



**Testimony of the Children's Defense Fund-New York
For the New York City Council Committee on Public Safety and Committee on Education
Oversight Hearing on School Emergency Preparedness and Safety
September 20, 2018**

Good afternoon. My name is Charlotte Pope and I am the Youth Justice Policy Associate with the Children's Defense Fund-New York (CDF-NY). The Children's Defense Fund's (CDF) Leave No Child Behind® mission is to ensure every child a healthy start, a head start, a fair start, a safe start and a moral start in life, and successful passage to adulthood with the help of caring families and communities. Through CDF's Cradle to Prison Pipeline® Campaign—a national initiative to stop the funneling of children, especially poor children and children of color, down life paths that often lead to arrest, conviction and incarceration—CDF-NY works to replace punitive school discipline and safety policies in New York City schools with social and emotional supports that encourage a positive school climate.

Thank you to Chair Richards, Chair Treyger, and to the members and staff of the City Council Committees on Public Safety and Education for this opportunity to testify before this oversight hearing on school emergency preparedness and safety.

CDF-NY is a long-time member of the Dignity in Schools Campaign of New York, a coalition that has been working for more than a decade to end the criminalization of young people in their classrooms. In our testimony today we urge the city to realign resources and invest in approaches to school safety that preserve the dignity and wellbeing of all students. Our ultimate goal is for the Department of Education (DOE) to implement restorative justice citywide by providing funding for schools to hire full-time restorative justice coordinators.

Bills under Consideration

Resolution 0514-2018

We support Resolution 514 and this effort to ensure all schools have one full-time guidance counselor and social worker for every 250 students and that smaller schools have at least one full-time guidance counselor and social worker. According to the most recent report on guidance counselors pursuant to Local Law 56 of 2014, there are 898 schools operating above that ratio and another 140 schools operating without a guidance counselor at all. This resolution offers a promising step toward making full-time counselors accessible to students and promoting a continued conversation with students and school communities about what they want and need.

We ask that the city use this movement forward to foster a pathway to employment for New York public school graduates who are trained and prepared to work as guidance counselors in their home communities and in their schools. There are precedents for this, including projects like NYC Men Teach, as well as peacekeeper or restorative justice coordinator models across the country.¹

¹ See POWER-PAC. (2015). *Parent-to-Parent Guide: Restorative Justice in Chicago Public Schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.cofionline.org/COFI/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/COFI-P2P-guide-update-2015.pdf>.

The School Emergency Preparedness Task Force

CDF-NY is concerned that the language establishing a school emergency preparedness task force rely upon an overly broad definition of school emergency:

School emergency means a situation involving a threat of harm to students, personnel, and/or facilities, including but not limited to natural, technological, and human-caused incidents, which require response from law enforcement.

The School Safety working group of the Mayor's Leadership Team intentionally narrowed the scope of school based emergencies to reflect a "threat of imminent danger" in order to ensure police interventions were an absolute last resort in schools. In part due to the overbroad scope of "school emergency," we are concerned that this task force will form recommendations to expand security processes and surveillance of young people in school. Many of the introductions, as written, could be interpreted to justify an increase in policing and zero tolerance approaches to emergency management or crisis intervention that are inconsistent with the Mayor's Leadership Team on School Climate's recommendations meant to alleviate some of the known harms of school safety policies.

CDF-NY works in coalition with students across the city who experience policing responses as measures that fail to address the underlying conditions that lead to conflict and violence in school. This mirrors research on the school-to-prison pipeline that describes how the introduction of police officers to schools leads to a "net widening" effect,² disrupts the schooling process and students' educational trajectories,³ and has had a disproportionately harmful impact on students of color,⁴ who are more likely to be arrested at school for behaving in the same ways as their white peers.⁵ Yet school criminalization continues even as new research finds either no correlation with safety or an inverse one.⁶

At the same time, research consistently finds that students who report high levels of school attachment have higher proportional odds of reporting feeling more safe.⁷ Creating an atmosphere of community and interconnectedness is a prevention strategy that has long proven itself to be a meaningful tool for improving a variety of academic and behavioral outcomes.⁸ However, schools need more tools and resources to implement effective alternatives, and we ask the city to direct attention there.

Introduction 0880-2018

Intro. 880 would require the DOE, in consultation with the NYPD, to install security cameras at schools "where such cameras are deemed appropriate," and report annually on the installation of such cameras. In 2004, City Council passed a bill to increase the installation of cameras in schools by the DOE in conjunction with the NYPD.⁹ While the final version of the law did not mandate the installation of video surveillance, it required the DOE to assess all schools by the end of 2006.¹⁰ Following the introduction of the bill, \$120 million was put into the DOE budget in the five year capital plan for the purpose of placing security cameras in schools.¹¹ By 2008 more than 300 middle and high schools in 130 buildings were set to be equipped with nearly 6,000 cameras belonging to the DOE's \$120 million Internet Protocol Digital

² Devin, D.N., and Gottfredson, D.C. (2018). The Roles of Police Officers in Schools: Effects on the Recording and Reporting of Crime. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 16(2): 208-223.

³ Justice Policy Institute. (2011). Education Under Arrests: The Case Against Police in Schools. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.justicepolicy.org/uploads/justicepolicy/documents/educationunderarrest_fullreport.pdf.

⁴ Sussman, A. (2012). Learning in Lockdown: School Police, Race, and the Limits of Law. *UCLA Law Review*, 59: 788-849.

⁵ Katayoon, M. (2011). Students of the Mass Incarceration Nation. *Howard Law Journal*, 54(2): 343-395

⁶ Adams, A.T. (2000). The Status of School Discipline and Violence, 567 ANNALS AM. ACAD. POL. & SOC. SCI. 140; Am. Psychological Ass'n Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are Zero Tolerance Policies Effective in the Schools? An Evidentiary Review and Recommendations, 63 AM. PSYCHOL. 852, 853-54.

⁷ Connell, N.M. (2018). Fear of Crime at School: Understanding Student Perceptions of Safety as Function of Historical Context. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 16(2): 124-136.

⁸ Connell, N.M. (2018). Fear of Crime at School: Understanding Student Perceptions of Safety as Function of Historical Context. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 16(2): 124-136.

⁹ Local Law of 2004, Council Int. No 0150-2004.

¹⁰ Ayoub, L.H.. (2013). *School Safety in New York City: Policy, Practice, and Programs from 2002 to 2013*. Center for Court Innovation. Available at <https://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/School%20Safety%20Policy%20Brief.pdf>.

¹¹ Andreatta, D. (2004, September 16). *Cams for All Schools as Crime Skyrockets*. New York Post. <https://nypost.com/2004/09/16/cams-for-all-schools-as-crime-skyrockets/>.

Video Surveillance (IPDVS) system.¹² One research study from 2008 found that enhanced surveillance added to students’ experiences of being “monitored,” “feared,” “contained,” and “harassed” all in the name of safety and protection.¹³ A report published nearly ten years later found the same results – New York City students are deeply aware that the persistent advancement of surveillance measures inside their schools has ill-intended consequences on them and their education.¹⁴

In addition to the issue of questionable effectiveness in promoting school safety, we are also concerned about youth privacy. The Council’s response to the FY2019 Preliminary Budget included the recommendation to spend \$100 million on camera security systems in schools,¹⁵ with ultimately \$1,794,000 in City Council Capital Funding allocated for school camera installation.¹⁶ When the question of the NYPD’s support for camera security systems was raised during the May 14 Executive Budget hearing, the NYPD responded, “We are very favorable on the installation of cameras we think they are very effective at helping us monitor what’s going on inside of schools”, while noting that “Currently though we only have access to the cameras from inside the school location. We highly recommend that we have remote access to that.” CDF-NY is deeply concerned by such recommendations.

New school security infrastructure will surely expand the NYPD’s and the School Safety Division’s capacity to keep students under surveillance. In an article published in 2008, the DOE claimed that while facial recognition software is not being used, the capacity for future installation is there.¹⁷ There is currently no effective oversight to limit the extent of surveillance or information collected relating to young people, and instead there has been much resistance to community efforts to increase public transparency.¹⁸

The School Safety Division of the NYPD

The new supporting schedules outline the modified Fiscal Year 2018 budget, and details that the NYPD’s School Safety Division budget was adjusted and grew to include over \$306 million for the last fiscal year – the largest it has ever been and over \$19 million more expensive than what was initially adopted in 2017.

	<u>City Spending July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018</u>	
	<i>School Safety Division</i>	<i>Police Department</i>
Current Modified 2018 Plan <i>Published June 18, 2018</i>	\$306,728,993 ¹⁹	\$5,889,539,378
Adopted 2018 Plan <i>Published June 8, 2017</i>	\$287,208,304 ²⁰	\$5,571,630,860
<i>Change in Spending:</i>	+ \$19,520,689 + 6.8%	+\$317,908,518 + 5.7%

¹² Winston, A. (2008, January 21). *What Do Cameras Cure? System Gets Own Scrutiny*. City Limits. Available at <https://citylimits.org/2008/01/21/what-do-cameras-cure-system-gets-own-scrutiny/>.

¹³ Weiss, J. (2008) Under the Radar: School Surveillance and Youth Resistance. PhD thesis. City University of New York.

¹⁴ Center for Popular Democracy and the Urban Youth Collaborative. (2017). *The \$746 Million a Year School-to-Prison Pipeline: The Ineffective, Discriminatory, and Costly Process of Criminalizing New York City Students*. Available at http://populardemocracy.org/sites/default/files/STPP_layout_web_final.pdf.

¹⁵ See *The New York City Council’s Response to the Fiscal 2019 Preliminary Budget and Fiscal 2018 Preliminary Mayor’s Management Report*. Available at <https://council.nyc.gov/budget/wp-content/uploads/sites/54/2018/04/The-Fiscal-2019-Preliminary-Budget-Response.pdf>.

¹⁶ See *New York City Council Capital Funding (2018)*, Available at http://www.nyc.gov/html/citycouncil/html/budget/capital_funding.shtml.

¹⁷ Winston, A. (2008, January 21). *What Do Cameras Cure? System Gets Own Scrutiny*. City Limits. Available at <https://citylimits.org/2008/01/21/what-do-cameras-cure-system-gets-own-scrutiny/>.

¹⁸ Brown, R. (2017, June 18). *Even de Blasio Thinks Proposed Surveillance Bill is too Liberal*. New York Post. Available at <https://nypost.com/2017/06/18/even-de-blasio-thinks-proposed-surveillance-bill-is-too-liberal/>.

¹⁹ This is the sum of \$301,825,145 in personal services and \$4,903,848 in other than personal services. See page 735 and 826 respectively <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/omb/downloads/pdf/ss6-18.pdf>.

²⁰ This is the sum of \$282,304,456 in personal services and \$4,903,848 in other than personnel services. See page 722 and 813 respectively <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/omb/downloads/pdf/ss6-17.pdf>.

The modified plan grew the School Safety Division budget by 6.8%, while the NYPD's overall budget grew by 5.7%. Through a 1998 Memorandum of Understanding, the Department of Education (DOE) essentially contracted-out school security to the NYPD. As a result, the DOE pays the NYPD through an intra-city payment each year. According to the supporting schedules this \$19 million increase in school security funding was paid for by the DOE:

<u>City Spending on School Safety July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018</u>		
	<i>Intra-City Payment</i>	<i>City Funds</i>
Current Modified 2018 Plan <i>Published June 18, 2018</i>	\$278,129,169	\$23,695,976
Adopted 2018 Plan <i>Published June 8, 2017</i>	\$258,600,021	\$23,704,435
<i>Change in Spending:</i>	+\$19,529,148	-\$8,459

The new Fiscal Year 2019 Adopted Budget accounts for 4,833 School Safety Agents – an increase of 187 agents from the Fiscal Year 2018 Adopted Budget – as well as an increase in 16 police officers for the School Safety Division of the NYPD. The budget reflects the NYPD's goal of growing the School Safety Division to include 5,511 total positions. At a time when there are only 2,800 full-time guidance counselors and students are calling for investments in their wellbeing, as Resolution 514 points out, the City must not continue to divert valuable resources away from remedies to the school-to-prison pipeline.

Importantly, the scope of police interventions in schools goes beyond this Division's funding. The majority of arrests and summonses carried out in schools are made by NYPD officers outside of the NYPD's School Safety Division. In the 2017-2018 school year, patrol officers and officers in the Detective Bureau made 77.6% of all arrests while patrol officers gave out 63.7% of all summonses.

CDF-NY understands that students who experience measures like arrests and summonses in school are more likely to also experience grade retention, reduced educational achievement, weakened social bonds and negative attitudes toward school, and end up missing or leaving school altogether.²¹ Aggressive and intrusive school security measures can "produce alienation and mistrust," decreases "school connectedness," and impedes "a cooperative learning environment by producing hostility and fear."²² School connectedness typically involves students' caring about and feeling invested in attending school.²³ It also involves students' feelings of belongingness at school and their trust of school staff. The benefits associated with greater attachment to school have led researchers and schools to identify increased school connectedness and development of a positive school environment as critical for conflict prevention.²⁴

Threat Assessments

CDF-NY is also concerned about the potential resurgence of zero tolerance responses to student threats of violence. During the first and second quarters of 2017, from January 1 to July 31, there were three school-based arrests of students for "terrorism," while in 2018's first and second quarters there were 23 arrests for "terrorism." This is a 667% increase in arrests for this charge, while overall there was a 6.5% decrease in the use of arrests overall during this time period. This raises concerns about the process of assessing threats and the ways in which exclusionary discipline and policing practices are being relied upon, while also raising other questions about the surveillance of young people.

²¹ Armour, M. (2016). Restorative Practices: Righting the Wrongs of Exclusionary School Discipline. *University of Richmond Law Review*, 50(3):999.

²² Beger, R.R. (2003). The "Worst of Both Worlds": School Security and the Disappearing Fourth Amendment Rights of Students. *Criminal Justice Review*, 28: 338–40.

²³ Theriot, M.T. (2013). The impact of school resource officer interaction on students' feelings about school and school police. *Crime & Delinquency*. Advance online publication, doi:10.1177/0011128713503526.

²⁴ Eisenbraun, K. D. (2007). Violence in schools: Prevalence, prediction, and prevention. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 459–469

In order to avoid a one-size-fits-all approach of zero tolerance models school districts in different parts of the country have implemented an effective threat assessment model as a violence prevention strategy.²⁵ The Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines in particular were developed as an alternative to zero tolerance approach to student threats.²⁶ One goal of the threat assessment process is to help a student deal with the problem, conflict, or frustration so that there is no longer a need to make a threat. This approach emphasizes teaching students and engaging the school community in effective ways to solve problems.²⁷

The Virginia Guidelines have been examined in a series of studies that have shown that staff training on the guidelines has a substantial effect on the attitudes and knowledge of different kinds of school staff, specifically including principals, psychologists, counselors, social workers, and school-based police officers.²⁸ Threat assessment strategies help identify students who may be in need of extra supports and services and foster a school environment where students feel connected to the staff and teachers. A randomized control trial in 40 schools produced strong evidence that the Virginia Guidelines can reduce long-term exclusions while other findings suggest that it is possible for school authorities to take a problem-oriented approach to resolve student threats without resorting to school removal. Considering what we know of best practices, we are alarmed by New York's recent data and insist that schools can avoid pushing students out of school.

The Warning Card Program

In February of 2015, the NYPD launched a warning card project to establish a pilot program in five school campuses in the Bronx that gives NYPD officers and School Safety Agents the discretion to issue a "warning card" to students instead of issuing a criminal court summonses for two infractions – possession of small amounts of marijuana and disorderly conduct – that occur on school grounds. In February of 2017 the NYPD expanded the warning card program to 11 additional school campuses, for a total of 71 schools. This school year the program has been implemented citywide.

During the 2017-2018 school year, or during the period of July 1 to June 30, there were 169 summonses given out in the participating schools – 88 of which were for disorderly conduct or possession of marijuana. Media reports show that only 82 warning cards were issued across the 71 schools in the last year and three large school campuses issued zero warning cards while continuing to issue summonses.²⁹ One explanation given by the administration was that this is a new policy, however 40 of the 88 summonses were issued inside of the original five pilot school campuses that have had the capacity to issue warning cards since 2015.

We ultimately do not believe that summonses are an appropriate response to young people in school. The DOE's Student Code of Conduct already offers alternatives and outlines 21 unique supports and interventions to be used in tandem with disciplinary actions, like parent outreach, peer mediation, or counseling staff referrals.

In 2011, data on school-related summonses became publically available in New York City for the first time as a result of the Council's Student Safety Act. Unfortunately, due to gaps in the data, we do not know the racial disparities in summonses by summons charge, but we do know that summonses overall were disproportionately given to Black students. In the 2017-2018 school year 53.2% of all summonses were given to Black students – 26% of the total student population – while 96.2% of all summonses were given to students of color – 85% of the student population.

²⁵ Cornell, D., and Lovegrove, P. (2012). Student Threat Assessment as a Method of Reducing Student Suspensions. Chapter prepared for *Race and Gender Disparities in School Discipline*, Center for Civil Rights Remedies, UCLA.

²⁶ Cornell, D. & Sheras, P. (2006). Guidelines for responding to student threats of violence. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

²⁷ Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Sprague, J.R., & Doyle, W. (2010). How can we improve school discipline? *Educational Researcher*, 39, 48-58.

²⁸ Allen, K., Cornell, D., Lorek, E., & Sheras, P. (2008). Response of school personnel to student threat assessment training. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 19, 319-332. See also Cornell, D., Allen, K., & Fan, X. (2012). A randomized controlled study of the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines in grades K-12. *School Psychology Review*, 41, 100-115.

²⁹ Spectrum News NY1. (2018, September 14). *Public Schools Tackle Students' First Offense with Warning Cards*. Author. Available at <http://www.ny1.com/nyc/all-boroughs/news/2018/09/14/public-schools-tackle-students-first-offense-with-warning-cards>.

Missing school to answer a summons and attend court not only requires students to miss classroom instruction time and possibly fall behind academically, but exclusion serves to stigmatize students and impede access to needed support or resources.³⁰ Accumulating evidence demonstrates that excluding students from school significantly decreases the likelihood that they will graduate from high school,³¹ and increases the likelihood that students will be pushed into the justice system in the future.³² Not only does a summons require missing school, it burdens young people with fines and court fees or potential warrants for missed court dates or inability to pay the fine. It is important to point out that this potential for intensifying punishment is only imposed on students 16 and older, while their 15 year old classmates are experiencing alternatives.

The Neighborhood Coordination Officer Pilot Program

During the May 14, 2018 Executive Budget hearing on Public Safety, the NYPD testified that the School Safety Division would be bringing the Neighborhood Coordination Officer (NCO) “philosophy” to schools starting in September in the Bronx and moving citywide after that. The program was featured in the New York Times during the first week of school, claiming the pilot would “turn school safety agents into the equivalent of beat cops.”³³

This “new approach to school safety,” as the New York Times labels it, will not remedy the conditions that lead to conflict or violence, but rather will push aside the more systemic problems and push young people out of school. Community policing will extend police presence and surveillance deeper into everyday student life, and further treat what are interpersonal and community concerns as police matters to be responded to with the tools of policing - like what we see reported through the Council’s Student Safety Act in use of force, handcuffs and restraints, arrests, and criminal court summonses numbers.

Using a longitudinal sample consisting of three years of data from the School Survey on Crime and Safety, researchers concluded that School Resource Officers (SROs) may contribute to a deterioration of the school climate and communal social organization of the school.³⁴ We urge the City to prioritize divestment from the intensive policing of youth and instead invest in community responses that preserve the dignity of all students.

The Memorandum of Understanding

This pilot program further contradicts the recommendations established by the Mayor’s Leadership Team on School Climate (hereafter “MLT”). In July of 2016, the MLT released their first of two reports, including the recommendation that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the NYPD and DOE be revised to decriminalize student behavior by clearly delineating the roles of school administrators and the NYPD, specifying behaviors that will not result in student arrest or receipt of a summons, and creating an arrest diversion program. As stated in the report, the MOU, as is, “fails to clearly delineate the role of educators in disciplining students for non-criminal behavior”.³⁵ With the school safety working group, CDF-NY worked to codify a ladder of referral within school administration to govern the initial response to harmful student behavior as the presence of school police creates the opportunity for increased application of the law directly to students without the filter of school administrators or policies.

³⁰ Noguera, P.A. (2003). Schools, Prisons, and Social Implications of Punishment: Rethinking Disciplinary Practices. *Theory into Practice*, 42(4): 341-350.

³¹ Justice Policy Institute. (2011). Education under Arrest: The Case Against Police in Schools. Washington, D.C.: Author. Available at http://www.justicepolicy.org/uploads/justicepolicy/documents/educationunderarrest_fullreport.pdf.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Shapiro, E. (2018, September 5). *Wander the Halls, Say Hello: A New Approach to School Safety*. The New York Times. Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/05/nyregion/school-safety-nyc.html>.

³⁴ Devlin, D.N., Rennó Santos, M., Gottfredson, D.C. (2018). An evaluation of police officers in schools as a bullying intervention. *Evaluation of Program Planning*, 71(12):12-21.

³⁵ The Mayor’s Leadership Team on School Climate and Discipline. (2016). *Maintaining the Momentum: A Plan for Safety and Fairness in Schools*. New York, NY. Available at http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/sclt/downloads/pdf/SCLT_Report_7-21-16.pdf.

Restorative Justice

By developing more balanced responses to student behavior, such as restorative justice, schools can promote stronger academic environments, which in turn improve school safety.³⁶ School-based restorative justice is a whole-school approach focused on relationships, reconciliation, and student inclusion in the school community as a means of addressing issues of the significant negative impact of exclusionary discipline.³⁷ The theory behind restorative practices is to empower people to resolve conflict or harm together,³⁸ and prevent unwelcome behavior and subsequent police intervention by facilitating relationship-building, setting clear behavioral expectations, and maintaining a positive school climate.³⁹

The Council's Restorative Justice Initiative

In the spring of 2016, with \$2.4 million of funding from the Council, the DOE launched a Restorative Justice Pilot Program in 25 schools.⁴⁰ We are disappointed to see that in FY2019 the Initiative received only \$1.3 million in funding, even as data made public by the Council shows that the program is working and there has been a significant decline in suspensions at the 25 schools participating.⁴¹

CDF-NY respectfully asks that the Council continue this initiative in FY2020 as well as continue to seek feedback from restorative practitioners and community members about how restorative practices are best implemented in schools. By prioritizing initiatives that build school capacity, we have a remarkable opportunity to sincerely and strategically transform schools from an inequitable, punitive model to an alternative, preventative and restorative model that improves school climate and safety.

Conclusion

CDF-NY believes that all city schools need access to models, such as restorative justice practices, that can positively address student needs and lessen the demand for policing and surveillance. It is our hope that the Council continues dialogue with the City on the value of sustainable investment in restorative justice in schools and ending the persistent disparities facing New York's students.

Thank you again for this opportunity to testify.

³⁶ Stinchcomb, J.B., Bazemore, G., and Riestenberg, N. (2006). Beyond Zero Tolerance: Restoring Justice in Secondary Schools. *Youth Violence & Juvenile Justice*, 4:123-147.

³⁷ Haft, W. (2000). More Than Zero, The Cost of Zero Tolerance and the Case for Restorative Justice in Schools. *Denver University Law Review*, 77: 795.

³⁸ Karp, D., and Clear, T.R. (2000). Community Justice: A Conceptual Framework. In C.M. Friel (Ed.), *Boundaries Changes in Criminal Justice Organizations*, vol. 2. (pp. 323-368). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

³⁹ Osher, D., Bear, G.G., Sprague, J.R., and Doyle, W. (2010). How Can We Improve School Discipline? *Educational Researcher*, 39(1): 48-58.

⁴⁰ DOE, "School Allocation Memorandum No. 66, FY 2017," Aug. 22, 2016, available at http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d_chanc_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy16_17/fy17_pdf/sam66.pdf.

⁴¹ See Committee Report <http://legistar.council.nyc.gov/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=573905&GUID=E5C8F3DF-4378-4AAA-82DB-7FAE23C1726B&Options=info&Search=>.