelca", većina škola ima protokole o ponašanju u ovakvim situacijama, a veliki broj takođe sprovodi obuke nastavnika i učenika i vežbe evakuacije (Flynn, 2018).

Mere bezbednosti u školskim zgradama u Srbiji

U Srbiji nisu propisani posebni bezbednosni uslovi koje školska zgrada mora da ispuni, osim onih koji su u vezi s protivpožarnim propisima. U članu 92. *Zakona o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja* (Sl. glasnik RS, br. 88/2017, 27/2018-dr. zakoni i 10/2019) propisani su *Uslovi za početak rada i obavljanje delatnosti ustanove*, koji, između ostalog, obuhvataju i higijensko-tehničke uslove (sanitarne i protivpožarne), u skladu s propisima. Prema *Pravilniku o izmenama i dopunama Pravilnika o bližim uslovima za osnivanje, početak rada i obavljanje delatnosti osnovne škole,* pri projektovanju, izgradnji, dogradnji, rekonstrukciji, adaptaciji i opremanju školskih objekata treba se pridržavati nacionalnih standarda o građenju javnih objekata: standarda pristupačnosti, protivpožarne zaštite, energetske efikasnosti, bezbednosti i drugih standarda iz oblasti projektovanja i izgradnje objekata (Pravilnik o izmenama i dopunama Pravilnika o bližim uslovima za osnivanje, početak rada i obavljanje delatnosti osnovne škole, 2020).

U pogledu preventivnih mera bezbednosti, *Normativi školskog prostora* predviđaju određene mere koje su više vezane za prostorno-funkcionalnu organizaciju, kretanje

i pristupačnost, nego što su konkretno proizvod razmatranja bezbednosti. Izuzetak je propis koji predviđa da školski kompleks (koji uključuje školsku zgradu, školsko dvorište locirano uz školsku zgradu i neposredno povezano s ulazima u školsku zgradu, sportske terene, zelene površine, prilaze za pešake i vozila, dostavno dvorište i parkiralište) bude ograđen zaštitnom ogradom visine do 180-210 cm, kao i propis koji nalaže da se pri izboru uže lokacije školske zgrade, pored tehničkih i ostalih, uzimaju u obzir i uslovi povoljne nosivosti i seizmike, kao i bezbednosti od prirodnih katastrofa. Prilazi za pešake i vozila po pravilu treba da su odvojeni. Kod svih spratnih objekata treba obezbediti lift dimenzija i ostalih karakteristika prema standardima pristupačnosti. Međutim, ne postoje jasne smernice za prostorno-funkcionalnu organizaciju u pogledu bezbednosti, na primer da prostorije za zaposlene i višenamenski prostor u okviru zajedničkih prostorija budu prostorno odvojeni od nastavnih prostorija. Postoji jedino smernica da administrativne prostorije budu grupisane i smeštene što bliže ulazu u školsku zgradu (Pravilnik o izmenama i dopunama Pravilnika o bližim uslovima za osnivanje, početak rada i obavljanje delatnosti osnovne škole, 2020).

Nedavno objavljeni priručnik Ministarstva prosvete o postupanju u kriznim situacijama u školama nedovoljno razmatra prostorne faktore (Vuković i sar., 2024). Priručnik se uglavnom bavi psihološkim aspektima reagovanja tokom i nakon kriznih događaja i daje samo nekoliko smernica vezanih za prostor škole. Ističe se da svaka škola treba da ima plan evakuacije, bezbedna mesta kao skrovišta i mesta ponovnog okupljanja nakon napuštanja objekta, kao i prostor za psihološku pomoć žrtvama nakon određenog događaja (Vuković i sar., 2024). Međutim, preporuke nisu dovoljno specifične prema tipu školske zgrade i okruženja, kao i tipovima ugrožavajućih situacija.

Na osnovu ovako definisanih zakona nameće se zaključak da prostorni faktori bezbednosnih rizika nisu dovoljno prepoznati u obrazovnom sistemu Srbije, pa iz tog razloga nemamo pravne regulative koje se odnose konkretno na segment „sigurnog" i „bezbednog" prostora. Domaća literatura još uvek nedovoljno razmatra „problem standarda gradnje škola kao faktor prevencije krize" (Kešetović i sar., 2012: 207). Recimo, nisu prepoznata načela koja autori definišu kao „koncept prevencije kriminaliteta kroz dizajniranje okruženja" (eng. *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design – CPTED*) koji je zasnovan na tri temelja: prirodni nadzor (odnosi se na „mogućnost da se vidi šta se u prostoru i objektu događa bez posebnih mera"), prirodna kontrola pristupa („mogućnost da se ograniči ko može da uđe u objekat i kako") i teritorijalnost („kapacitet da se uspostavi kontrola nad okruženjem, jasnim utvrđivanjem ko je glavni i ko se pita, ko pripada unutra, a ko je stranac") (Kešetović i sar., 2012: 203). Naravno, odlučivanje o vrsti prostornog prilagođavanja školske zgrade rizicima nije jednostavan zadatak. Izbor bezbednosnih mera zavisi od raznih faktora (veličina škole i lokalne specifičnosti) i potrebno je naći pravu meru mogućih rešenja (Kešetović i sar., 2012). Ovo je posebno složeno pitanje danas kada se javljaju novi rizici koji nisu ranije bili u fokusu bezbednosti (amok situacije).

Diskusija i zaključak

Razvijanje koncepta „bezbednog prostora" u srpskim školama zahteva da kreatori obrazovnih politika izvrše reviziju postojećih propisa. Njihov cilj treba da bude stvaranje novih normativa, koji će uzeti u obzir potencijalne rizike u implementaciji i kreiranju bezbednosnih standarda, a voditi računa i o očuvanju obrazovne kulture jedne zajednice. Međutim, u donošenje novih nacrta koji se tiču bezbednosti prostora u srpskim školama potrebno je uključiti i stručnjake iz različitih naučnih oblasti, kako bi se uspostavili novi principi koji bi smanjili bezbednosne rizike. Kroz nove propise treba osigurati bezbednost za sve subjekte koji su uključeni u vaspitno-obrazovni proces. Školsko okruženje treba da bude prilagođeno potrebama učenika i nastavnika, uz mogućnost menjanja u skladu s društvenim i vaspitnim promenama. Jedan od izazova s kojima će se suočiti arhitekti koji se budu bavili unapređivanjem bezbednosti prostora školskih zgrada u Srbiji biće implementacija prostornih rešenja i elemenata zasnovanih na preporukama i propisima o preventivnim merama bezbednosti u prostore postojećih školskih zgrada, gde sprovođenje ovakvih mera nije bilo predviđeno na početku. U ovom radu, ostvarivanje uslova sigurnog i bezbednog školskog prostora razmatrano je na nivou propisa, preporuka i postojećih mera. Naše zaključke svakako treba dopuniti analizom postojećeg stanja opremljenosti školskih zgrada i potrebnih infrastrukturnih ulaganja za smanjivanje bezbednosnih rizika. Svaka aktivnost usmerena na donošenje prostorne regulative i organizovanje sistema reagovanja unutar školske zgrade na bezbednosne rizike treba da uzme u obzir specifičnosti svake škole, veličinu (prostorno i po broju učenika), poziciju (gustina urbanog prostora), kao i društvene i kulturološke specifičnosti (percepcija rizika i bezbednosti).

Kako bi se omogućilo efikasno upravljanje bezbednošću uopšte, kao i upravljanje bezbednošću u vanrednim situacijama, prilikom projektovanja školskih zgrada važno je uzeti u obzir dva povezana aspekta – arhitektonsku logiku prostora i ljudski faktor. Prvi faktor se odnosi na optimalno pozicioniranje i dimenzionisanje prostornih elemenata, čime se otklanja bezbednosna pretnja ili se dobija dovoljno vremena za adekvatnu reakciju. Drugi faktor je podjednako važan. U ekstremnim situacijama oružanih napada koji zahtevaju brzu i koordinisanu reakciju svih prisutnih u školskoj zgradi, važno je razumeti da ljudi imaju različit doživljaj prostora i reagovanja na krizne situacije. Stoga je, osim prostorno-funkcionalne organizacije školske zgrade, neophodno i unapređivanje sistema obezbeđenja i tehnoloških rešenja, kao i obuka osoblja, nastavnika i učenika.

Literatura

AIA. (n.d.). *Where we stand: School design and student safety*. https://www.aia.org/about-aia/where-we-stand/school-design-student-safety

Baeva, L. V. (2023). Existential sources of school shootings and Columbiana. *Journal of Philosophy*, *27*(3), 774-792. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2023-27-3-774-792

Biegel, S. (2010). *The right to be out: Sexual orientation and gender identity in America's public schools*. University of Minnesota Press.

Blue, D. (1998). *Safety By Design* [Conference presentation]. The 3rd International CPTED Conference, Washington DC, United States.

Byron, K. (2017). From infantilizing to world making: Safe spaces and trigger warnings on campus. *Family Relations*, *66*(1), 116-125. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12233

Cassidy, R. (2014, January 9). *Special report: Can design prevent another Sandy Hook?* BDC Network. https://www.bdcnetwork.com/special-report-can-design-prevent-another-sandy-hook?utm_medium=website&utm_source=archdaily.com

Dobbins, T. (2018, August 25). *Sandy Hook School Architect Testifies in Front of Congress About School Safety*. Archdaily. https://www.archdaily.com/900588/speaking-to-congress-jay-brotman-outlines-how-the-profession-intends-to-improve-school-safety?ad_source=search&ad_medium=projects_tab&ad_source=search&ad_medium=search_result_all

Domalewska, D., Kobylińska, M. G., Yen, P. H., Webb, R. K., & Thiparasuparat, N. (2021). On safe space in education: A Polish-Vietnamese comparative study. *Journal of Human Security*, *17*(1), 35-45. https:// doi.org/10.12924/johs2021.17010035

Dyck, J.A., & Lippman, P. (2023). Creating dynamic school buildings that activate the learner and the learning process. In P. C. Lippman, & E. A. Matthews (Eds.), *Creating Dynamic Places for Learning: An Evidence Based Design Approach* (pp. 163-193). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-8749-6_9

Flensner, K. K., & Von der Lippe, M. (2019). Being safe from what and safe for whom?. A critical discussion of the conceptual metaphor of 'safe space'. *Intercultural Education*, *30*(3), 275–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2019.1540102

Flynn, K. (2018, Jun 20). *Architects prioritize design as a school security solution.* AIA. https://sites.jla.us.com/files/Sheridan/White%20Papers/architects-prioritize-design-as-a-school-security-solution-aia.pdf?804299a1bd

GADRRRES (2022). *Comprehensive School Safety Framework 2022-2030.* https://gadrrres.net/files/cssf_2022-2030_en.pdf

Gawlik-Kobylinska, M. (2021). Can security and safety education support sustainability? Lessons learned from Poland. *Sustainability, 13*(4), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041747

Harber, C. (2021). School buildings (and grounds). In C. Harber (Ed.), *Post-Covid schooling: Future alternatives to the global normal* (pp. 185-222). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-87824-5_8

Haidt, J., & Lukianoff, G. (2019). *The coddling of the American mind*. Penguin Books.

Hebib, E., i Žunić Pavlović, V. (2018). Školska klima i školska kultura: okvir za izgradnju škole kao bezbedne i podsticajne sredine za učenje i razvoj. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, *50*(1), 113-134.

Jackson, R. (2014). *Signposts: Policy and practice for teaching about religions and non-religious worldviews in intercultural education*. Council of Europe Publishing.

Jevtić, B. R. (2023). Simulation of a school facility evacuation: The case of the secondary school "Svetozar Marković" in Niš. *Vatrogarstvo i upravljanje požarima, 1-2*(8), 17-29.

Joseph, J. J., Purser, C. W., Elia, E., & Yelderman, L. A . (2023). The impact of routine activities on the number of school shooting injuries and fatalities. In J. D. Herron, S. R. Sartin, & J. Budd (Eds.), *Addressing violence in the U.S. public school system* (pp. 191-217). Information Science Reference. https:// doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8271-1.ch010

Keković, Z., Milošević, M., i Putnik, N. (2012). Problemi identifikacije i klasifikacije bezbednosnih rizika u školama. U B. Popović Ćitić, S. Đurić, i Ž. Kešetović (ur.), *Bezbednosni rizici u obrazovno-vaspitnim ustanovama* (str. 51–69). Fakultet bezbednosti u Beogradu.

Kešetović, Ž., Lipovac, M., i Mlađan, D. (2012). Projektovanje školskog prostora kao faktor prevencije bezbednosnih rizika. U B. Kordić, A. Kovačević, i B. Banović (ur.), *Reagovanje na bezbednosne rizike u obrazovno-vaspitnim ustanovama* (197-210). Čigoja.

Kirk, M. (2018, August 22). *How Architecture and Design Can Hinder Active Shooters.* https://www.architectmagazine.com/aia-architect/aiafeature/how-architecture-and-design-can-hinder-active-shooters_o

Kislyakov, P., Shmeleva, E., Karaseva, T., & Silaeva, O. (2014). Monitoring of education environment according to the social-psychological safety criterion. *Asian Social Science*, *10*(17), 285–293. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n17p285

Lian, H., Zhang, S., Li, G., & Zhang Y. (2023). Pedestrian simulation on evacuation behavior in teaching building of primary school emergencies and optimized design. *Buildings*, *13*, 1747. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13071747

Margas, N. (2023). Inclusive classroom climate development as the cornerstone of inclusive school building: review and perspectives. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1171204

Pravilnik o izmenama i dopunama Pravilnika o bližim uslovima za osnivanje, početak rada i obavljanje delatnosti osnovne škole (2020). Prosvetni glasnik, Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, br. 16/2020.

Reed–Danahay, D. (2015) Social space: distance, proximity and thresholds of affinity. In V. Amit (ur.), *Thinking Through Sociality* (pp. 69-96). Berghahn Books.

Schneidawind, J. (2018, August 16). *AIA architect pushes for school design best practices in testimony to White House Cabinet officials today*. AIA. https://aeccafe.com/nbc/articles/1/1607286/AIA-Architect-Pushes-School-Design-Best-Practices-Testimony-White-House-Cabinet-Officials-Today

Schneider, T. (1998). *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design - School CPTED Basics* [Conference presentation]. The 3rd International CPTED Conference, Washington DC, United States.

Schneider, T. (2007). *Ensuring quality school facilities and security technologies.* The Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence & Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

School Facility Design Safety Guidance (2013). Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI).

Tadić, V. (2022). O pristupima definisanju i operacionalizaciji pojma bezbednosti u školi. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, *71*(2), 249-266.

Tiškevič, O. (2023). Zakordonniй dosvid formuvannя bagatofunkcionalьnih škilьnih budivelь. Sučasni problemi Arhitekturi ta Mistobuduvannя, (66), 252-263. https://doi.org/10.32347/2077-3455.2023.66.252-263

Tomanović, S., i Petrović, M. (2006). *Rizici i bezbednost u susedstvu iz perspektive dece i njihovih roditelja*. U S. Tomanović (ur.), Društvo u previranju (str. 139-157). Institut za sociološka istraživanja Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu.

Velissaratou, J., & Blyth, A. (2017). *Framework for a module on the physical learning environment*. Revised Edition. OECD. https://www.oecd.org/education/OECD-FRAMEWORK-FOR-A-MODULE-ON-THE-PHYSICAL-LEARNING-ENVIRONMENT.pdf

Vallinkoski, K. K., & Koirikivi, P. M. (2020). Enhancing Finnish basic education schools' safety culture through comprehensive safety and security management. *Nordic journal of studies in educational policy*, *6*(2), 103-115.

Vuković, S., Fejzula, M., Petrović, N., Stojanović, N., Panić, Z., Parezanović, J., i Zečević, O. (2024). *Postupanje ustanova obrazovanja i vaspitanja u kriznim događajima. Priručnik za zaposlene u ustanovama obrazovanja i vaspitanja*. Ministarstvo prosvete Republike Srbije, Populacioni fond Ujedinjenih nacija, Kancelarija u Republici Srbiji.

Vulević, S. (2019). Amok situacije i napadi „aktivnog strelca" kao oblik ugrožavanja bezbednosti. Bezbednost, *61*(2), 134-152.

Vygotsky L. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Harvard University Press.

Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja. Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, br. 88/2017, 27/2018-dr.zakoni i 10/2019.

Nena Vasojević
Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd, Srbija
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0131-1831

Ivana Vučetić
Inovacioni Centar Mašinskog fakulteta, Beograd, Srbija
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4036-7785

Suzana Ignjatović
Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd, Srbija
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5681-8288

Željka Buturović
Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd, Srbija
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1826-2362

School Space as a "Safe Space" and "Secure Space": Educational and Architectural Challenges[1]

Nena Vasojević[2] [iD]
Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

Ivana Vučetić [iD]
Innovation Center of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Belgrade, Serbia

Suzana Ignjatović [iD]
Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

Željka Buturović [iD]
Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

⸺⸺⸺⸺∞◦∞◦⸺⸺⸺⸺

Abstract   *The paper discusses the two concepts of school space – "safe space" and "secure space", using the educational and architectural approach. It points to the differences, as well as the overlapping of these two concepts. The paper also provides a critical overview of best practices and international standards for physical and psychosocial school safety/security and design of school buildings, as well as current Serbian regulatory framework addressing these issues. Achieving the conditions of a safe and secure school space is addressed at the level of regulations, recommendations, and current measures. The current regulations on security in school buildings do not include specific preventive measures for security and safety. Developing the concept of "safe space" and "secure space" in Serbian schools requires a revision of the current legislation by the creators of educational policies. In order to enable the efficient management of security in general, as well as management in emergency situations, it is necessary to take into consideration the architectural logic of the space, as well as human factors, in designing school buildings. Also, any activity aimed at adopting appropriate spatial regulations and organising the risk*

---

response system in a school building, has to take into account specific features of that building. New regulations will have to ensure security for all subjects involved in the educational process, while the school environment has to be aligned with the needs of students and teachers, and provide opportunities for introducing changes and adjusting to the broader educational and cultural community.

Keywords: *safe space, school, secure space, architecture of school buildings.*

Introduction

School security can be understood as physical security within a school building as well as an environment where an individual feels free to express his/her opinion and be himself/herself. As a result of the tragic shooting event that took place at a school in Belgrade in 2023, security in schools, i.e., physical security within the school space, has become a dominant topic among the local public. However, there is no uniform theoretical approach to researching security risks in schools, preventing an emergence of scientifically-based and practically applicable framework for assessing and responding to heterogeneous risks school youth face today (Keković et al., 2012).

In education, there is an ever greater overlap between the concepts of "security" and "safety", which tend to be frequently associated through the phrase "school safety and security" (Vallinkoski & Koirikivi, 2020: 103). The concept of safety involves several dimensions, from physical safety from earthquakes, to social safety from poverty and exclusion. On the other hand, the concept of security refers, primarily, to security against physical assaults against bodily integrity involving different degrees of life threat. In accordance with the prevalent approach, which considers security/safety to be a single concept, different models have been presented for resolving the major problems in schools relating to this aspect. Strategic documents discuss "comprehensive safety", which includes a very broad spectrum of safety/security issues: from psychosocial safety, peer violence, and curriculum contents, to disaster risk reduction, violence, and climate change (GADRRRES, 2022).

In this paper, we distinguish between safety and security. The concept of "safe space" has a dominant social and a psychological dimension, which is also indirectly related to a physical space component. In contrast, we use 'security' to refer to the protection of physical integrity against any danger from the outside (an "amok situation") (Vulević, 2019), as well as against any danger inside the school premises (peer violence). Therefore, "security" has more narrow meaning, largely limited to the framework of the school building and the its associated outdoor space.

School space is refers to the social framing of the physical, geographical, or material substrate (Reed-Danahay, 2015) and is therefore primarily a social space. It is defined by the social and cultural patterns of perception of the school as an educational institution and the basic instrument of public education. The school as a "social space" implies outer spatial boundaries (determined by the physical boundaries of the school space), as well as internal spatial boundaries (determined by different functions of the school, i.e., compartmentalisation of the space within the school). Within such a broad framework, the question of how to articulate risk control in terms of physical security, while complying

with the principle of safe space as a social and psychological category becomes relevant. How do we determine the boundaries of "safe space" within the school, and how do we determine the boundaries of a "secure space"? Are there specific places within the school building designed specially to serve as a safe space (for instance, offices for academic and psychological counseling), in addition to other places designed for physical security in at-risk situation? Are behavioural norms overridden by the implementation of the safe space principle and the secure space principle?

School space has become the subject of interventions in accordance with the requirements of "comprehensive safety" and security, and hence, safety and security are treated as an integral whole, rather than individually. In our paper, we address both the physical and the spatial dimension of the two main requirements we have identified as being at the core of contemporary paradigms: the "safe space" requirement and the physical security requirement. Combined, these two concepts have a meaning that is as symbolic as it is practical. However, in this paper we are particularly interested in the spatial and physical aspects of safety and security, respectively: how they should be implemented operationally (security systems within the school space); how the school space should be segmented with regard to security risks (building, school yard); how to define the roles of the involved parties in controlling the security of the school space (parents, teachers, pupils, management) – who should have the authority to check the premises, who should have access and to which particular parts of the school facility; how should the school space to be surveilled for security purposes, what are the appropriate architectural solutions, such as the layout of check points, evacuation exits, etc. Another important question is whether the two concepts - safe space as a socially tolerant milieu, on the one hand, and security as protection against the risk of physical threat, on the other - may collide within the school environment, especially from the perspective of spatial regulation and architectural solutions. This topic is rarely discussed in domestic literature (Hebib i Žunić Pavlović, 2018; Tadić, 2022).

"Safe space" as school space

The meaning of safety in this context refers to the combination of physical security and freedom to openly express one's views and speak about oneself. In recent years, this term has been increasingly present in education, in reference to the dimension of "safe space", which is associated with pupils' rights and freedoms.[3] The importance of this topic has been highlighted in the official documents and recommendations by the Council of Europe. For example, *Signposts* defined "safe space" as "in a safe classroom space, students are able to express their views and positions openly, even if these differ from those of the teacher or peers" (Jackson, 2014: 48). Here, physical security is of secondary importance.

---

3   The relevant literature provides different definitions describing the concept of "safe space". It is worth noting that the "secure space" concept derives from the feminist and LGBT movement in the 1970s and that it was originally used for referring to the "physical meeting places where like-minded individuals could meet and share their experiences in a safe environment" (Flensner & Von der Lippe, 2019, p.276).

On the other hand, certain authors, such as Domalewska and associates, point to the fact that "safe space is risk free as it constitutes 'brave space', namely, an environment free from abuse and ridicule" (Domalewska et al., 2021: 36). Safe space is an environment or a milieu. Such "space" in schools is associated with the physical space where pupils stay during the education and training, including classrooms, school premises (offices, sports and recreation gyms, cafeteria, school yard, staff offices, and the like). Safe space is an environment that supports learning, and embraces a prosocial principle, which ensures that individuals, i.e., pupils have respect for each other in spite of their differences. Nevertheless, in the USA, the "safe space" concept has often had the opposite effect, with trigger warnings having a disquieting effect on the pupils and teachers and literature with a potential to cause unpleasant feelings getting removed from the curriculum (Byron, 2017).

The authors Domalewska et al. (2021) state that "safe-space classrooms in educational institutions differ from the safe-space policy in higher education institutions or workplaces because the rules and goals of cohabitation differ" (Flensner et al., 2019, as cited in Domalewska, et al., 2021: 36). A safe space is primarily a learning space intended to provide a "positive atmosphere that encourages students to break down their isolation, form an inclusive and collaborative classroom community" (Biegel, 2010; Gawlik-Kobylinska, 2021; Kislyakov et al., 2014, as cited in Domalewska et al., 2021: 36). Such space implies "a classroom climate that feels secure, supportive and risk-free so that students can honestly express their individuality, opinions, attitudes, knowledge, and behaviour without fear of being the target of violence, harassment or hate speech" (Domalewska et al., 2021: 36). Such an approach is stimulating for interaction within the space "without fear of ridicule and supports their well-being, resilience and moral identity" (Kislyakov 2014, as cited in Domalewska et al., 2021: 36).

The characteristics of the educational environment can be considered environmental factors that affect psychosocial well-being of all subjects of the educational process (Kislyakov et al., 2014), and are equally important for students and teachers. It is only in a safe space that the teacher can apply an individual approach to each pupil, "creating a space for a subject-subject interaction" (Antonova, 2013: 286, as cited in Kislyakov et al., 2014). The skill of the teacher in forming a "tolerant space" requires synergy among numerous elements, such as unconditional acceptance of the subject (irrespective of age, race, ethnic group, language, financial status, etc.), as well as support of the administration (Pogodina, 2006, as cited in Kislyakov et al., 2014).

One must bear in mind that the main precondition for a safe space is a cross-cultural dialogue, on the one hand, and exploration of the diversity of opinions, values, and views, on the other (Domalewska et al., 2021; Jackson, 2014). An environment of this kind encourages pupils' self-discovery. This necessarily leads to a different set of challenges. Yet, it is only in this manner that cognitive, emotional, and social development (Vygotsky, 1978) of an individual, i.e., the pupil, can take place. However, safe space does not imply "comfortableness" (Domalewska et al., 2021), making social and psychological safety situation dependent. Educational institutions need to create a positive learning environment, which includes adequate physical resources (classrooms, materials, technologies, and the like) (Velissaratou & Blyth, 2017).

One must bear in mind that, in the context of dominant institutions, intersectional approach implies that safe space is impossible for members of marginalised groups. As a result, contrary to the idea of open multicultural communication, the framework of safe spaces has resulted in exclusion of unpleasant topics and prioritization of pupils' and teachers' feelings. For this reason, the concept of safe space has been subject of numerous critiques (Haidt & Lukianoff, 2019).

An increasing emphasis has also been put on the importance of inclusiveness in the school environment, which contributes to the pupils' security and comfort (Joseph et al., 2023). Thus, one of the key elements in international educational guidelines and school policies around the world is construction of inclusive schools, which are meant to stimulate positive relations among pupils, reduce peer violence and enhance pupils' general wellbeing (Margas, 2023). Some studies (Baeva, 2023; Flynn, 2018) have shown that taking care of social and emotional learning, engaging in cultivating positive values in pupils, and training teachers to be able to identify and resolve problems which are not easily noticeable (rowdiness, violence, and the like) might prevent potentially threatening situations in school environment. Practice has shown that school building can have a great impact on learning process, instruction provided, and relationship between students and teachers (Harber, 2021). Therefore, school buildings should be designed in a manner that stimulates learning, in accordance with theory and practice in education and environmental psychology (Dyck & Lippman, 2023).

Nonetheless, the concept of "safe space" as a school environment secure in a psychological sense, has been increasingly relegated to the background following the emergence of new risks within the school space. The frequent occurrence of school shootings has brought pupils' physical security to the forefront, triggering a polemic on the design of school facilities most likely to reduce the number of victims resulting from such attacks. Recommendations regarding desirable spatial solutions, which are supposed to encourage tolerance and communication within the school, may be in collision with the priority of physical security. For this reason, the rest of our paper focuses on architectural solutions that mitigate security risks in school facilities.

School building as a secure space

Following World War II, the increase in the number of school age children and democratisation of education led to changes in the regulations on school buildings design, as well as to establishing a more dynamic interaction between the school space and its surroundings (Tiškevič, 2023). The more open concept of school buildings has made them more accessible to the local community, but at the same time more susceptible to security risks. Due to the frequency of such events over the past decades, it has become necessary to work on improving the safety and security of school facilities. Thus, in architectural projects of school facilities, apart from considering the practical, aesthetic, and economic requirements, it is also necessary to address the security-related requirements (Tiškevič, 2023).

Modern school should have effective design while addressing physical, social, and psychological needs of its users (Blue, 1998). This adds to the intricacy to project design, where architects have consider possible adverse effects of preventive security measures which may trigger fear and unease in the pupils. It is necessary to identify innovative architectural solutions that can prevent and contain violence which, however, do not disrupt the character of an environment that stimulates learning. This approach creates open school communities in accordance with social, psychological, economic, and environmental factors (AIA, n.d.). Security enhancing architectural may include various barriers to movement, limitation of access, or security systems. They have to be as unnoticeable as possible and be an integral part of the overall design. Otherwise, educational and emotional development of pupils and their socialization could be put at risk (Schneidawind, 2018).

However, there is a lack of guidelines and access to relevant information in the school building design process. Moreover, there is no single design concept that is applicable to each school. Instead, in each individual case, school design has to accommodate student population, specifics of the location, and the needs of local community (Schneidawind, 2018). It is necessary to take into account not only emergency circumstances, but also more common problems, which pupils and teachers may encounter on a daily basis, such as bullying. Therefore, in addition to strategies for improving security, it is necessary to work toward "safe space" as well. Dobbins (2018) emphasises the need to ensure better access to counseling and psychological services by placing them close to the library, or other common areas (Dobbins, 2018).

Discussions about security at the school building must also take into account individual experiences among different school actors - students, teachers and parents. School space is a public space. The perception of security at a public space by school age children differs from adults' understanding of risk. A study on the perception of public space risk by children in Serbia has shown a less prominent separation between the public and the private than is the case in the West. There is also greater autonomy in children's mobility compared to some other countries (Tomanović & Petrović, 2006). The same research has revealed that, in Serbia, risk-related anxiety associated is comparatively lower than expected, and that parents use instructions far more than restrictions to control public space risks (Tomanović & Petrović, 2006). Indeed, experience can change perceptions. Serbia's first school shooting may change dominant cultural scripts regarding risks in public spaces, including school buildings.

Extreme security-risk situations and school space

Schools in the United States of America experience the highest number of situations with potentially grievous consequences, primarily those relating to armed attacks, known as school shootings. This is why, since 2013, special security protocols in designing school buildings or in major reconstruction works in the existing facilities (OSPI, 2013; Vulević, 2019), have become mandatory. When the threat is external, security strategies are based on making it more difficult to access interior of the school building by applying physical

barriers, specially designed spatial elements, and school access security control systems. At the same time, efforts have been made to ensure a quick evacuation from the interior of the school building, if necessary, by identifying evacuation routes. It is also important to establish secure hiding places within the school building in case evacuation is not possible. The above preventive measures may include different elements of architectural and landscape design, and the use of modern technology, as well as a special spatial and functional organisation of the school building.

The spatial and functional organisation of the school building is the starting point for the creation of a safe and secure environment. Certain authors emphasise that the zone of the main school area, which includes classrooms and student dedicated zones, has to be separate from the entrance hall. A cluster of public purpose areas (toilets, halls intended for parent meetings and reception, as well as other offices), which can be accessed without any restrictions (Cassidy, 2014) should be between them. The entrance hall with the reception area should also be physically separated from the main school area, and it has been frequently recommended, have bullet proof glass. However, this recommendation does not apply to all school areas, i.e. glazing around the entrance to the classrooms should be avoided in order to create so called secure niches in the classroom blind spots which cannot be viewed from the hall (Flynn, 2018). The entrance has to be positioned in such a manner as to enable monitoring of school visitors from the main area and reception area of the school building as well as from the ground floor and public areas. School buildings should have a limited number of entrances and they should be equipped with monitoring and screening technology, such as cameras and metal detectors, which can be located within the first double gate area. If the detectors identify a suspicious object, the second gate can only be opened by security (Schneider, 1998, 2007). Furthermore, it is desirable to provide several alternative exits in the event of an urgent evacuation (Kirk, 2018). Having one single entrance and exit may cause the bottleneck effect, which can make student vulnerable targets during rush hours. Finally, it is recommended that staff in the reception area be trained to know exactly what to do or whom to call if they identify a threat (Flynn, 2018). It would also be desirable to have secure rooms in strategically selected locations throughout the building, equipped with security locks and metal doors (Kirk, 2018).

There exist recommendations for design-based security solutions for the school yard and the access path as well. The path leading to the school building has to be designed in such a manner as to slow down movement by means of various space barriers, which are part of the ground floor design[4] (Flynn, 2018). Security experts consider that well elaborated ground floor designs send out the message that people care about the school and that they can provide deterrent against bad actors. Nevertheless, the greenery on the ground floor has to be carefully arranged to make sure it does not block the

---

4   The ground floor design concept or the landscaping architectural design concept includes paved surfaces intended for gatherings or communications (pathways), parking, and greenery, in the immediate zone of the school building, as a space belonging to it between the school building and the area intended for public purposes..

view, or that it cannot be used as a hiding place (Cassidy, 2014). The access path and pertaining area of the ground floor should be designed in a way to be easily seen from the interior of the school building (Flynn, 2018).

"Safe space", as a concept, cannot be achieved if architectural organisation of the space does not encourage communication, openness, and connectivity in teaching and social activities. The architect Brotman, who advocates for "open space" solutions the issue of school building security, gives the example of a "rain garden" surrounding the school (like a "trench"), its positive side being that it is not so noticeable as part of the design project, while performing a security function (Schneidawind, 2018). This is an example of spatial organisation where the concept of "safe space", as a positive social environment, is associated with physical security.

In addition, strategies for improving school building security based on performance-oriented evacuation are also being implemented. It has been established that each individual relies on three principles while making decisions during the process of an emergency evacuation: their instincts, their experience, and limited rationality (Pan et al., 2005, as cited in Lian et al., 2023). In a crisis situation, the majority of people have the tendency to leave the building by taking the most familiar path (Lian et al., 2023). In addition to this, in predicting behaviour during evacuation from school buildings, it is also necessary to observe interactions between the evacuated persons and the surroundings, i.e., to take into consideration other individuals and space barriers. The results of an evacuation simulation performed using *AnyLogic platform* (simulation modelling software) in a school in Hangzhou (China), have shown that the design of communications in the school building and the dimensions and positions of the corridors and stairways can impact the results of evacuation (Lian et al., 2023). Evacuation simulation at the *Svetozar Marković* School in Niš performed using *Pathfinder* (simulation software), has shown that the efficiency of evacuation depends on the speed of movement, which needs to be within certain limits in order to avoid bottlenecks at critical points (Jevtić, 2023). In the USA, the majority of schools have protocols for "active shooter" situations, and a large number provide teacher and student trainings and evacuation drills (Flynn, 2018).

Security measures in school buildings in Serbia

The only requirements Serbian regulations regarding security measures in school buildings have are those relating to fire safety regulations. Article 92 of The Basic Education Law (Official Gazette of the RS, No. 88/2017, 27/2018-other law and 10/2019) prescribes norms and standards for *educational facilities*, which include, among others, hygiene-technical requirements (sanitary and fire safety requirements), in accordance with the regulations. The Regulations specify that in designing school facilities, as well as in their construction, construction of building extensions, reconstruction, adaptation, and equipment, it is necessary to adhere to the national standards on the construction of public facilities, namely: the standards applying to accessibility, fire safety, energy efficiency,

security, and other standards in the area of project design and construction of facilities (Rulebook on Amendments to the Rulebook on Closer Conditions for the Establishment, Start of Work, and Performance of Elementary School Activities, 2020).

With regard to preventive security measures, *Architectural Standards for Educational Facilities* prescribes certain measures associated with spatial and functional organisation, movement, and accessibility, without much regard for security. An exception to this is the regulation requiring that school compound (which includes school building, the school yard next to the school building, which is directly connected with the school building entrances, sports grounds, green areas, access roads for pedestrians and vehicles, the supply delivery yard, and the parking lot) be fenced off by a protective fence 180-210 cm high. Another regulation requires that, when considering locations for a school building, it is necessary to consider ground bearing capacity and seismic parameters, and possibilities of natural catastrophes, among others. Access roads for pedestrians and vehicles must be separated from each other. All multi-storey facilities have to be provided with elevators complying with accessibility standards. However, there are no clear guidelines regarding the spatial and functional organisation in the context of security, for instance, ensuring that staff area and the multi-purpose area within common areas are spatially separated from the classrooms. There is only one guideline specifying that administrative premises should be clustered together and situated closer to the school building entrance (Rulebook on Amendments to the Rulebook on Closer Conditions for the Establishment, Start of Work, and Performance of Elementary School Activities, 2020).

In the recently published handbook by the Ministry of Education on dealing with crisis situations in schools, spatial factors are not sufficiently addressed (Vuković et al., 2024). The handbook's focus is on the psychological aspects of response during crisis and its aftermath, providing few guidelines related to the school building. It emphasises that every school must have an evacuation plan, secure hideouts and places for reunion after evacuation from the facility, as well as a space for psychological assistance to the victims following a crisis event (Vuković et al., 2024). However, the recommendations are not specific enough in respect of either the type of school buildings and their surroundings, or the types of hazardous situations.

The obvious conclusion here is that spatial security factors have not been sufficiently appreciated in the educational system of Serbia. There are no legal regulations relating specifically to the segment of "safe" and "secure space". Scholarly literature has not yet adequately addressed the "problem of the standard of school building construction as a factor of crisis prevention", either. (Kešetović et al., 2012: 207). The concept of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design – CPTED, which is based on three foundations: natural supervision (referring to the "possibility of detecting what is happening in the space and the facility without taking any special measures"), natural access control ("the possibility of applying restrictions with regard to who can enter the facility and how"), and territoriality ("the capacity for establishing control of the environment, by clearly defining who is in charge, who belongs inside, and who is an outsider" Kešetović et al., 2012: 203) has not been widely recognized. Of course, decid-

ing on the architectural adjustments to the school building in relation to risks is not an easy task. The selection of adequate security measures depends on various factors (size of the school and other local specifics), and it is necessary to identify the right scope of potential solutions. This is an issue of particular complexity, as we face emergence of new risks (amok situations) which were formerly outside of security considerations.

Discussion and conclusion

Developing the "safe space" and "secure space" concept in Serbian schools calls for a review of the current regulations by creators of educational policies. Their objective should be the creation of new norms which take into account potential risks in implementation and creation of security standards, while also preserving educational culture of the community. The drafting of new regulations on security in Serbian schools should involve experts from different scientific fields, in order to establish new principles designed to reduce security-related risks. New regulations have to ensure security for all the subjects involved in the educational process. The school environment has to be adjusted to the needs of the pupils and teachers, while remaining open to modifications in accordance with the changes in society and education. One of the challenges architects will face when trying to improve security of school buildings in Serbia will be implementation of design concepts and elements in line with the recommendations and regulations on preventive security measures, in the space of the existing school buildings, where the implementation of such measures was not anticipated at the very beginning. This paper discusses the implementation of the requirements for a safe and secure school space at the level of regulations, recommendations, and current measures. Indeed, our conclusions have to be supplemented by an analysis of the current infrastructure in school buildings, including needed investments for reducing security risks. Adoption of relevant spatial regulations and creation of response systems within the school building in the event of security risks has to take into account the specifics of each school, its size (space-wise and in terms of the number of pupils), its position (urban area density), as well as the social and cultural specifics (perception of risks and security).

In order to provide for efficient security management in general, as well as security management in emergencies, the process of drafting school building design projects has to take into consideration two mutually associated aspects – the architectural logic of the space and the human factor. The first aspect refers to the optimum positioning and dimensioning of spatial elements, resulting in either the elimination of security threats or provision of time for adequate response. The second aspect is equally important. In extreme situations involving armed attacks, which require a prompt and coordinated response by all the individuals present in the school building, it is important to understand that people experience space in different ways, and that they have varied reactions to crisis situations. Hence, apart from the spatial and functional organisation of the school building, it is necessary to upgrade security systems and technological solutions, provide training to the staff, teachers, and pupils.

References

AIA. (n.d.). *Where we stand: School design and student safety*. https://www.aia.org/about-aia/where-we-stand/school-design-student-safety

Baeva, L.V. (2023). Existential sources of school shootings and Columbiana. *Journal of Philosophy*, *27*(3), 774-792. http://dx.doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2023-27-3-774-792

Biegel, S. (2010). *The right to be out: Sexual orientation and gender identity in America's public schools.* University of Minnesota Press.

Blue, D. (1998). *Safety By Design* [Conference presentation]. The 3rd International CPTED Conference, Washington DC, United States.

Byron, K. (2017). From infantilizing to world making: Safe spaces and trigger warnings on campus. *Family Relations*, *66*(1), 116-125.   https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12233

Cassidy, R. (2014, January 9). *Special report: Can design prevent another Sandy Hook?* BDC Network. https://www.bdcnetwork.com/special-report-can-design-prevent-another-sandy-hook?utm_medium=website&utm_source=archdaily.com

Dobbins, T. (2018, August 25). *Sandy Hook School Architect Testifies in Front of Congress About School Safety*. Archdaily. https://www.archdaily.com/900588/speaking-to-congress-jay-brotman-outlines-how-the-profession-intends-to-improve-school-safety?ad_source=search&ad_medium=projects_tab&ad_source=search&ad_medium=search_result_allDomalewska, D., Kobylińska, M. G., Yen, P. H., Webb, R. K., & Thiparasuparat, N. (2021). On safe space in education: A Polish-Vietnamese comparative study. *Journal of Human Security*, *17*(1), 35-45. https:// doi.org/10.12924/johs2021.17010035

Dyck, J.A., & Lippman, P. (2023). Creating dynamic school buildings that activate the learner and the learning process. In P. C. Lippman, & E. A. Matthews (Eds.), *Creating Dynamic Places for Learning: An Evidence Based Design Approach* (pp. 163-193). Springer Nature. https:// doi.org/ 10.1007/978-981-19-8749-6_9

Flensner, K.K., & Von der Lippe, M. (2019). Being safe from what and safe for whom?. A critical discussion of the conceptual metaphor of 'safe space'. *Intercultural Education*, *30*(3), 275–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2019.1540102

Flynn, K. (2018, Jun 20). *Architects prioritize design as a school security solution*. AIA. https://sites.jla.us.com/files/Sheridan/White%20Papers/architects-prioritize-design-as-a-school-security-solution-aia.pdf?804299a1bd

GADRRRES (2022). *Comprehensive School Safety Framework 2022-2030*. https://gadrrres.net/files/cssf_2022-2030_en.pdf

Gawlik-Kobylinska, M. (2021). Can security and safety education support sustainability? Lessons learned from Poland. *Sustainability, 13*(4), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041747

Harber, C. (2021). School buildings (and grounds). In C. Harber (Ed.), *Post-Covid schooling: Future alternatives to the global normal* (pp. 185-222). Springer Nature. https:// doi.org/ 10.1007/978-3-030-87824-5_8

Haidt, J., & Lukianoff, G. (2019). *The coddling of the American mind*. Penguin Books.

Hebib, E., i Žunić Pavlović, V. (2018). Školska klima i školska kultura: okvir za izgradnju škole kao bezbedne i podsticajne sredine za učenje i razvoj. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, *50*(1), 113-134.

Jackson, R. (2014). *Signposts:f Policy and practice for teaching about religions and non-religious worldviews in intercultural education*. Council of Europe Publishing.

Jevtić,.R. (2023). Simulation of a school facility evacuation: The case of the secondary school „Svetozar Marković" in Niš. *Vatrogastvo i upravljanje požarima, 1-2*(8), 17-29.

Joseph, J. J., Purser, C.W., Elia, E., & Yelderman, L. A. (2023). The impact of routine activities on the number of school shooting injuries and fatalities. In J. D. Herron, S. R. Sartin, & J. Budd (Eds.), *Addressing violence in the U.S. public school system* (pp. 191-217). Information Science Reference. https:// doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8271-1.ch010

Keković, Z., Milošević, M. i Putnik, N. (2012). Problemi identifikacije i klasifikacije bezbednosnih rizika u školama. U B. Popović Ćitić, S. Đurić, i Ž. Kešetović (ur.), *Bezbednosni rizici u obrazovno-vaspitnim ustanovama* (str. 51–69). Fakultet bezbednosti u Beogradu.

Kešetović, Ž., Lipovac, M., i Mlađan, D. (2012). Projektovanje školskog prostora kao faktor prevencije bezbednosnih rizika. U B. Kordić, A. Kovačević i B. Banović (ur.), *Reagovanje na bezbednosne rizike u obrazovno-vaspitnim ustanovama* (str. 197-210). Čigoja.

Kirk, M. (2018, August 22). *How Architecture and Design Can Hinder Active Shooters*. https://www. architectmagazine.com/aia-architect/aiafeature/how-architecture-and-design-can-hinder-active-shooters_o

Kislyakov, P., Shmeleva, E., Karaseva, T., & Silaeva, O. (2014). Monitoring of education environment according to the social-psychological safety criterion. *Asian Social Science, 10*(17), 285–293. https:// doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n17p285

Lian, H., Zhang, S., Li, G., & Zhang Y. (2023). Pedestrian simulation on evacuation behavior in teaching building of primary school emergencies and optimized design. *Buildings*, *13*, 1747. https:// doi. org/10.3390/buildings13071747

Margas, N. (2023). Inclusive classroom climate development as the cornerstone of inclusive school building: review and perspectives. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1-11. https:// doi.org/10.3389/ fpsyg.2023.1171204

Rulebook on Amendments to the Rulebook on Closer Conditions for the Establishment, Start of Work, and Performance of Elementary School Activities (2020). Educational Gazette, Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia, No. 16/2020. [In Serbian]

Reed–Danahay, D. (2015) Social space: distance, proximity and thresholds of affinity. In V. Amit (Ed.), *Thinking Through Sociality* (pp. 69-96). Berghahn Books.

Schneidawind, J. (2018, August 16). *AIA architect pushes for school design best practices in testimony to White House Cabinet officials today*. AIA. https://aeccafe.com/nbc/articles/1/1607286/AIA-Architect-Pushes-School-Design-Best-Practices-Testimony-White-House-Cabinet-Officials-Today

Schneider, T. (1998). *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design - School CPTED Basics* [Conference presentation]. The 3rd International CPTED Conference, Washington DC, United States.

Schneider, T. (2007). *Ensuring quality school facilities and security technologies.* The Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence & Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

School Facility Design Safety Guidance (2013). Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI).

Tadić, V. (2022). O pristupima definisanju i operacionalizaciji pojma bezbednosti u školi. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, *71*(2), 249-266.

Tiškevič, O. (2023). Zakordonniй dosvid formuvannя bagatofunkcionalьnih škilьnih budivelь. Sučasni problemi Arhitekturi ta Mistobuduvannя, (66), 252-263. https://doi.org/10.32347/2077-3455.2023.66.252-263

Tomanović, S. i Petrović, M. (2006). Rizici i bezbednost u susedstvu iz perspektive dece i njihovih roditelja. U S. Tomanović (ur.), *Društvo u previranju* (str. 139-157). Institut za sociološka istraživanja Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu.

Velissaratou, J., & Blyth, A. (2017). *Framework for a module on the physical learning environment*. Revised Edition. OECD. https://www.oecd.org/education/OECD-FRAMEWORK-FOR-A-MODULE-ON-THE-PHYSICAL-LEARNING-ENVIRONMENT.pdf

Vallinkoski, K. K., & Koirikivi, P. M. (2020). Enhancing Finnish basic education schools' safety culture through comprehensive safety and security management. *Nordic journal of studies in educational policy*, *6*(2), 103-115.

Vuković, S., Fejzula, M., Petrović, N., Stojanović, N., Panić, Z., Parezanović, J., i Zečević, O. (2024). *Postupanje ustanova obrazovanja i vaspitanja u kriznim događajima. Priručnik za zaposlene u ustanovama obrazovanja i vaspitanja*. Ministarstvo prosvete Republike Srbije i Populacioni fond Ujedinjenih nacija, Kancelarija u Republici Srbiji.

Vulević, S. (2019). Amok situacije i napadi „aktivnog strelca" kao oblik ugrožavanja bezbednosti. *Bezbednost*, *61*(2), 134-152.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Harvard University Press.

Law of the Basic of the Education System. Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia, No. 88/2017, 27/2018- other lex and 10/2019. [In Serbian]

Nena Vasojević
Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0131-1831

Ivana Vučetić
Innovation Center of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Belgrade, Serbia
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4036-7785

Suzana Ignjatović
Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5681-8288

Željka Buturović
Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1826-2362